~~GS 7154~~
~~7ft-337~~
560332/

~~JUN 08 1995~~
~~IL 8431434~~

Copyright by

Richard Emil Bjork

1961

ABSTRACT

THE CHANGING ROLES OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: A STUDY OF CERTAIN PERCEPTIONS OF UNIVERSITIES' INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND THE IMPACTS OF SUCH ACTIVITIES ON UNIVERSITIES' PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

By Richard E. Bjork

Body of Abstract

American universities have increased markedly all aspects of their participation in international relations. This study focuses primarily on that aspect of universities' participation in international relations for which the university as an institution accepts formal responsibility (referred to in this study as "international programs"), and on the impacts of such international programs on universities' roles in international relations as perceived by a sample of university, government, and foundation personnel. Additionally, the history of American universities' major international activities since 1900 is traced briefly to indicate the significant antecedents of universities' present roles in international relations.

Data for the present study were obtained from interviews and the currently limited amount of literature concerned with the international programs of American universities. A total of 423 persons with international program experiences were interviewed. Of the 423 interviewees, 303 were university personnel, eighty-seven government personnel, and twenty-three foundation personnel. The university personnel

were selected from thirty universities involved in international programs at the time interviewing was conducted. Fifty of the government interviewees were working overseas in activities related to universities' international programs at the time they were interviewed. The remaining thirty-seven government personnel were interviewed in Washington, D. C. The twenty-three foundation personnel interviewed were high-level persons in the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Unguided interviews were used in all instances.

The interview data were organized to explore three groups of hypotheses dealing with the following: (1) the ways university personnel perceived universities' roles in international relations; (2) the perceptions of universities' roles held by foundation and government personnel; (3) with certain aspects of the operational relationships associated with international programs. More specifically, the interviews attempted to indicate the respondents' perceptions of what international acts universities perform, how universities perform such acts, and why universities perform such acts. The respondents' statements with respect to these hypotheses provided material for an analysis of the impacts of international programs on universities' roles in international relations.

Main Findings

1) a. University respondents stated most frequently that universities are expected to perform international acts that are primarily educational in nature. Universities are seldom expected to perform political acts.

b. Non-university personnel representing foundations and the government stated, by a small margin of frequency, that universities can be expected to perform political acts. The second most frequently stated expectation of this group was that universities are expected to perform educational, cross-cultural, and economic acts. Those respondents emphasizing that political acts can be expected were almost exclusively government personnel, and those emphasizing expectations about other kinds of acts were almost exclusively foundation personnel.

c. Such stated expectations by all respondents are not wholly in accord with the reported pattern of international programs presently operative. Currently operative programs appear to be primarily in cross-cultural and humanitarian fields.

2) a. University and foundation respondents most frequently stated that international programs should be performed primarily through the sending of American faculty and staff abroad, and that such personnel should be abroad within the framework of a university-to-university relationship. Additionally, most university respondents mentioned that universities should have considerable operating independence when operating internationally.

b. Government respondents most frequently stated that universities' international activities should be more closely related to the government's international activities. Government personnel did not generally appear to support the universities' claim for independence.

3) Statements by university respondents as to why universities perform international acts fell with almost equal frequencies into three categories:

   a. Development of the cooperating country.

   b. General advancement of knowledge.

   c. Strengthening of American university

   The frequencies with which universities openly supported "execution of American foreign policy objectives" were very low. This is in contrast to the frequent statements of non-university respondents that universities' international activities are expected to support foreign policy objectives.

4) The over-all impact of international programs has been to expand the numbers, kinds, and sizes of the universities' roles in international relations. The programs' impacts are most evident in the following areas:

   a. Characteristics of university personnel, and university policies toward them.

   b. Subject matters taught and researched by universities.

   c. Internal organization of universities.

   d. International roles of universities.

   e. Some characteristics traditionally associated with the university as an institution.

   The expansion and changes of universities' roles have produced considerable confusion and dissension among university personnel. Universities are presently reorganizing and developing new forms to meet the increasing demands of international activities on universities' resources.

THE CHANGING ROLES OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: A STUDY OF CERTAIN PERCEPTIONS OF UNIVERSITIES' INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND THE IMPACTS OF SUCH ACTIVITIES ON UNIVERSITIES' PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

By

Richard E. Bjork

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Political Science

1961

G 16396
7/28/61

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Whatever the limitations and deficiencies of the present study, it must be acknowledged that numerous persons deeply interested in the international activities of American universities have cooperated fully and given generously of their time. Without the assistance and understanding of the academic, foundation, and government communities generally, it would have been impossible for this writer to have assembled the data which form the basis of the study. Their contributions are deeply appreciated.

Very special burdens were borne by the members of the committee which guided the writer past many pitfalls. Dr. Edward W. Weidner, Chairman of the writer's Thesis Committee, provided leadership and direction tempered with sympathetic understanding. Drs. Bruce L. Smith and Howard Scarrow as members of the Thesis Committee spent innumerable hours reading and correcting the drafts of the present study, and counseling the writer in the ways of scholarship.

The writer acknowledges a debt of sincere appreciation to Dorothy Young for her hours of typing and her attention to thousands of details.

Financial support from the Institute of Research on Overseas Programs and the Carnegie Corporation of New York provided the means for gathering the data for the present study. Naturally, none of the groups or persons who have cooperated with the writer bear any responsibility for the views expressed herein or for possible errors committed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES v

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY 1

Major Social Science Concepts Used 4
Statement of Guiding Hypotheses 13
Explanation of Guiding Hypotheses 21
Policy Significance of Hypotheses 33

II. DEFINITIONS AND METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION 39

Selection of Universities Studied 41
Data Collection Procedures 44
Characteristics of the Universities and Programs in the Sample 49

III. BACKGROUND MATERIALS RELATED TO THE CURRENT PARTICIPATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS . . 55

Religious Predecessors and Influences 60
The Development of Government Interest and Influence in International Programs 70
"The Prelude" until 1936 71
The Extension and Formalization of Cooperation Between the Government and Universities in International Relations after 1936 77
Private Foundations as Sponsors of International Programs 109
Independent Activities of Universities on the International Level 128

IV. PERCEPTIONS OF KNOWLEDGEABLES ABOUT ACTS PERFORMED BY UNIVERSITIES THROUGH INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS 142

Accuracy and Validity of Data 144
Previously Collected Data 146
Findings 147
Types of Acts Universities are Expected to Perform Through International Programs 148
How Universities are Expected to Perform International Acts 162
Resource Utilization 163

Chapter Page

Operational Arrangements 168
Source of Funds 172
Why Universities are Expected to Perform International Acts 178
Summary and Conclusion 191

V. EXAMINATION OF THE GUIDING HYPOTHESES (PART I) 195

VI. EXAMINATION OF THE GUIDING HYPOTHESES (PART II) 230

Summary of Findings on Second Group of Hypotheses . . . 255
Impact of University-Sponsor Operating Relationships on Universities 257
Summary and Problems Raised 283

VII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 286

Actors' Perceptions 286
Impacts of International Programs on Participating American Universities 293
Recommendations 317

BIBLIOGRAPHY 325

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Number of Interviewees and International Programs, Classified by Universities Included in Sample	45
2.	Distribution of Interviewees by Primary University Roles	48
3.	Distribution of Universities by Size	50
4.	Distribution of Universities by Type of Control	52
5.	Primary Sources of Funds for International Programs	53
6.	Frequency of Statements by University Personnel About the Types of Acts Universities Are Expected to Perform in International Relations Through International Programs	151
7.	Frequency of Statements by Non-university Personnel About the Types of Acts Universities Are Expected to Perform in International Relations Through International Programs	154
8.	Number of University International Programs Reported to be Performing Particular Types of Acts	158
9.	Frequency of Statements by University Personnel About Primary Ways in which Universities Are Expected to Carry Out International Programs	165
10.	Frequency of Statements by University Personnel About What Kinds of Operational Arrangements Universities Are Expected to Utilize in Carrying Out International Programs	170
11.	Frequency of Statements by University Personnel About the Sources from which Universities Can Expect to Receive Funds for Carrying Out International Programs	174
12.	Frequency of Statements by University Personnel About "The Most Important" Reason Why U.S. Universities are Expected to Carry Out International Programs	180
13.	Frequency of Statements by Non-university Personnel About "The Most Important" Reason Why U.S. Universities Are Expected to Carry Out International Programs	181
14.	Broad Purposes of Universities' International Programs, According to Presidents of Universities with ACE Membership	186

Table Page

15. Ranking of Coordinators' Opinions as to the Reasons Their Universities Have Adopted International Programs 190

16. Comments by U.S. University Personnel on Aspects of the Impact of International Programs on Cooperating Foreign Countries 203

17. General Summary of Main Comments by "Knowledgeable" U.S. University Personnel Relative to Hypotheses Ia-Ii 229

18. Extent of Administrative Differences Between Universities and Sponsors, as Perceived by Various Types of Respondents 260

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

Some American universities have recently altered their roles in a manner which suggests that they have a growing interest in international relations and that they consider themselves capable of exerting an important influence in international relations. This role alteration has been stimulated by the world political environment following World War II and the Korean War. This new environment has led to increased financial assistance for university participation in activities related to other nations. The wherewithal to implement the growing international interests of the universities has been forthcoming in significant amounts from such interested parties as private foundations and the United States Government as well as from many less substantially endowed donors. These events have created circumstances in which international communications and contacts have developed rapidly and extensively among university personnel. On an unprecedented scale, American university personnel have been brought into direct contact with the aspirations and problems of societies very different from their own. The impact of this contact has never been accurately gauged, but recent events indicate that some of the personnel of American universities, among others, have been sufficiently impressed by their experiences to influence their universities to increase their commitments in the international sphere. These catalytic factors, along with a propitious

environment, finances, and individual commitments have thrust American universities onto the international scene with enhanced resources, but with what appear to be poorly defined concepts of their roles.

The several hundred interviews conducted on thirty-five American university campuses for this study suggest that while most policy-makers for American universities are only moderately concerned about the roles universities play in international affairs, they seem to be aware of the fact that the magnitude of universities' participation in international relations has increased markedly. At least, the fact that the U.S. Government and foundations have recently increased the financial resources available to universities for activities involving foreign nationals and countries is widely known in American university circles. Further, the interviews indicate that the most interested of university personnel, usually administrators, are known to maintain fairly complete records of the international activities of other universities, especially those that are viewed as competitors or equals. Even those university personnel who profess only a marginal interest in international affairs appear to have generally accurate notions about the major international activities of American universities. Notwithstanding this quite extensive "feel" for the broad dimensions of the universities' international participation, few university persons, even those directly responsible for the operation of particular international programs, have been able to describe concretely what the policy implications of this type of activity are.

The painstaking process of relating increasing international opportunities for university action to the roles of universities in societies has made a slow start. Even today it is visible on only a

few American campuses. In most cases, no serious attempt has been made by the universities to explore fully the consequences that flow from international involvement. Attitudes of indifference, confusion, and hostility toward involvement are common throughout American universities. It is one purpose of this study to explore the attitudinal environments at American university campuses on which international programs operate. Once this is done, it may be possible to describe the levels of interest university leadership groups have in formulating roles for universities in international relations, and to offer a statement of the possible policy implications of such roles.[1]

Because the term "international relations" is frequently identified exclusively with political intercourse among nation-states, it is important to this study that some non-political elements of international relations be indicated. In the present case, the most significant non-political elements are travel and the diffusion of culture, information, and education. However, it should be acknowledged that it is quite possible that activities in the foregoing areas might have non-political origins and goals, but might become political in the process of being conducted internationally. This study recognizes this possibility and attempts to discuss its incidence, especially in the area of government-sponsored university programs. Nonetheless, it is equally important to emphasize the fact that universities differ from political agencies in various ways, such as method of operation, focus

---

[1] General supporting evidence for the statements made in this paragraph is also available from the comments of university leaders made at the Annapolis Conference on International Education, April 4-5, 1959, under the auspices of the Bureau of International Cultural Relations, U.S. Department of State. A summary of the discussions of the conference was given limited distribution in lithographed form.

of interest, etc. These differences tend to prevail internationally as well as nationally. Consequently, the international relations of a nation-state and of its components (such as universities) are multi-dimensional. This study is primarily focused on one dimension of international relations, e.g., international educational cooperation as it functions through the international programs of American universities.[2]

Major Social Science Concepts Used

Two theoretical concepts common to the social sciences, elite and role, are emphasized in this study. These two concepts are related, and their relations provide a framework for a description and analysis of the international activities of American universities as well as of the activities of the sponsoring and cooperating institutions involved with American universities.

The concept of role has at least two important aspects which are useful for an analysis of the international activities of American universities. The first is the relationship of any actor's role to his status or situation in society. In general social-scientific usage, the concept of role involves the definition of a specific situation by the actor or acceptance of such a definition by the actor. Thus if an actor has no status in society or cannot define his situation, he has no role that can be identified.[3] Secondly, formulation, assumption, and execution of a role by an actor are functions of the perception of such a role by the affected actors.

---

[2]For a much broader discussion of education and international relations, see Howard E. Wilson, Universities and World Affairs (New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1951).

[3]For a summary of some of the major attempts to define the concept of role, see Lionel J. Neiman and James W. Hughes, "The Problem of the Concept of Role--A Re-Survey of the Literature," Social Forces, October 1951, Vol. 30, No. 1, pp. 141-149.

In 1936, Ralph Linton theorized about status and role in a manner which continues to be widely accepted today. He argued that a role represents the dynamic aspect of a status. An actor is socially assigned to a status and occupies it with relation to other statuses. When he puts the rights and duties which constitute the status into effect, he is performing a role. Role and status are inseparable; consequently, there are no roles without statuses or statuses without roles. Every actor has a variety of roles deriving from the various patterns in which he participates, and at the same time, a general role which represents the sum of these roles and determines what he does for society and what he can expect from it. The roles associated with the statuses within a single social system are usually fairly well adjusted to one another and produce no conflicts as long as the actor is operating within this system.[4]

In defining the concept of role, Linton introduces several terms which contribute to the construction of an analytic framework for this study. These terms are actor, patterns, system, and status. For present purposes, an actor can either be an individual or an institution. To have relevance to this study an individual must be directly connected with American universities, sponsoring organizations, and/or foreign institutions cooperating within the compass of an international program related to an American university. Major relevant institutional actors are American universities, their international sponsors, especially the

---

[4]The material presented in this paragraph has been extracted from Ralph Linton, The Study of Man (New York: Appleton-Century, 1936), p. 114, and Ralph Linton, The Cultural Background of Personality (New York: Appleton-Century, 1945), p. 18. Comments about Linton's concept of role are included in Neiman and Hughes, op. cit., pp. 145-6.

U.S. Government and foundations, and the cooperating foreign institutions such as universities and special government agencies. The interactions among these actors loosely define the system in which they operate, for the relative uniqueness of their activity vis-à-vis general publics or other specialized collective actors precludes significant intrusions from casual sources. Rough limits to the maximum expansion of the system are imposed by the exigencies of the world situation, which in turn is influenced primarily by nation-state actors. The result of this circumstance is that the system operates with only modest precision and predictability. One indication of the tenuousness of the system's existence is the high and persistent level of anxiety displayed by American university policy-makers about decisions to participate in the system. Despite malfunctions within the system, there exist sufficient regularity of behavior and patterns of interaction among the three major sorts of actors for one to conclude that a system does exist within which certain university activities are conducted internationally. The fact that individuals within universities, sponsoring organizations, and foreign cooperating institutions are quick to identify malfunctions further supports the concept of a system.

In Linton's definition of the concept of role, the term "patterns" refers to the various substructures, -statuses, and -situations in society from which roles are derived, the sum of which constitute an actor's general role. Related to the present study, a "pattern" means that portion of the universities' general societal role which manifests itself in international programs. The general role of universities in society includes more than their participation in international activities. The international pattern is only one of several

patterns in which the universities participate; and the roles derived from this pattern constitute a single component of the general role which American universities perform. In fact, international participation is usually viewed as definitely secondary to the universities' responsibilities to the nation, state, community, and the "people". This much all of the actors in the system can agree upon, but when attempts are made by them to describe, evaluate, and relate the international pattern and the role derived from it, the actors diverge. Discussion of the nature and consequences of this divergence will be deferred until the theoretical basis of this study has been established.

Status consists of a set of rights and duties. A social system's acknowledgement of rights, and its expectation of the performance of duties by an actor, are prerequisites for the assumption of a role. Without elaboration, a definition of this type is helpful only to a limited degree, for it tends to describe role and status structurally without indicating the derivation of the set of rights and duties or indicating how actor performance is judged. It includes no positive indication that role and status are in part a function of perception as well as situation. This study, for example, assumes that university personnel exhibit a relatively high consensus with regard to the general status and role of the university in American society. University personnel may disagree about this general role, but they are not comparable to the disagreements among those actors (U.S. Government and foundations, for example) who are co-actors with American universities in international society. The status of the American university internationally has not yet been completely defined in terms of rights and duties the performance of which describes its general roles. The

discovery and assignment to universities of status-describing factors is in a confused state. Thus, not only must there be an international situation in which rights and duties of a university status can be formulated, but there must also be a high degree of perceptual consensus among the affected parties if American universities are to have identifiable roles.

To illustrate the significance of role perception to this study, one might speculate about some possible perceptions of American universities in international affairs which could exist among the three actors in our system. The American university, confident of its status and roles at home, might consider its international roles as essentially an extension and expansion of its national roles. Thus the American university would function as a training center for the development of a wide range of skills and knowledge, most of which could be placed in the service of society quite directly. Foreign students studying at American campuses would tread a path of course work designed to equip them to march in the cause of progress. In this manner, a portion of the American success story could be exported with the expectation that it would serve as a useful guide to countries less developed than the United States. From another point of view, the sponsors of American universities' international activities might perceive those universities as instruments to be used to advance certain types of political policies not usually considered part of the universities' general role in the United States. The result could easily be conflict between the universities and their sponsors on the issue of what constitutes an appropriate international role for American universities. Finally, the foreign institutions cooperating with American universities in their

international endeavors might perceive these institutions as convenient places to send their young for technical training, as agencies of the U.S. Government, as bulwarks to the old order or as devices to build a new order, among other things. These random bits of speculation suggest the possible range of perceptions about the international roles of American universities.

Linton's definition of the role concept, as adopted for use in this study, emphasizes the fact that role is the dynamic aspect of status. This suggests that one way to determine various actors' perceptions of their own and others' roles is to examine statements they make which are related to the performance of certain acts by a particular actor. In this study this means statements made by university and sponsoring organization personnel about the acts performed by American university personnel in the conduct of international programs for which the university accepts formal responsibility.[5]

Such statements have been collected from universities and sponsoring agencies. When distributed into the following categories, they indicate the kinds of perceptions the knowledgeable personnel composing these two collective actors hold with regard to the roles American universities are currently playing through education in the field of international relations, and the implications of such roles. Distributive categories which are useful for "getting at" role perceptions include:

1) statements about the kinds of acts universities are expected to perform.

---

[5]Chapter II contains a description of the institutions and personnel referred to here in general terms.

2) statements about "how" universities are expected to perform such acts.

3) statements about "why" universities are expected to perform such acts.

It is assumed that the persons making the foregoing types of statements do so with conscious or unconscious regard for certain symbols related to international relations. Harold D. Lasswell in World Politics and Personal Insecurity[6] suggests some symbol types which are relevant to this study. First are the symbols of identification. With what individual and collective actors do universities identify themselves, and with what actors are they identified by those who sponsor their international programs? Second are the symbols of demand which describe the prerequisites for satisfaction of those participating in an enterprise. Third are the symbols of expectation which purport to describe the ideal and real goals of the actors as well as possible consequences of their acts and of others' acts.

Although this study does not attempt to specify the key and/or secondary values of the respondents, it anticipates that the respondents' statements, when distributed in the aforementioned categories and linked to certain symbols, will provide a crude picture of some of the major value structures or referents of the major actors. Such value "pictures" are suggestive when one attempts to formulate explanatory generalizations. Moreover, they provide various groups of decision-makers with

---

[6] Edition used is contained in Harold D. Lasswell, Charles E. Merriam, and T. V. Smith, A Study of Power (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1950). Additional material on symbols is available in Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Power and Society (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950).

some insight into the possible implications of international programs, as related especially to American universities.

"Elite" is a second social science concept used in this study. It is considered as a special component of role structure. Emphasizing Harold D. Lasswell's comments on elites[7], one can say that the term "elite" designates holders of high positions in a collectivity. These high positions are defined in terms of the various actors' relative levels of receipt of various values in society, such as power, knowledge, wealth, etc. Every value in society has an elite, which is composed of those individuals who receive the most of that value. "Most" is understood to be an amount considered by actors or analysts to be significantly larger than that received by the mass of persons pursuing the value in question. The receipt of a substantially greater portion of this value may afford the receivers, the "elite," an opportunity to exercise control over those who get less of the value. A high degree of possession is characteristic of a relatively small number of individuals; consequently, the elite is commonly thought of as "the few." Such a concentration of value-income is not inevitable, but it is the general case. Lasswell stresses the point that it is not necessary that a power structure be represented schematically as a pyramid with the elite located at the pinnacle. An elite may be so broad--that is, values may be so widely shared in a society--that the power structure can be drawn to look like an inverted pyramid in extreme cases.[8] In most instances, a true picture lies somewhere between these two extremes.

---

[7]For a brief history of the elite concept and a definition of "elite" see Harold D. Lasswell and others, The Comparative Study of Elites (Stanford: Stanford University Press, January 1952).

[8]Ibid, pp. 12-13.

Since an elite is composed of those who get the most of a particular value, it often follows that such individuals, "elite members," have the greatest authority within a value system, and that they have the greatest potential control. Whether or not they utilize their authority by exercising control is another matter, for we are all familiar with the formal ruler who technically possesses authority, yet does not control. In this study we are primarily interested in those elites who actually exercise control through approved channels (the active elites and active sub-elites). If they exercise control, it is probable that they will possess the power to make decisions which affect their respective collectivities.[9] However, this is not intended to exclude the counter-elites, outside the approved channels, who are interested in reapportioning a value system so that they are in a position to exercise control. This study will attempt to demonstrate that American universities may perform a significant role vis-à-vis counter-elite personnel from foreign countries.

In summary, the two social scientific concepts which appear most prominently throughout this study are role and elite. Role is a derivative of status in society and of the perceptions held by and about actors affected by that status. With regard to institutions, we are first concerned with the statuses of American universities in international relations and with the elements of these statuses that affect their international roles. Secondly, we note that American universities attempt to perform their international roles in conjunction with their roles in the American national social system and under the

---

[9]The relationships of authority, control, decision, and power are discussed in Lasswell, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

stresses and strains imposed by their own perceptions of their roles as well as by the perceptions of the two other actors in the system, i.e., sponsors and foreign cooperating institutions. Finally, we assume that the major targets of the international activities of American universities are the elites of power and knowledge.

Statement of Guiding Hypotheses

The value of this study to social scientists and policy-makers may lie in the hypotheses to be developed. Three major sets of hypotheses relative to the universities' roles in international relations will be explored. The first deals with the universities' perceptions of their roles; the second deals with the ways the major sponsors of the international activities of American universities perceive the universities' roles internationally; and the third deals with actual operational relationships associated with international programs, as viewed by the writer. Each of the three major sets of hypotheses to be explored leads to several sub-hypotheses which are intended to indicate the multiplicity or singularity of views about the international role of American universities held by persons representing the universities and their sponsors.

The first major hypothesis and its sub-hypotheses purport to describe the manner in which university personnel consciously involved in the operations of American universities' international programs view the international roles of these institutions. The hypotheses do not attempt to indicate how university personnel apparently unaffected by or unaware of the international commitment of American universities perceive this facet of the universities' activities.

Hypothesis on primary educational role of American universities in international relations as perceived by university personnel

I. Since most American university personnel do not differentiate between the sorts of demands various societies place on their elites of knowledge, they tend to believe that the primary educational role of American universities in international relations is to provide more or less uniform academic training for all persons, irrespective of their national backgrounds or social statuses; and that such training will and should equip all those persons with a variety of skills especially valued by literate, industrialized societies.

Hypotheses on secondary roles of American universities in international relations as perceived by university personnel

American university personnel tend to believe that:

(Ia) Through participation in international programs American universities are contributing significantly to the training/education of foreign elites/leaders.

(Ib) Through participation in international programs American universities make significant contributions to the international policies of the United States and its government.

(Ic) Through participation in international programs American universities make significant contributions to the general welfare of mankind, e.g., to humanitarian activities, expansion of educational facilities, diffusion and growth of knowledge, mutual understanding, etc.

Hypotheses on impact of international programs on participating American universities as perceived by American university personnel

American university personnel tend to believe that:

(Id) International programs provide an impressive demonstration of the nature and importance of foreign persons and events, which makes a positive contribution to the education and development of most university personnel, both students and staff.

(Ie) International programs are important sources of stimulation, through the presence of non-nationals on American university campuses and because of the foreign experiences of university personnel, for changes in curricula, for expansion of all activities related to international events, and for the growth of cosmopolitan attitudes among university-educated personnel.

(If) Participation in international programs tends to enhance the prestige of the universities involved.

(Ig) In many cases, participation in international programs results in additions to university faculties and the development of new areas of interest and competence.

(Ih) Notwithstanding the foregoing (Id - Ig), the impact of international programs on American university campuses has created mixed attitudes of disappointment, confusion, indifference, and hostility among university personnel.

(Ii) Notwithstanding Id - Ig, the fact that American universities, through international programs, make unique contributions to international relations, to other societies, and to American education is hardly evident among those university personnel who have had any contact with their institutions' international programs.

We now can state a second set of hypotheses, one which reflects the way in which the sponsors of the international programs of American universities perceive the international roles of those universities. There are many different types of sponsors. An attempt has been made in this study to concentrate on the most active and significant sponsors of American universities, internationally, namely the U.S. Government and a few large private foundations. Not only do these organizations expend the largest sums of money for university work in the international field and send large groups of American educators abroad; they also represent important forces in international relations in their own right. Their influence is so sizeable that it has prompted numerous people interviewed during this study to conclude that the government and large foundations tend to overshadow the universities they sponsor, thereby complicating the activities of American universities in foreign countries. While acknowledging the strengths of the government and large foundations in that area of international relations involving American universities, it is important to remember that others have not abandoned the field completely to them. Scores of organizations promote and sponsor university programs abroad. Many, such as religious groups, have a long history of operating on the international scene in cooperation with or through American institutions of higher education. More recent sorts of sponsors include universities themselves and their subdivisions, and local or national clubs and other organizations who have done much to develop the study-abroad programs and student exchanges. None of these programs singly can match the scope and organization of government-sponsored and foundation-sponsored programs, but in the aggregate they are influential in determining the universities' roles

in international relations. The U.S. Government, large private foundations, and a variety of small, internationally oriented groups, then, constitute the three types of sponsors discussed in this study. The small scale sponsors, as a group, are the most difficult to characterize and analyze. Regardless of the difficulties involved in treating their contributions systematically, an initial attempt will be made in this study to grasp the extent and complexity of their relationships with American universities in international relations.

Hypotheses on primary role of American universities in international relations as perceived by personnel of sponsoring organizations

II(a) Since government responsibilities in international relations are urgent and tend to be viewed by U.S. Government personnel in a short-term or medium-term perspective, there exists among government personnel acquainted with government-sponsored international programs involving American universities a tendency to consider such institutions and their staffs primarily as instruments to be used by the government in support of relatively urgent and relatively specific foreign policy objectives.

(IIai) The methods to be utilized and the goals to be pursued in international programs tend to be formulated by U.S. Government elites with a primary emphasis on short-term or medium-term political objectives and only a moderate interest in the educational practices and aspirations of the American or foreign universities.

II(b) Large foundations, the major private sponsors of the international programs of American universities, display a high degree of

ambivalence with regard to their role expectations for American universities.

(IIb1) The larger the program in terms of money and persons involved, the more closely the expectations of the foundations and relations between the foundations and the universities approximate those in the government-university situation.

(IIbii) The smaller the program, the greater the freedom the foundations accord the universities to formulate their own roles.

II(c) The minor private sponsors, small foundations, student organizations, individual grantors, religious groups, etc., of the international programs of American universities tend to have a wide variety of perceptions relative to the international roles of American universities.

(IIc1) Since the number and size of the international programs sponsored by these groups is small compared to those sponsored by the government and large foundations, there is a tendency for them to reflect special characteristics derived primarily from the immediate nature of the circumstances in which they were started.

In addition to the two sets of hypotheses above, dealing with various actors' perceptions of the universities' primary roles in international relations, which is the primary focus of this study, a third set of different but related hypotheses will be explored. These hypotheses deal with the actual administrative or operational relationships between the universities and the sponsors of their international

programs, as viewed by the writer. While the question of "how" international programs are administered is not as important as the fundamental questions of "why" and "what" international programs, it represents a major stumbling block to the operation of many university international programs.

Universities and their sponsors have often appeared to be able to agree to undertake a particular international venture with a minimum of fuss over how clearly the policy objectives have been formulated or various contingencies provided for. Interviews with university and sponsoring personnel conducted for this study indicate that the acceptance of the "idea" of an international program is likely to be accompanied by professions of goodwill and good faith. It sometimes happens, however, that implementation of an "idea" raises issues that were not anticipated. Universities and their sponsors, for example, have been plagued by administrative and operational differences that occasionally have overshadowed the programs they have agreed to undertake. All agree that such differences are damaging, but, as this study will indicate, they persist. The nature of the problems raised when a program is put into operation is suggested by the following hypotheses.

Hypotheses on actual operating relationships between American universities participating in international programs and their sponsors, as viewed by the writer

III. Since many general administrative practices and attitudes of universities and their sponsors tend to differ, the actual operation of international programs may create significant areas of dissension between the two parties.

(IIIa) Dissension between the universities and their sponsors on administrative matters tends to affect adversely the operation of international programs.

Areas of Dissension

(IIIai) Fiscal control practices of many sponsoring organizations foster antagonisms on university campuses, while some sponsors (especially governmental sponsors) view the fiscal practices of some universities with suspicion.

(IIIaii) Disagreement on the allocation and performance of certain service responsibilities generates tensions which interfere with personnel performance.

(IIIaiii) Partial withdrawal of the government from the process of personnel selection for international programs has tended to reduce conflict between the universities and the government.

(IIIaiv) Most universities tend to favor a minimum of identification with their sponsors while operating abroad; sponsors' reactions vary.

(IIIav) Most universities tend to favor private sponsorship of international programs to government sponsorship.

(IIIavi) Cognizant of its broad public responsibilities, the U.S. Government as a sponsor tends to try to impose its administrative beliefs and practices on universities; government and university practices differ enough to cause significant friction between the two institutions.

(IIIavii) The administrative relationships between universities and non-government sponsors are more acceptable to the affected parties than are government-university relationships.

(a) Non-government sponsors tend to operate under administrative patterns vis-à-vis universities which reduce but do not eliminate sources of disagreement between the two institutions.

The preceding hypotheses require clarification and expansion to demonstrate their relevance and significance to this study.

Explanation of Guiding Hypotheses

Hypothesis I suggests that most American university personnel do not differentiate between the universities' responsibilities and roles in American society and their responsibilities and roles in international society. The belief that American universities should provide a prescribed amount of course work for all students, regardless of their national allegiance, appears strong among university personnel. Most course work provided is basically the same for U.S. nationals and non-nationals. The subject matter tends to be attuned to the needs and purposes of American society. The appropriateness of this orientation in the minds of most university personnel is generally considered to be self-evident, given the striking progress of American society. Consideration for the peculiar needs of other nations and their students studying in the United States is reflected more in special administrative treatment than in special educational procedures. Few American

university persons have attempted to relate the education of non-nationals to the problems of international relations and the development of the particular foreign countries involved. It is a widely held conviction among university personnel that training non-nationals through American methods and in subject matter geared to the American level of development is sufficient, and that such training will benefit other countries and enhance the world position of the United States.[10]

When American universities permit their own personnel to represent them abroad under international programs, they tend to believe that their representatives are primarily agents for transferring American educational techniques and achievements. The emphasis is strongly on striving to develop methods and instill values abroad which are characteristic of American universities and acceptable to the sponsors of international programs. Attempts to assist others to maximize the potentials of their own cultures are relatively weak, as are efforts by American university personnel abroad to comprehend the environment in which they operate and the possible lessons to be learned from foreign experiences. The consequences may well be that the impact of American universities on those foreign institutions and countries in which they operate is diminished while the impact on the American university through its personnel who have had foreign experience may be severely blunted.

When American universities undertake to train non-nationals on their own campuses, they tend to disclaim any concern for or knowledge

---

[10]For an analysis of how foreign students are handled on American university campuses, see Cora DuBois, Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States (Washington: American Council on Education, 1956), Chapter 12, entitled "Campus Policies and Practices," pp. 165-197.

of the students' positions relative to various elites in their own countries. Notwithstanding theis area of indifference or lack of knowledge about foreign students, there exists the notion among university personnel that they are grooming potential leaders of foreign countries. The belief that these foreign charges will find important positions upon their return home is widespread, although seldom substantiated. One might speculate that American university personnel are blinded somewhat by the relatively open and unreflective atmosphere of American society and that they overvalue an American education for a non-national. The result is that there persists in American universities the belief that these institutions can accept for training a wide variety of foreign students without particular regard to their statuses in their own societies and that as a result of their American university experience they will be accepted as equipped to occupy leadership positions in their home societies.[11] The training given them consists mainly of a general introduction to the cultural and intellectual heritage of the United States, joined to a considerable amount of concentration on the acquisition of some skills which are or will be useful to society, normally to American or western societies. Thus the hypothesis strongly suggests that most American universities have not developed programs designed to

---

[11]The strengths and weaknesses of such assumptions are covered in such works as Richard D. Lambert and Marvin Bressler, Indian Students on an American Campus (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956); Herbert Passin and Robert K. McKnight, In Search of Identity: The Japanese Overseas Scholar in America and Japan (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958); Franklin D. Scott, The American Experience of Swedish Students: Retrospect and Aftermath (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956); Jeanne Watson and Ronald Lippitt, Learning Across Cultures: A Study of Germans Visiting America (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1955). These works are part of a series sponsored by the Committee on Cross-Cultural Education, Social Science Research Council.

join certain aspects of the United States' technical competence to the needs of other societies, many of which are widely classified as "less-developed."

As the sub-hypotheses to Hypothesis I indicate, there is a tendency for American university leaderships to consider participation in international programs as an important means to improve the prestige positions of their respective institutions. (See especially Sub-hypothesis I (If).) Some engage their institutions in international activities indiscriminately in the belief or hope that such involvement will bring their institutions into prominence and attract money and personnel. Other university leaders, also highly motivated by thoughts of prestige, carefully select the international programs and cooperating foreign institutions with which to become associated. The former group of universities tend to be relatively new to "academic society" or are trying to establish themselves, while the latter group generally has a distinguished reputation already established.

Once the prestige factor is ascertained and thought to be assured, most American university leaders reflect on how appropriate international programs are for American universities in general and their respective institutions in particular. Their reflections tend to be expressed in very vague generalities mainly concerned with the advancement of knowledge and international humanitarianism. (See Sub-hypothesis I (Ic).) Since universities are assumed to be institutions dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake and for its application to the needs of society, and to be humane institutions, university leaderships can justify international commitments of great magnitude and diversity which appear to be designed to promote these

goals. Thus they often conclude that their international pursuits are in harmony with their national responsibilities and goals. (See Sub-hypotheses I (Ia) and (Ib).) But when this same university leadership group attempts to analyze the relationship of the universities' general role in society to the attainment of certain political goals promoted by non-university groups who are sponsors of universities abroad, that leadership group pursues a tortuous course to rationalize its own behavior. Regardless of some misgivings, the policy-makers for American universities assert, in a manner that may suggest false bravado, that the reconcilement of the universities' international commitments and their general role in society has been achieved.

Implicit in these sub-hypotheses is the suggestion that those persons who have a direct operational responsibility for an international program of an American university are somewhat more specific than their policymaking superiors about the goals and roles of the institutions in international relations. They tend to speak more in terms of what their universities are doing abroad than what benefits accrue to their own institutions from participation in international programs. This is not to say that they are uninterested in improving the status of their own institutions; but they emphasize contributions to others over benefits to themselves. Foreign student advisors are a bit more ambivalent on this point than the program coordinators just mentioned, for they must concern themselves not only with what foreign students learn from their sojourns on American university campuses, but also with the impact they have on these campuses. Despite the demands of handling many of the details of training foreign students in the United States, the foreign student advisors are vigorous in contending that the primary value of the

foreign student's American training for all parties concerned lies in the contributions he can make in his own and international society. The possibility that the status, character, and role of American universities might be permanently affected by international activities appears to have arisen only recently to the level of awareness among those persons with day-to-day responsibilities for international programs and students.

In the aggregate, American university personnel who have any knowledge of their universities' international programs display a surprisingly high degree of disappointment, indifference, and confusion concerning these programs. (See Sub-hypothesis I (Ih).) The interviewers had assumed that universities participated with considerable enthusiasm in international programs. While there are "pockets" of highly vocal enthusiasts on most of the thirty-five campuses visited for this study, there are also large numbers of persons who are very uncertain about the wisdom of participation. The result is that a significant number of universities are plagued with internal disagreements on what the international role of the university should be. The disagreements seldom prevent involvement by a university, but they do create unsettled operating circumstances.

Amid the difficulties and uncertainties surrounding many international programs of American universities, few universities reflect on the creative possibilities which might be developed through international activity. Sub-hypothesis I (Ii) suggests that the time has not yet arrived when universities can perceive opportunities to produce for others and harvest for themselves contributions which might alter the character of the major actors in the system under study as well as the

nature of their relationships. One thesis of this study is that the universities have indeed altered their roles in international relations through a complex of forces mostly external to the universities, but they have yet to become aware of the significance of their altered roles. On all campuses visited there were voices raised extolling the advantages for the universities, sponsors, cooperating institutions, and mankind inherent in international programs. On only a few campuses could the university personnel point to examples of how the universities' international experiences were making positive, new contributions to the universities, or indicate evidence of intentions to incorporate in their programs any results of their foreign contacts.

In the first set of hypotheses the emphasis has been on the self-image American universities and their personnel hold; the second set of hypotheses deals with the views held by the sponsors of university-related international programs. It has been indicated previously that the most important sponsors, for the purposes of this study, are the U.S. Government and large foundations. Secondary sponsors include small foundations, religious groups, business organizations, etc. Discussion of the second set of hypotheses excludes universities as sponsors since their perception of their international roles is covered by the first set of hypotheses.

Most sponsors have goals for their own organizations. These goals may require the utilization of other institutions, universities in this study, for their achievement. This may mean that the goals of the universities may be subordinated to the goals of the sponsors if they conflict, that the universities may be permitted to pursue their own goals in conjunction with the pursuit of the sponsors' goals if

they do not conflict, or that the universities may increase the possibility of achieving their goals through the pursuit of the sponsors' goals if the two sets of goals are the same or complementary. Universities tend to believe that the last mentioned circumstance prevails, or they ignore the possibility that their sponsors may have goals that conflict with their own. Hypothesis II suggests that the sponsors of American universities' international programs emphasize their own goals, often to the exclusion of the universities' goals. In the broadest terms, there appears to be relatively little comprehension on the part of the sponsors as to what universities might hope to get out of international programs under their sponsorship. This is not true of all sponsors. It tends to be more characteristic of the U.S. Government than it does of foundations; but the situation is rare in which the universities' and the sponsors' goals are one and both perceive this agreement. Sponsors tend to bury university goals in glittering platitudes and then move on to specify clearly university responsibilities to the sponsors' pursuit of the sponsors' goals. The result frequently is an acrimonious quarrel among the major actors involved, or a more or less brilliant lesson in subterfuge.

Since the U.S. Government has international goals which are widely accepted as more important than university goals, and since the government occupies a status superior to that of universities in international relations and one which requires a different role, government foreign policy elites easily rationalize their emphasis on universities as instruments of foreign policy. The press of their day-to-day problems precludes much attention to university goals which do not correspond to immediate and anticipated needs of the government. (See

Sub-hypothesis IIai). For example, the U.S. Government casts its international action largely in terms of amassing the wherewithal to contain and diminish what it perceives to be the "Communist threat to the Free World." Whatever the advisability and feasibility of such a general goal, it is not unreasonable to assume that the pursuit of it requires the application of large quantities and many varieties of resources. One such resource is the educational system of the United States, and in this case, the institutions of higher education. When foreign policy elites begin to introduce such resources as universities directly into international relations through financial and policy relationships formalized in a contract, there is a real likelihood that these elites will tend to subordinate university goals to national goals. Even if university goals in international relations are compatible with those of government sponsors, there is a widespread tendency for them to be lost in the world of governmental administration as the bureaucratic machine attempts to rumble toward the official goals set for it.

Many top administrators of government policy in the area of university contracts for international programs simply state that they consider the universities to be one among many instruments for the achievement of foreign policy goals. They are seldom concerned with analyzing the role of universities in American society, not to mention international society. What they are looking for are means to a particular goal, and some feel that universities can be useful in this or that instance.[12] If such attitudes prevail in important elite posts in government, and the data collected for this study indicate how

---

[12]Special attention should be given to the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency in this regard.

widespread they are, it is highly probable that little attention has been given or is being given by the U.S. Government to the effects of international programs on the development of American universities.

Large foundations also sponsor a significant number of the international programs of American universities. As Sub-hypotheses IIbi and IIbii suggest, these sponsors tend to relate the explicitness of their role expectations of universities to the size of the international program. The larger the foundation-sponsored university program, the more elaborate is the control structure imposed by the foundation on the university likely to be, and the more explicit the program goals. Many foundations have general country or area policies abroad which reflect their interests and goals. To some extent they pursue these goals through their own organizations, utilizing university personnel as staffs to a large degree, but as staffs acting independently of universities. But they frequently find it necessary, convenient, advisable, practical, etc. to call upon universities as such to perform certain program functions. On some occasions, the foundations solicit university participation in a manner suggesting that the universities originated the idea of a program.[13] Or they may openly shop for an institution interested in a particular program financed by the foundation. In a few cases, the foundations move in to underwrite a program which a university may have started on its own or through the assistance of another sponsor such as the U.S. Government. Regardless of how the university and the foundations come together, there are strong indications that the universities involved in large

---

[13]For a foundation's description of this practice see "What Carnegie Corporation Is," Quarterly (New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York, April 1959), Vol. VII, No. 2, especially page 6.

foundation-sponsored programs are likely to defer to the program goals of the foundations. Consequently, it is possible that broad university goals in international relations may be secondary if not incidental to foundation goals.

Comparatively small international programs financed by large foundations tend to approximate conditions described by Sub-hypotheses II(c) and IIc1. That is, when supporting grants are small and/or the grantor is small, the universities appear to have greater freedom to perform an international role basically of their own design. It is in the arena of small university international programs that "anything goes." There is no pattern which describes the variety of relationships and objectives which persist among the universities and their sponsors under these conditions. The most widespread characteristic among them is that they provide the universities with the greatest opportunity to operate independently of, often in ignorance of, the international goals of government elites. However, the possibility that the small size and scope of such programs tends to reduce their importance as compared to government and foundation-sponsored programs in the eyes of foreign policy elites is reflected in a higher level of indifference respondents in this study displayed when queried on the subject.

Hypothesis III and the related sub-hypotheses have been formulated to indicate the influence of administrative procedures on international programs, and differences in administrative practices of the universities and their sponsors. There is considerable evidence to indicate that universities as whole institutions hardly participate in the negotiations and decision-making processes leading up to their

international involvement. These decisions are made at a variety of levels of university administration. It is fairly common to find that top university leadership is unaware of the origins or goals of large-scale programs in which its own institution is involved. This study will describe the numerous ways in which international programs get started at American universities.

When a program actually begins to operate, its ramifications are felt throughout a wide circle of university personnel. The administrative ramifications may become a major cause of frustration, joy, and sorrow for the universities involved. Nearly all American university personnel interviewed who have been at all familiar with international programs delighted in relating the administrative problems which have been part of the programs' operations. This they did without prodding. They generally had much less to say about the goals or value of their universities' international activities. The prominence of the administrative factors in universities' international programs will be explored later in this study. For now it appears appropriate to suggest that the universities perceive themselves as special institutions in society which merit special administrative consideration on the part of their sponsors. Their failure to receive this consideration in important instances has provoked an interesting "war" between those who pay and those who perform.[14]

---

[14]For example see the reports of the American Council on Education's Committee on Institutional Projects Abroad, issued annually from 1955-1960, under the general editorship of Richard A. Humphrey. The Committee on Institutional Projects Abroad attempts to provide regular opportunities for the discussion of international programs involving American universities. Discussants include representatives from universities and sponsoring organizations. Since the Committee's first major meeting in 1955, administrative differences between the universities and their sponsors have been a major area of discussion at every meeting.

Policy Significance of Hypotheses

If the testing of the preceding hypotheses has significance for social scientists, it is anticipated that the conclusions drawn from such testing and the data used to perform the examination will have relevance for policy-makers. Since the main focus of this study, as indicated by the hypotheses, is on what American universities' roles in international relations are and how universities and their sponsors perceive their performances in these roles, it is possible that university, foundation, government, and other sponsoring agencies' leaderships will draw implications from it which influence their decisions. A few of what the author considers, on the basis of extensive interviews with university and sponsoring groups' personnel, to be the most significant policy implications of this study follow. The hypotheses may suggest additional important issues to others; however, the nature of the data collected for this study imposes limitations on how many documented policy suggestions can be advanced.

The opening remarks of this study stated that some American universities have altered their roles in recent years so as to participate directly in international programs. For some this is a new venture and for others this represents an expansion of activities started years ago. But the vast majority of American universities are only indirectly affected by international educational experiences, or apparently unaffected. Regardless of the degree of American universities' present involvement in international relations, it is probable that a growing number of universities will be required to make important policy decisions in this area as international contacts and contracts grow. Given the prominent position of the United States in international

affairs and the growing need for educational services throughout the world, it seems almost certain that American universities will be faced with mounting pressures to participate in many aspects of international relations. Thus the number of non-participants probably will decline in the future, and the indirect influence of the international experiences of other universities on the remaining non-participants is likely to increase.

As the number of participating universities grows and their influence as well as that of other institutions and individuals becomes more pervasive, the pressure may mount for American universities to evolve a new philosophy of education adapted to their new experiences and responsibilities. This, then, could mean that international experiences would suggest to American university personnel a critical re-examination of Hypothesis I. This starting point could lead to still further consideration of a new status and role for American universities both in the United States and internationally. The development of a truly international type of university in the United States is a possibility which far-sighted university policy-makers might explore. If academic thinking has not yet advanced to this point, there still remain scores of significant policy matters suggested by the growing international activities of universities which could alter the present national emphasis in higher education.

Most American universities that are likely to undertake international programs have at least a vague notion of what such activity is. Therefore, the first policy question they face is why they should engage in such a program. They must balance the contributions they might hope to make to others and to other causes against the benefits they might

derive for themselves from an international program. In this area of decision-making, university leaderships are confronted with a multitude of imponderables and a wide expanse of "no knowledge." They have not yet found a way to put international programs into terms which permit them to weigh the "costs" of involvement against the possible "profits." If this study can contribute a few suggestions in this general area, universities may be able to assume an international role with their goals in sharper focus.

Once universities are able to achieve a "feeling" for why they desire to participate in international programs (and to many the answer to "why" is never much clearer than a "feeling"), they then begin to meet a series of operational problems which require policy decisions of the top leadership. The following list of questions represents some of the problems most frequently mentioned by university personnel:

1) How are international programs to be staffed?
   a. What percentage of overseas personnel should come from the home campus?
   b. What requirements for employment abroad should be established?
   c. What requirements for selection of non-nationals to come to a U.S. campus should be established?
   d. How shall faculty members' and campus administrators' participation in an international program be related to universities' reward structures?
2) How are international programs to be related to the universities' other responsibilities?
   a. How are they to be programmed and administered on the home campus?

b. How can the university utilize the experiences of the persons involved in international programs to the best advantage of all the affected parties?

c. What are the universities' abilities to handle international programs without foregoing other important goals?

d. What types of international programs are most appropriate for which universities?

3) What relationships between universities and other institutions are developed and fostered as a result of international programs and what are the consequences of these relationships?

As the universities' sponsors observe these institutions' attempts to develop some rationale for their international commitments, they too must seek answers to the policy questions raised, for they have been instrumental in creating the environment in which these kinds of questions are significant. Without financing from sources outside of the universities, the universities could not have moved as far from their campuses as they have, nor could they have provided for the thousands of foreign students, professors, and non-academic personnel who have visited their campuses. Without the program stimulus of many of the sponsors, it is doubtful that the universities would, at this time, have generated the complex of activities and relationships which characterize their international programs. Inasmuch as the sponsors have contributed much to the policy questions confronting universities, they must join with the universities in comprehending and solving their problems.

In addition to assisting the universities to reach policy decisions relative to international programs which maximize the possible

benefits to all actors and minimize unwanted consequences, the sponsors must grapple with several major questions which are almost solely within their competence to answer. First, they need guidelines which are helpful in answering the questions of how much money?, for what purpose?, to whom?, in what form?, and for what period of time? These are key variables which must be controlled before any university can function effectively in international relations. This study cannot offer definitive answers to the preceding questions, but the data contained herein should be suggestive of ways to approach these problems.

Secondly, sponsors will ask, should relationships between the sponsors and the universities be direct or indirect, formal or informal, or should a wide variety of relationships be encouraged? Should sponsors unify their financing efforts and standardize their practices? The data to be used for testing the second and third sets of hypotheses of this study will indicate to a considerable degree how American university personnel feel on these questions, and to a lesser degree the sponsors' feelings and reactions. Since the issue of who is going to control international programs is at stake, the findings of this study may make a significant contribution to an important policy area.

Although this study does not cover the policy implications of American universities' international programs for the foreign cooperating institutions and groups, it does offer some suggestions for over-all policies related to the roles of American universities in international relations. Such policies will have at least indirect effects on foreign institutions; however, this study does not attempt to measure such effects. This very important policy area is discussed in a series of "country" or "region studies" being completed under the auspices of the

Institute of Research on Overseas Programs at Michigan State University. If the present study can make a constructive contribution to the formulation of a general international role for American universities, it will have strengthened an important dimension of international relations.

To this point, an attempt has been made to establish the analytical framework for this study and to describe its scope. Within the compass of two social scientific concepts, i.e., role and elite, an examination of the general role of American universities in international relations as of 1958-59, as perceived primarily by university and sponsoring organization personnel, will be undertaken. The study will not include perceptions of American universities held by those foreign institutions or groups which cooperate with American universities and their sponsors in this international venture. The role perceptions utilized have been cast in the form of hypotheses which will be tested against a veriety of data to be described.

CHAPTER II

DEFINITIONS AND METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

This study uses several terms in a manner which may require some clarification. The terms "role" and "elite" have already been described as they apply to this study. Several other terms which indicate the focus and method of this study appear frequently, and others are offered which tend to define certain boundaries of the present research. A discussion of how these terms are related to this study may decrease the area of misunderstanding which often exists between author and reader.

The key actor in this study is the American university. The term "university" is used to denote any institution of higher education in the United States which is listed in the Education Directory, Part 3, Higher Education published by the U.S. Office of Education. Thus many junior colleges and other academic institutions utilizing the term "college" are included in the single designation of "university" for the purposes of this study. Consequently, "university" is used in a purely descriptive manner without attempting to differentiate institutions of higher education. Such a choice has been made with the full knowledge that terms like "college" and "university" generally are used in a more restrictive manner and frequently connote different status and prestige levels. But for present purposes, such distinctions are of secondary importance and the convenience of a single term describing a multiplicity of institutions with a core of comparable characteristics

argues favorably against the use of several more exact terms and/or the use of more ponderous phrases, e.g., "institutions of higher education."

The significant acts which universities perform and in which we are interested are either classifiable under the term "international program" or are related to that term in a reasonable manner. Basically, for any activity to qualify here as an "international program," it must involve the sending or receiving of persons or things between an American university and a cooperating institution in a foreign country, as part of a relationship for which the American university, or subdivision of it, accepts institutional responsibility for at least one year. Since the Institute of Research on Overseas Programs' (IROP) The International Programs of American Universities[1] represents the most recent and complete inventory of this facet of universities' activities, it has been used in this study to identify those universities engaged in international programs, their sponsors, and the character of their involvements. "Related acts" of import to this study include acts of administrative and intellectual support for a program which are not specified in any formal way. For example, some universities active in international programs attempt to incorporate some of the experiences gained under an international program into their curricula although they may not be required to do so by any agreement instituting an international program.

According to the IROP study, 184 American universities were involved in 382 international programs during 1958. Thus the data for

---

[1] Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, The International Programs of American Universities: An Inventory and Analysis (East Lansing, Michigan: Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, 1958).

this study have been drawn from a portion of the 184 universities having international programs; and it should be re-emphasized that this study deals principally with those 382 sets of operations which conform to the preceding definition of international programs. Excluded are the complex independent activities related to universities which cause persons or things to move internationally. Probably the most prominent of these exclusions are the actions of foreign students studying independently at American universities and actions of American students studying in foreign universities on their own. Such activities have been and still are under the scrutiny of many researchers in several fields of academic endeavor.[2]

Selection of Universities Studied

Thirty of the 184 American universities with international programs were selected for intensive study through interviewing. Five other universities without international programs were included in the sample for purposes of control and comparison. The total sample, then, consists of thirty-five universities, thirty of which have one or more international programs and five of which have none. The selection of the thirty universities having international programs was made by distributing the total population of 184 such institutions into thirty categories according to the number of programs they had. The thirty categories were determined by dividing thirty into the 382 international programs, thereby making thirteen programs the characteristic of a category. This weighted the sample in favor of those institutions with the

---

[2]See especially the several books on foreign students in the United States sponsored by the Committee on Cross-Cultural Education, Social Science Research Council, cited in Chapter I, at p. 23.

greater number of programs, and virtually assured the inclusion of every university having approximately thirteen programs, e.g., Harvard and Cornell. To select those universities from categories having more than one institution (for example, there were several categories with thirteen universities each having one program), a table of random numbers was used. The result might be described as a weighted, somewhat randomized sample.

A similar procedure was followed to select the five institutions without programs. The institutions with programs were first divided into five categories instead of thirty. Then five institutions with programs were selected from these five categories, by means of a table of random numbers. These five universities in turn were matched against five universities without programs that had the most similar enrollment figures as reported in the 1957 Education Directory, Part 3, Higher Education and were similarly situated geographically. These five institutions without programs are referred to as "controls" in this study.

The sample of universities is as follows:

1) Thirty Institutions Having International Programs

Augustana College and Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois
California, University of, Berkeley, California
Chicago, University of, Chicago, Illinois
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Houston, University of, Houston, Texas
Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Illinois
Illinois State Normal University, Normal, Illinois
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana
Kentucky, University of, Lexington, Kentucky
Maine, University of, Orono, Maine
Marymount College, Tarrytown, New York
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Miami, University of, Coral Gables, Florida
Minnesota, University of, Minneapolis, Minnesota
Nebraska, University of, Lincoln, Nebraska
Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

Oblate College and Seminary, Bar Harbor, Maine
Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma
Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oregon
Pacific Union College, Angwin, California
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College, Prairie View, Texas
Rockford College, Rockford, Illinois
Stanford University, Stanford, California
Stout State College, Menomonie, Wisconsin
Tennessee, University of, Knoxville, Tennessee
Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, College Station, Texas
Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan
Western College for Women, Oxford, Ohio

2) Five Control Institutions Having No International Programs

Georgia, University of, Athens Georgia
North Texas State College, Denton, Texas
Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, New York
Washington, University of, Seattle, Washington
Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio

Organizations and groups which participate in the support and sponsorship of international programs represent the second major type of actor of importance to this study. Sponsors of international programs were divided into three broad categories. The first category was composed of U.S. Government agencies which are legally charged with the responsibility for sponsoring in a systematic fashion the participation of American universities in international programs. The most conspicuous example of this kind of sponsor was the International Cooperation Administration. Large, private foundations, such as Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller, constituted the second major category of sponsors. The third category consisted of a wide variety of organizations and institutions interested in some aspect of international education and capable of implementing this interest over a period of time through financial support of a university program. Many religious groups, small foundations, community groups, and universities fit into this category. The use of public funds is an important characteristic of the institutions in the first category, while the sponsors in the

other two categories rely primarily on private funds to support the international programs of American universities.

Data Collection Procedures

Determination of the perceptions the two foregoing sorts of major, institutional actors held concerning the roles of American universities in international relations through international programs was attempted by two means. First, all available "knowledgeables," those persons with a reasonably recognizable interest in, or connection with, an international program and an affiliation with either a participating university or sponsoring organization, were interviewed in an effort to collect statements about the "what, why, and how" of international programs from their particular vantage points. Second, a wide variety of formal statements issued in the names of the participating universities and their sponsors were examined for materials which would indicate institutional attitudes of direct consequence to the maintenance, growth, or reduction of international programs.

In the first instance 303 persons or groups directly connected with universities engaged in international programs were interviewed. At the time they were interviewed, they either were actively engaged in some aspect of their institutions' international activities, or they had been so engaged, or they were about to become so engaged. Table 1 indicates the numbers of interviewees at each of the thirty universities having international programs, and it also lists the number of programs each institution was engaged in during the period from September 1958 - June 1959 when the interviews were conducted.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF INTERVIEWEES AND INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS, CLASSIFIED BY UNIVERSITIES INCLUDED IN SAMPLE

University	No. of Interviewees at Univ. in Sample	% (2) is of Total No. of Interviewees (303) at all Univ. in Sample	No. of International Programs Conducted in 1958 - 59 by Univ. in Sample	% (4) is of Total No. of Programs (120) Conducted in 1958 - 59 by all Univ. in Sample	% of Total No. of Programs (382) Conducted in 1958 - 59 by all Univ. in U.S.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Augustana	5	1.6	3	2.5	.7
U. of Calif., Berkeley	27	8.8	7	5.8	1.8
U. of Chicago	18	5.9	7	5.8	1.8
Cornell	19	6.3	11	9.3	2.8
Emory	1	.3	1	.8	.3
Harvard	31	10.2	19	16.0	4.9
U. of Houston	2	.6	2	1.7	.5
Ill. Inst. of Tech.	2	.6	1	.8	.3
Ill. State Normal	6	2.0	1	.8	.3
Indiana	13	4.2	7	5.8	1.8
U. of Kentucky	12	3.9	2	1.7	.5
U. of Maine	3	1.0	1	.8	.3
Marymount	5	1.6	4	3.4	1.0
M.I.T.	7	3.2	2	1.7	.5
U. of Miami	9	3.0	7	5.8	1.8
U. of Minnesota	11	3.7	4	3.4	1.0
U. of Nebraska	16	5.2	1	.8	.3
Northwestern	8	2.6	7	5.8	1.8
Oblate	1	.3	1	.8	.3
Oklahoma State	16	5.2	3	2.5	.7
Pacific Union	1	.3	1	.8	.3
Oregon State	6	2.0	1	.8	.3
Prairie View A & M	12	3.9	1	.8	.3
Rockford	8	2.6	2	1.7	.5
Stanford	23	7.7	7	5.8	1.8
Stout State	4	1.3	1	.8	.3
U. of Tennessee	13	4.2	5	4.2	1.3
Texas A & M	5	1.6	1	.8	.3
Wayne State	12	3.9	7	5.8	1.8
Western College for Women	7	2.3	3	2.5	.7
Total	303	100.0	120	100.0	31.0

Possible interviewees were originally identified with the assistance of the presidents or comparable university officials of those universities with international programs, through responses of those officials to a questionnaire distributed by the Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, Michigan State University.[3] In that questionnaire, the presidents identified the person or persons on their campuses who had been assigned primary, official responsibility for the conduct of international programs. For convenience, such persons are referred to in this study as "coordinators." Contact with the program coordinators resulted in the identification of other possible interviewees. Arrangements to meet with such knowledgeables as the coordinators as well as others were, in most cases, made through the presidents' offices of the various universities included in the sample. However, occasionally persons generally known to have a part in a particular international program were approached directly with the knowledge of the affected university president. University administrators, program coordinators, and interested faculty all suggested numerous potential interviewees. While the list of interviewees grew in a random fashion, the focus on those persons who had some overt relationship to or interest in international programs was maintained.

To a very limited extent interviewing was influenced by the circumstances of time and place. Every effort was made to schedule as many interviews as possible in advance of the arrival of the interviewer on a particular campus. But, occasionally, unexpected opportunities or difficulties altered the plan or the interviewers' visits. The very

---

[3]This questionnaire is reproduced in Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, op. cit., pp. 316 and 317.

high level of interest in this study exhibited by all university personnel assured the interviewers a congenial welcome. To maximize the congeniality of the atmosphere in which the interviews took place, the interviewers provided the interviewees with the normal assurances of anonymity. Although such assurances are generally considered conducive to candor, in themselves they offer no assurance that candor will actually be forthcoming. The conduct and content of the interviews themselves must convince the skeptical. In the opinions of the author, who conducted approximately seventy-five per cent of the interviews, and of the others who conducted the interviews utilized in this study, those persons who gave of their time, which ranged from thirty minutes to several days, did so with the feeling that they wanted to make a constructive contribution to a fledgling effort in a complex field. The interviews were frequently occasions for interviewees to collect many diverse thoughts about their experiences with international programs and to systematize them through the medium of a primarily open-ended interview. Probably, then, the interviews represent more or less candid statements of the levels and types of thinking among university personnel who are considered knowledgeable in the field of university programs.

Because it is commonly believed that persons with different occupational and interest orientations to and relationships with universities have different outlooks on such subjects as international programs, the interviewees have been classified along three lines. The first category is "administrative," the second "teaching," and the third "student." The interviewees have been distributed among these categories on the basis of their own descriptions of their primary university roles at the time they were interviewed. Table 2 illustrates the results of such a distribution.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF INTERVIEWEES BY PRIMARY UNIVERSITY ROLES

Types of Roles (1)	Number of Interviewees (2)	% of Total No. of Interviewees (3)
Administrative	152	50.2
Teaching	126	41.6
Student	25	8.2
Total	303	100.0

Similar but less extensive interviews were conducted among personnel of two major sponsors of international programs, i.e., large foundations and the U.S. Government. Twenty-three representatives of the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations and of the Carnegie Corporation in addition to eighty-seven U.S. Government officials contributed their observations to this study. Fifty of the interviews with government personnel took place at overseas posts and the remaining thirty-seven were conducted in the United States, primarily in Washington, D.C.

All interviewees among government and foundation personnel, unlike university personnel, have been classified as "administrative" for the purposes of this study. The government interviewees ranged in administrative rank from ambassadors and agency heads to program officials in overseas missions. Such officials are generally considered to be holders of positions of importance and responsibility. They all have significant contact with international programs. The same holds true for foundation representatives, although contact with foundation

presidents was possible and practical while similar access to the President of the United States was not. Consequently, it is felt that a reasonable effort was made to collect the comments of those people from sponsoring organizations who are the top "knowledgeables" in the field of international programs.

Systematic interviewing was not done among the large numbers of other organizations that participate in the sponsorship of the international programs of American universities. While the comments of personnel associated with these organizations would have been helpful, personal contact with them was beyond the resources available for this study. To compensate in part for this shortcoming, serious attention has been given to secondary materials describing the commitments such organizations have made to international education as a facet of international relations.

Characteristics of the Universities and Programs in the Sample

The names of the universities in the sample used for this study and the way in which the sample was drawn have been indicated. Two characteristics of this group of universities are worth describing in that they provide keys to understanding past trends of international program development and predicting future developments. They are size of institution and type of control exercised over the institution.

As Table 3 shows, the sample is heavily weighted in favor of larger institutions. This is a natural outcome of the fact that numbers of programs were emphasized in drawing the sample originally. The larger institutions tend to have greater resources or are able to attract more outside support for international programs than the smaller

institutions. Thus the number of programs at large universities has grown, increasing the likelihood that such institutions would appear in the sample. Since this growth pattern has been characteristic of the last decade,[4] and since it appears probable that this pattern will continue as long as foundations and the government are interested in the international services of American universities, the sample, although dominated by larger institutions, is well adapted to a study of the roles of American universities in international relations.

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF UNIVERSITIES BY SIZE

Size of University (1958-1959 Enrollment)	Universities in Sample (30)		All U.S. Universities Having International Programs (184) During 1958-1959	
(1)	No. of Universities (2)	Percentage (3)	No. of Universities (4)	Percentage (5)
1. Very Large (15,000 and over)	5	16.7	20	11.0
2. Large (8,000-14,999)	9	30.0	19	10.5
3. Medium (2,000-7,999)	9	30.0	70	37.6
4. Small (Less than 2,000)	7	23.3	75	40.9
Total	30	100.0	184	100.0

[4]See Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, op. cit., pp. 20-21, for supporting data.

Since public universities tend to be larger than most private universities, it is not surprising to find that almost half of the sample consists of public universities (See Table 4). Moreover, the same factors which increased the probability that large universities would be heavily represented in the sample caused a like inclusion of public universities. As the IROP study shows, the large and, in most cases, public universities have attracted the major share of the new government and foundation funds earmarked for international programs. There is no strong evidence that the distribution of such funds will change in favor of small universities in the future. Quite the contrary, for it is the opinion of responsible commentators that foundations are favoring larger programs by large institutions rather than smaller programs by small universities and independent scholars.[5] Thus while the large, public universities may be over-represented numerically in the sample used for this study, their representation has afforded the interviewers an opportunity to collect a significant amount of data from the "front-runners" in international programs.

---

[5]A specific example is contained in Joseph C. Kiger, Operating Principles of the Larger Foundations (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1954), pp. 38-39. Similar comments are included in Abraham Flexner, Funds and Foundations: Their Policies Past and Present (New York: Harper, 1952); Dwight Macdonald, The Ford Foundation: The Men and the Millions (New York: Reynal and Co., 1956); and Raymond B. Fosdick, The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation (New York: Harper, 1952). An examination of the Annual Reports of the three largest foundations for a five year period indicates that large universities receive an ever-increasing proportion of the money dispensed annually.

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF UNIVERSITIES BY TYPE OF CONTROL

Type of Control	Univs. in the Sample (30)		All U.S. Univs. Having International Programs (184) during 1958-1959	
	No. of Univs.	Percentage	No. of Univs.	Percentage
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Public	14	47.0	71	38.5
a. Land-Grant	(11)	(37.0)	(39)	(21.2)
b. Not Land-Grant	(3)	(10.0)	(32)	(17.3)
2. Private	16	53.0	113	61.5
a. Religious	(5)	(16.0)	(43)	(23.3)
b. Not Religious	(11)	(37.0)	(70)	(38.2)
Total	30	100.0	184	100.0

Of related interest is the fact that eleven of fourteen public universities used for this study are land-grant universities. While land-grant universities represent less than four per cent of the total number of American universities, they figure prominently in international programs as a result of their active participation in the ICA-financed technical assistance programs. A glance at any ICA financial report or an examination of The International Programs of American Universities will serve to show that more money is spent in international programs by land-grant universities than by any other type of university. Although money is only one factor in international programs, its importance is never overlooked by those who are responsible for this aspect of international education.

Table 5 shows the primary sources of funds for the 120 international programs operated by the thirty American universities in the sample. Similar data are also provided for all university-related international programs. Part of the decision to emphasize the role perceptions of large foundations and the U.S. Government in this study was influenced by their prominence as sponsors of the programs included in the sample. Together they provide funds for over fifty-five per cent of the programs under study. The sixty-five programs sponsored by these institutions, according to The International Programs of American Universities, far overshadow the fifty-five programs sponsored by other institutions (See Table 5), in terms of money, personnel, materials,

TABLE 5

PRIMARY SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Sources of Funds	International Programs in Sample (120)		All International Programs in Operation During 1958-1959	
(1)	No. of Programs (2)	Percentage (3)	No. of Programs (4)	Percentage (5)
U.S. Government	42	35.0	120	31.4
Large Foundations	23	19.2	45	11.8
Other	55	45.8	217	56.8
Total	120	100.0	382	100.0

complex commitments, and institutional interrelationships. For example, the budgets for most of the large foundation and government programs are reckoned in millions of dollars while not one of the programs financed

by other sponsors has a comparable budget. Therefore, this study not only gives primary attention to large institutions, but also stresses the activities of American universities within the context of relatively large international programs.

In summary, this study uses as its most important source of information thirty American universities having responsibility for 120 international programs. The bulk of interviewing and other forms of data collection have been done in cooperation with large, public universities. Although such universities frequently are involved in a variety of international programs, their personnel were able to comment most extensively on the larger programs and sponsors. This emphasis on size is primarily an outcome of the way in which the sample was drawn, but it also represents an assumption on the part of the author and other interviewers that such an emphasis represented the best application of available resources and that it would result in more significant conclusions in terms of future developments involving universities in international relations. The activities of smaller universities and smaller international programs have not been forgotten, nor have they been overlooked because they are meaningless. Since time and money were limited, the work of smaller institutions was not the center of this study, but lay on the margins.

CHAPTER III

BACKGROUND MATERIALS RELATED TO THE CURRENT PARTICIPATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES IN INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

The involvement of American universities as whole institutions in international relations is primarily a phenomenon of this century. Before 1900, universities were rarely responsible for the development or operation of a program related to a foreign institution. They contributed faculty to a wide variety of foreign missions on behalf of governments, foundations, and religious organizations, but as universities they did not make extensive international commitments.[1] During the same period, university students engaged in foreign educational travel and foreign students were beginning to arrive in the United States; however, such ideas as the "junior-year-abroad" were not developed until the 1920's and systematic exchanges of students were still in an embryonic state.[2] Thus the contacts of American universities as wholes in the international field were for the most part indirect. Initiative and direct responsibility for international programs by American universities have been stimulated by a complex of national and

---

[1]For a detailed survey of these missions see Merle Curti and Kendall Birr, Prelude to Point Four: American Technical Missions Overseas, 1838-1938 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1954).

[2]The history of the exchange of persons idea is traced in Guy S. Métraux, Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education (New York: Social Science Research Council, June 1952), especially Chapter 1.

international developments occurring in the first half of the twentieth century.

The developments from 1838 to 1938, which Curti and Birr refer to as the "prelude," were promoted in many ways. Some were the creation of highly motivated religious missionary groups who traversed numerous areas of the world extolling the dual virtues of Christianity and of western civilization as interpreted and practiced in the United States. Some were fostered by the interest of the U.S. Government in exploring, exploiting, pacifying, or assisting certain areas such as the Far East, Liberia, and Latin America. In a few cases, American universities entered into academic relationships with foreign universities as a means of cross-stimulation, utilizing faculty exchanges for the most part, or occasionally to provide assistance to universities in less developed areas, or to advance certain fields of knowledge through cooperative effort. Private, charitable, non-religious organizations added their influence to the pattern of universities' international involvement, through numerous overseas activities, frequently in fields aimed at alleviating human suffering, e.g., medicine and public health, which functioned with the assistance and cooperation of universities and their personnel. From an organized point of view, four types of institutional activity--missionary, government, university, and foundation[3]--have tended to exert influences which have culminated in the relatively large-scale commitment of American universities to the international field today.

---

[3]A similar breakdown of major institutions appears in the introductory material of Paul S. Bodenman, American Cooperation with Higher Education Abroad (Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin 1957, No. 8).

Certain events and world developments of the past fifty years or so have created significant opportunities and challenges for an expansion of international activities by universities. Among these, technological advance stands as an important stimulus and a broad avenue for international educational intercourse. Complex movements of individuals, materials, and professional groups began to appear in response to new methods of discovering, applying, and disseminating knowledge. New centers of learning appeared throughout the world, affecting both the progress of technology and the roles of American universities in international relations. It is the latter, of course, which are of primary interest in this study. As technical change began to affect the relationships of the United States with other political units, the socio-political elements of the American universities' international involvement have become more prominent. This does not necessarily mean that the traditional educational aspect of international contact among universities and other institutions has been forsaken. It does indicate, however, that socio-political considerations have been raised to a higher level of relevance and consciousness than they had enjoyed previously.[4]

Continued developments in communications and transportation represent a second area of change which has increased the opportunities for international contact among universities and users of university services. Transportation has become more rapid and inexpensive, thereby increasing its attractiveness and fostering greater contacts among persons related to universities, among many others. A glance at such censuses of international movements of university personnel as Open

---

[4]For supporting comments see Métraux, op. cit., pp. 48-53.

Doors[5] and reports of the U.S. Government's International Cooperation Administration (ICA) and International Educational Exchange Service (IES) suggests a relationship between improved travel possibilities and growing numbers of educational travelers.

While advances in transportation have improved the prospects of face-to-face communications by university personnel, vast improvements in "mass" communications (print, radio, film, television) during the last century have added significantly to the internationalization of knowledge and have brought universities into closer contact with each other and with other institutions. So impressive has this type of contact been that it is now commonplace to hear and read of an "international educational community" and to see education held up as a universal which knows no boundaries, making it a firm base for international understanding.

Although widespread international contacts by universities have been greatly dependent on a complex of technical advances, they have been equally dependent on a host of national and international socio-political developments. Socio-political events within the United States have created the financial wherewithal and the governmental approval for increasing university commitments abroad, prerequisites for any important adventure in international education. Had universities sought to maximize the potentials of technical advance for international education from their own resources, it is doubtful that they would have marched very far beyond their rudimentary activities of 1900. They needed the financial support of both business and government. But more

---

[5]Institute of International Education, Open Doors (New York: Institute of International Education, published annually).

important, they had to wait for a political atmosphere which would encourage major elements of American society to look beyond the national boundaries. Such events as major wars, economic and political developments in the Soviet Union, the Middle East, Africa, Latin America and the Far East, and general world economic and political conditions, all served to stimulate international attitudes in the United States. A few universities as whole institutions took cognizance of these new conditions and later added their weight to the forces and circumstances drawing other universities into international relations.

As the foregoing material indicates, the historical review of international events and developments related to the current involvement of American universities is focused on the activities of four groups and certain influential events. The four groups are religious missionaries, government, universities, and foundations. Their activities Philip Glick has described as "forerunners" of current technical assistance programs.[6] The major events are broadly related to technological advances and to some major socio-political circumstances, such as those surrounding revolutions and wars. The two world wars, 1914 and 1939, are particularly important reference points in this connection.

Material for this portion of the study has been obtained primarily from a moderately extensive literature related to educational aspects of the international experiences of the United States, and secondarily from interviews with persons currently knowledgeable in this field. Literature covering universities and their personnel in international relations before World War II is scanty, corresponding to

---

[6]Philip M. Glick, The Administration of Technical Assistance: Growth in the Americas (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 4-6.

the limited nature of their participation. The main impetus for research and writing in this field has occurred jointly with the upsurge of international programs of American universities following World War II. Thus, the present review is more detailed and extensive for the latter period than it is for the former, notwithstanding the greater span of time represented by the period prior to World War II. In any event, this chapter is not a definitive history of the international activities of American universities. Rather, it is intended to identify the important predecessors of the current international programs and to indicate the nature of their influence on these recent developments.

Religious Predecessors and Influences

In their efforts to spread Christianity, American religious organizations have been active outside of the United States throughout most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. One by-product of their drive has been the development of educational institutions around the world. Protestant faiths with primary headquarters in the United States are responsible in varying degrees for the establishment and maintenance of approximately 360 institutions offering collegiate instruction in areas outside of Europe and North America.[7] The development of Roman Catholic institutions of higher education outside of the United States by Americans has not paralleled the Protestant development, since the United States is not the seat of authority for the Catholic church. Americans contribute to the activities of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, which is an important missionary instrument for

---

[7] For an inventory of these institutions see W. Plumer Mills, Protestant Colleges in Asia, the Near East, Africa, and Latin America (New York: Missionary Research Library, 1955), mimeographed.

the Roman Catholic Church, and some Catholic-controlled universities in the United States maintain relationships with Catholic universities in other countries. But any attempt to single out the American contribution to the worldwide educational program of the Catholic church is far beyond the scope of this study. Research in this area has been an interest of the National Catholic Education Association since at least 1952. Suffice it to say that the universalistic attitudes attributed to Catholicism have tended to involve Catholic universities in the United States and also Catholic professors at non-Catholic universities in this country, in international relations, and that this involvement is one of many factors contributing to the development of international programs at American universities.

Religious organizations have placed particular emphasis on carrying their messages to the non-Christian world through educational institutions. By 1936, the entire Protestant missionary enterprise supported over several thousand general educational institutions abroad at all levels, including fourteen medical colleges, 414 bible schools, and 129 theological seminaries.[8] While the work of the American Catholic organizations is not comparable in scale, similar activities of the Catholic church in general are substantial and the American Catholic contribution in terms of personnel and finances is important.[9] For example, a preliminary statement by George F. Donovan of the National Catholic Education Association indicates that there are at least

---

[8] R. Pierce Beaver, "Educational Work of the Protestant Foreign Missionary Agencies of the U.S.A." (New York: Missionary Research Library, 1954), manuscript.

[9] Kenneth Scott Latourette, The Christian World Mission in Our Day (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954), pp. 91-92.

sixty-three Catholic-controlled colleges and universities outside the United States.[10] This figure does not include those collegiate institutions which are Catholic in spirit but were not founded by Catholics or are not completely controlled by the Catholic church. The American Protestants have approximately 100 comparable institutions in terms of level of offering, although only a few are subject to comparable control. The relevant aspects of this phenomenon for this study are the rapidity with which the missionary efforts bore fruit in terms of on-going educational institutions, the reliance the missionary agencies have placed on American universities for staff and support, the high incidence of these institutions in less developed areas and its implications for later activities in these same areas, and the stimulus missionaries have provided for the American community to look outward.

It has been common practice for missionaries entering a new area to establish first a church and then a school. In most cases it is assumed that eventually both would become self-supporting and, within the doctrine of the founding group, self-governing. The intention has been to plant a seed that could grow in the native soil yet would retain essential features of the parent body. To encourage this development, missionaries entered the field of education originally at the primary and secondary levels. First things first, and besides, this appeared to be a logical starting point for the building of future Christians. Moreover, most missionaries were ill-equipped intellectually and financially to undertake an educational venture at the college level, even

---

[10]George F. Donovan, Associate Secretary, College and University Department, National Catholic Education Association, "A Preliminary Statement--Numerical Distribution of Catholic Colleges and Universities," 1956 (Manuscript), as reported in Bodenman, op. cit., pp. 24-25.

if local conditions permitted such enterprises. Most of the areas in which missionaries began their labors had few students prepared for collegiate instruction. In some areas, such as Japan, China, and India, universities were feasible once political sanction was obtained and staff was located to operate such institutions. But as is obvious from Dr. Beaver's figures just cited, collegiate institutions of missionary origin represent a fraction of the fruits of their effort.

In those areas where conditions offered some possibilities that institutions of higher education could survive, missionary groups moved to establish them in addition to their work in the primary and secondary fields. The main impetus for Christian colleges in missionary lands came after 1870.[11] This was not an especially convenient juncture in terms of developments in American higher education. Instead, it reflected the level of political acceptance of missionaries in foreign countries at a particular time and the level of zeal prevailing in the American missionary groups. The success of the movement depended on fortuitous circumstances, and American universities were either poorly prepared to make a significant direct contribution or disinclined to do so. Thus the missionaries undertook to build institutions of higher education in foreign lands on little more than their own energies and an unsteady political toleration on the part of foreign governments. They operated on their faith and lived by their wits (frequently

---

[11] For the founding dates of many of these colleges see W. Plumer Mills, op. cit. A detailed account of such developments in China is available in Alice H. Gregg, China and Educational Autonomy: The Changing Role of the Protestant Educational Missionary in China, 1807-1937 (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1946), especially Chapters II-VI.

involving the American government in their cause).[12] They faced death and ruin at frequent points. That they founded institutions which probably did not deserve the label of "college" is unimportant beside the fact that they were able to build anything in the face of substantial adversity. It is not the purpose of this study to evaluate the contributions of the missionaries to higher education abroad, but the fact that many of the institutions they founded drew American universities into the international field is part of our present history.

Few of the early Christian colleges have developed formal institutional relationships with a specific American university or group of universities. Prominent exceptions have been the cooperative efforts of Yale and Oberlin which started near the turn of the century and have persisted to the present, albeit in altered form. The universities' main contacts have been through religious governing and coordinating "boards" for missionary activities, located in the United States.[13] These boards have managed to provide a modicum of communication between missionaries and American universities which are subject to control or influence by religious groups. The missionary activities have been dependent, especially in the field of higher education, on personnel recruited from American universities. The main source of such persons

---

[12] An interesting account of the political activities of the missionaries in China is available in Paul A. Varg, Missionaries, Chinese and Diplomats: The American Protestant Missionary Movement in China, 1890-1952 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958).

[13] The term "boards" does not describe precisely the various concerted efforts of religious groups to manage their missionary enterprises. It is intended merely to indicate that many of the various religious sects have joined efforts in the interests of economy and efficiency. For example, this development is well demonstrated in James G. Maddox, Technical Assistance by Religious Agencies in Latin America (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956), Chapter 3.

has tended to be universities which have had a common faith with the missionaries, or at least have encouraged the development of a missionary spirit among their faculty and students. By and large, such practices have not led to firm ties between American universities and foreign institutions, but they have done a small bit toward fostering an awareness in the American academic community of the processes of education in areas of the world outside of the United States and Europe.

In some American universities, especially those controlled by evangelical religious organizations, it is fair to say that the possibility of overseas service on behalf of the church is at least an implied condition of employment and/or part of the reward structure. This practice has led to a kind of "educational missionary service" which is available for work on both the home and foreign fronts. As a prominent Seventh Day Adventist educator stated in an interview, persons performing such services consider their primary responsibility to be to the governing authority of the church and secondarily to any particular educational institution. Such attitudes, if they are representative, provide some indication as to why religious groups have seemingly not encouraged direct university-to-university relationships, but have strongly interposed the church between American and foreign universities. As an examination of Part II of The International Programs of American Universities will show, this characteristic is more prominent among Protestant institutions than Catholic. A partial explanation of this may be contained in the fact that Catholic universities in the United States have a greater tendency to look up to prominent Catholic universities in other countries, while the highly fragmented Protestant religion and its universities provide fewer such guides.

Notwithstanding the relative paucity of close, institutional relationships which have developed as a consequence of faculty members of American universities serving in the cause of missionary education, these same faculty members have had an important propagandizing effect on American education. It is common to find "missionary zeal," for example, among the inventory of characteristics considered essential for those persons involved in American university international programs in less developed areas. What is really meant, apparently, is that education and politics should be substituted for religion while maintaining the drive and devotion usually attributed to religious missionaries. The influence of the early educational missionaries on current attitudes toward the use of American university faculty in international programs will, perhaps, be more concretely demonstrated in that portion of this study devoted to an examination of these attitudes.

American university students have participated actively and widely in Protestant missionary activities in particular. While comparatively few faculty members from American universities have left these institutions for educational service as missionaries, large numbers of students have added their energies to this endeavor. Not only have they been drawn from student bodies at universities with a strong religious orientation, they also have included large numbers from the more venerable and secular institutions such as Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. They have focused their activities at the national level in large organizations such as the American Intercollegiate Young Men's Christian Association and numerous smaller groups. By 1895, the American Christian student movement had joined forces with similar groups from around the world to form the World Student Christian Federation.

The Federation has since evolved into a variety of international Christian student organizations which operate through church mission boards, the Young Men's and Women's Christian Associations, Youth for Christ International, Student Volunteer Movement for Christian Missions, and many other channels.[14] The point being, simply, that student interest continues to be high in the educational missionary field, although it is not as unified as it had been, and it tends to be overshadowed by the growing number of secular international programs directly related to particular American universities.

The Federation, stimulated by John R. Mott, the long-time driving force in the Christian student movement, undertook to convert students around the world to Christianity. Its appeal was thought to be especially attractive to student groups since those who carried the appeal abroad were themselves students. (This line of reasoning continues to prevail among many promoters of international educational programs, especially those who argue for the ICA-sponsored university contract.) Thus from about 1900 to 1940, American university students engaged with vigor in a missionary project designed to promote Christianity through emphasis on a set of common characteristics, viz., those associated with students. World War I interrupted their activities only briefly, and the 1920's were years of intense work for the

---

[14]The Directory of North American Protestant Foreign Missionary Agencies, Third Edition, 1958, no longer includes the World Student Christian Federation, but does list numerous other student organizations in the missionary field.

student groups as they set out to capture the "strategic points in the world's conquest," to use the words of John Mott.[15]

From the point of view of this study, it does not appear that the Federation and its successors have succeeded in capturing those strategic points they had in mind, i.e., universities. Their influence in establishing enduring direct connections between students in American universities and students in foreign lands seems to have been meager in view of the fact that very few current international programs as defined herein can be traced to the student movements.[16] The student groups have, however, encouraged some American students to survey at least one area of intercourse between cultures. This has been cited by many writers in the fields of religion, education, and politics as one of several factors contributing to a growing interest by Americans, and especially those connected with universities and sponsoring agencies, in international relations. It is not possible to specify the nature of the contribution student missionary activities have made to this process, nor is it possible to establish a direct cause and effect relationship between these activities and the role of American universities in international relations. We know that all missionary groups

---

[15]An interesting partisan account of the World Student Christian Federation is contained in John R. Mott, Strategic Points in the World's Conquest: The Universities and Colleges as Related to the Progress of Christianity (New York: Flemin H. Revell Company, 1898, Sixth Edition). It is interesting to note that the book contains an enthusiastic endorsement by former President Benjamin Harrison.

[16]Additional evidence to support this contention is available in Métraux, op. cit., Chapter 1. The influence of student missionary groups in the development of student exchanges, for example, is omitted from his catalog of factors related to this phenomenon. Furthermore, neither the study by Bodenman nor the one by the Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, previously cited, indicates that the Christian student organizations have involved American universities in international programs that are currently operative.

continue to send university faculty and students to educational institutions abroad in the service of the church; and we know that numerous foreign students in the United States are sponsored by the same groups. From this and previously stated facts, we can reasonably surmise that missionaries and their work are part of the general mosaic of institutions and events which underpins the growing international involvement of American universities.

Perhaps the key to why the extensive international educational activities of the missionaries during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have not resulted in more university-to-university relationships with institutions in the United States may be found in the manner in which religious organizations tend to organize and operate their missionary programs.[17] Religion and its propagation are at the core of all their work. Education is one of several important vehicles for the realization of the religious objectives which flow from the core. This means that religious authorities stand continually in a superior or co-equal relationship to educators working within the framework of a particular faith. Frequently, the president of a sectarian university considers his service as a responsibility to the church and secondarily to a particular university. Or he may blur the picture until the school and religion are one and the same. Whatever the procedure, there has been a tendency for religious organizations to emphasize the missionary responsibilities of American universities to foreign universities as a

---

[17]Examples of organizational methods in the missionary field especially related to universities are available in The Student Missionary Appeal (New York: Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions), published annually from 1895. This publication is composed of the proceedings of the International Conventions of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions.

process to be carried on through the church under unified leadership. Such practices are less than conducive to the development of close university-to-university relationships. At least when the Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, Bodenman, Métraux, and the U.S. Government, among others, conducted their respective surveys, few such relationships were reported. Thus, while we can find very few international programs of the type analyzed in this study among sectarian universities, we recognize that cooperation among these institutions is extensive within certain other institutionalized dimensions.

The Development of Government Interest and Influence in International Programs

In combination with missionary groups, through paths blazed by missionaries, and independently, U.S. Government missions, with responsibilities primarily in technical subject-matters, have been operating internationally since at least the middle of the nineteenth century. They have grown from very small beginnings to an important part of the foreign political apparatus of the United States. In their growth, these governmental missions have increased the numbers of university personnel working overseas in the service of the government, they have brought the universities into closer and more direct relationships with the government, and they have drawn the universities into both the educational and the socio-political aspects of international relations while shedding or adding to many of the original technical characteristics. The influence of these early government programs on the development of the current international programs of American universities is more discernible than is the missionary influence just discussed. Our examination of this facet of the universities' involvement in international relations is divided into two periods--before and after 1936.

"The Prelude" until 1936

Following the Civil War, the U.S. Government began to take cognizance of international technical missions as an instrument for the exportation and importation of knowledge. According to Curti and Birr, "These efforts possessed the elements of the technical mission of our time, but it was not until late in the first decade of the twentieth century that the technical mission in its full, modern sense emerged."[18] Although these early missions were staffed mostly with government personnel, there were prominent exceptions as well as strong indications that the universities would be heavily tapped for personnel. Thus it is appropriate to this study to examine the development of technical missions and their impact on American universities.

The emphasis of the first technical missions was on exploration and acquisition of certain technical knowledge. Business and political interests in the United States stimulated the commissioning of numerous exploration groups which were charged with the responsibility of reporting on the potentials of hitherto unknown areas, primarily for commercial purposes. Not only did such missions advance general knowledge in a few areas. They also tended to arouse further government and commercial interest in expanding the work already done and in increasing the number of missions. As the number of missions increased, demands for the services of leading university personnel to participate in these undertakings mounted. Curti and Birr indicate the university affiliations of many of the members of early technical missions.

---

[18]Curti and Birr, op. cit., p. 11.

Shortly after the initial surge of exploratory missions had become a small but steady stream, advisory missions became part of the international activities of the U.S. Government. Between 1900 and World War I, the successes of American technology and education were being recognized, especially in colonial and other less-developed areas. While the limits of advancement in these fields in the United States had not yet been approached, the government and other agencies, such as universities, had begun to find it advantageous, prestigeful, and challenging to direct to foreign areas some of their energies related to these fields. Their motives included curiosity, commercial and political interest, and others too vague to be expressed.[19]

Advice was usually given at the request of a foreign government. Such requests were normally made through the U.S. Government, which then undertook to meet the needs in question. To do so, the government relied heavily on its own agencies, especially the military and agriculture. But personnel shortages, more pressing demands, and respect for university personnel all combined to cause the government to encourage faculty members to participate. Usually such participants were highly respected members of their professions who were motivated by service ideals, professional interest, travel, curiosity, and higher pay to forego the routines of academic life for varying periods of time. Their service with the government rarely involved the university from which they were recruited in any direct way. The participants were generally not guaranteed any particular professional status protection by the universities, except that they would be re-employed upon their return.

---

[19] Ibid, pp. 204-205.

Unlike many of the technical missions designed to explore new regions and gather data, the early advisory missions involving Americans overseas were generally financed by the foreign governments requesting the missions. Some support costs were occasionally borne by the U.S. Government, but the concept of American advisory teams financed primarily by their own government had not yet been extensively developed. Policy control usually was divided between those who paid the bills and those performing the services, depending on the environment and the ingenuity of the advisors. Curti and Birr cite many instances of advisory missions operating independently of the U.S. Government as well as frequent cases of the government's declining to be involved after being urged to by the American mission members. The overall picture in regard to American policy control of and interest in early technical advisory missions was replete with contradictions and inequities. There is no direct correlation between those missions regarded as successful by historians and U.S. Government interest in them. Then as now, government association with international programs tended to be beneficial insofar as the political aims of the cooperating countries coincided or were complementary.

While most of the activities of American university personnel participating in the pre-World War I technical missions did not result in direct, cooperative relationships between an American and foreign university, a few exceptions are noteworthy. In Japan, the Massachusetts State College of Agriculture, upon the invitation of the Japanese minister in Washington and with the enthusiastic support of President Clark of that college, undertook to develop an agricultural college on Hokkaido in 1876. Curti and Birr contend that "the influence of the

college on the development of Hokkaido was considerable."[20] In support of this, they cite numerous new techniques which were introduced and retained. The college itself was modeled after the Massachusetts State College of Agriculture. Although formal relationships between Hokkaido and Massachusetts lapsed with changes in personnel and developments in international affairs, enough interest was maintained by both institutions to encourage the reestablishment of formal cooperation under ICA auspices in 1957.

The groundwork for Amherst College's sustained interest in Japan and later formal affiliation with Doshisha University was probably first begun in 1872, when President Seelye of Amherst College interested the Japanese Ministry of Education in a physical education program. While Amherst's representative in Japan, Dr. George Leland, worked for the Japanese government, he did exert an influence on the university system which encouraged Amherst to establish close contact with Doshisha University in 1922. The Amherst House continues to be an active center for American studies at Doshisha.

The work of the government-sponsored technical missions, both of the exploration and advisory types, was altered and interrupted by World War I. In one respect, the war accelerated the movement of technical experts to and from the United States. This movement was to meet unusual demands somewhat removed from educational interests, however. Nonetheless, the U.S. Government re-entered the technical mission field with vigor following the war. From about 1920 to 1939, the U.S. Government steadily increased its sponsorship of missions committed to the assistance of foreign countries and to the commercial, social, and

---

[20] Ibid, p. 47.

political interests of the United States. It was during this period that the government began to call upon universities as whole institutions to make decisions related to the allocation of their resources for international purposes. The consequences of these developments were just beginning to have an impact on the universities, foreign cooperating institutions, and the United States Government when World War II changed the complexion of overseas missions.

But to say that American universities were on the threshold of joining forces with the government in international relations is to go beyond the temper of the times, for, in fact, during the interwar period, military and financial missions far exceeded educational missions in number and scope. These missions, like those before World War I, included many university persons who had a particular expertise appropriate to a technical mission and who were sufficiently motivated to participate. Few included university personnel who were asked to apply their knowledge and skills in the subject matter field of American education to foreign cultures. While there existed a good deal of curiosity about American education and its contributions to the strengths of the United States, skepticism about American education as compared to European and Asian forms prevailed among most foreign groups.[21] By 1940, the rise in the economic and political stature of the United States had dissipated many doubts about the value of the American educational system. This new upsurge of confidence in American education on the parts of foreign countries was manifested in an increased number of requests from foreign governments and institutions for various forms of educational assistance and cooperation.

---

[21] Ibid, pp. 198-203.

Curti and Birr include the following examples of American educators working in the service of foreign governments in an effort to revamp their national educational systems. During the 1920's, John Dewey provided educational counsel to the governments of China and Turkey. Dewey's efforts in China were complemented by the additional work of Paul Monroe. In 1926, Liberia called upon the prominent Negro educator, James Sibley, to act as an educational advisor to the government. A full-scale educational mission was dispatched to Peru in the early 1920's at the invitation of the Peruvian government. This venture, which ultimately ended in failure, involved the educators in a complex game of Peruvian and international politics. It stands as one of the early examples of the possible difficulties which may result from the use of education and educators as political instruments.

Two important similar educational assistance missions under bilateral government auspices went out in the 1930's. The first was the attempt of Ernest Work of Muskingum College to establish an educational system for Ethiopia. Political factionalism and the Italian invasion of Ethiopia destroyed any opportunities for Work to make a permanent contribution to Ethiopian education. The second was an educational mission to Iraq involving prominent American educators and, indirectly, Columbia University. While this group made a careful study of education in Iraq, their report found its way to a "pigeon-hole," and there it remained.[22]

Immediately before World War II, a special type of international education involving the U.S. Government and military institutions of

---

[22]A brief description of these two missions is contained in Curti and Birr, op. cit., pp. 198-200.

higher education was developing rapidly. The recognition of the United States as a world military power following World War I tended to attract increasing numbers of foreign military officers to the American military academies. Actually, West Point accepted its first group of foreign trainees in 1816, and Annapolis in 1919.[23] Although these institutions differ significantly from other American institutions of higher education, their experiences should not be ignored in an analysis of the trend toward greater use of universities as training agencies for non-nationals under governmental sponsorship.

The Extension and Formalization of Cooperation Between the Government and Universities in International Relations After 1936

Perhaps the most significant preliminary steps on the road to cooperation in the field of international education between the U.S. Government and universities were taken between 1936-1939. During that time, the government entered into close, formal arrangements in the field of education, as part of a broad program of technical cooperation with Latin American countries. This movement, while part of the previous administration's programs, took discernible form under the guidance of the Roosevelt administration. Walter Sharp states that this program was part of the Roosevelt administration's "good neighbor" policy and that the original impetus came from the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Relations adopted by the Buenos Aires Conference of 1936.[24]

---

[23]Committee on Government Operations, Forty Second Report, Government Programs in International Education (A Survey and Handbook) United States House of Representatives Report No. 2712, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959), p. 34.

[24]Walter R. Sharp, International Technical Assistance (Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1952), p. 4.

Further stimulus was provided by the Eighth International Congress of American States at Lima in 1938.

Glick states in The Administration of Technical Assistance that "two largely independent, somewhat parallel, operations" emerged from these meetings.[25] They were the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation (SCC) and the Institute of Inter-American Affairs (IIAA). The programs of both SCC and IIAA came into being "in response to two stimuli: requests for technical and economic assistance from the Latin-American countries and a growing recognition within the United States and Latin America of the interdependence of the nations of the Western Hemisphere."[26] From 1939-1950 they provided the major avenue of cooperation among the U.S. Government, institutions of higher education in the United States, and their Latin American counterparts.[27] World War II precluded the development of any comparable programs in other parts of the world, even if any desire for them existed. Thus the decade of cooperative effort in Latin America involving governments and universities of both the United States and other countries represented an important "get-acquainted" period. The trend was getting clearer. As the international political responsibilities and interests of the United States increased, American educational personnel and institutions were being drawn into cooperative international programs with the government. The initiative for this relationship lay primarily with the government, according to Glick, Sharp, Curti, and Birr.

---

[25] Glick, op. cit., p. 6.

[26] Ibid, p. 14. See also Sharp, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

[27] Picture of their scope can be obtained from the tables in Glick, op. cit., p. 11 and p. 21.

The SCC was the first organized and systematic attempt to construct a program of technical cooperation with comprehensive goals and indefinite time limits. It derived its authority from two statutes (Public Laws 63 and 355 of the 76th Congress) which authorized the President to detail for temporary service any person in the employ of the United States to give advice and assistance on request to any Latin American government in an effort to render closer and more effective the relationships between the American republics.[28] This part of the program was not particularly new, nor did it affect American universities directly, for it emphasized the use of government personnel as advisors to Latin American governments. It did, however, tend to systematize the myriads of requests which resulted in the sorts of American missions described by Curti and Birr. The existence of this kind of machinery also proved to function as a stimulant for the development of increasingly complex programs which in turn increased the demands on the government for technicians and advisors. Although the programs were still small by today's standards, they at times exceeded the resources of particular government departments. On such occasions it was customary for the government to turn to such institutions as universities for additional, temporary personnel. There is no evidence available to this writer to indicate that universities were especially antagonistic in regard to government "raiding" at this juncture in the development of their cooperative relations. Available

---

[28]As extracted by Glick, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

statistical evidence shows that the number of university personnel involved grew as the SCC programs grew.[29]

Of particular interest in the SCC program is the exchange of students and professors and the training of Latin Americans in the United States as part of a technical assistance program. These features were later developed into independent programs with their own government agencies, and the training of non-nationals in the United States as part of a technical assistance program has become an integral part of many university-contract programs. This "strictly academic" aspect of SCC's program, however, was secondary to the sending of technical advisors to Latin America. During the years 1940-1948, nearly eighteen million dollars were expended on SCC programs, of which less than five million were used for "cooperation in education."[30] Nonetheless, this much attention to the exchange of educational personnel on the part of the government, meager as it is by current standards, was novel.

From July 1, 1940 to December 31, 1948, SCC programs brought 1,883 foreign trainees to the United States. Most of these trainees were given in-service training by government agencies; however, many also attended American universities as part of their American sojourn. During the same period, over 1,700 students and 558 faculty members were also exchanged between American universities and Latin American institutions under SCC auspices.[31] Cooperating in this enterprise was the

---

[29]U.S. Department of State, "Scientific and Technical Cooperation in the American Republics, under the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation, 1939-1949," July 1, 1949, 145 pp., mimeographed, as quoted by Glick, op. cit., p. 10.

[30]Glick, op. cit., p. 11.

[31]U.S. Department of State, Point Four (Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1950), p. 130, as quoted in Glick, op. cit., p. 11.

Cultural Relations Division of the Department of State, which had been established almost concurrently with SCC and IIAA. The Cultural Relations Division, in addition to SCC, administered a number of grants for faculty and student exchanges with Latin American countries. It also began a modest program of educational exchange with countries in the Near and Far East.[32]

Overlapping of responsibility, duplication, and general confusion among the three agencies interested in educational exchange programs led to a redefinition of responsibility in 1943. SCC agreed to limit its activities to programs of technical assistance, primarily in education. Under these programs, SCC continued to bring trainees from Latin America to the United States, but it relinquished nearly all of its general educational exchange activities to the Department of State.[33] Consequently, the Department of State became the center of activity in the field of student and faculty exchanges financed by public funds. While the Department has since been reorganized to handle the growing number of such exchanges, primary responsibility for educational exchange still resides there.

Although SCC and the Cultural Relations Division of the Department of State were expanding the area and number of contacts between the U.S. Government and American universities in the international field, their work in this vein was overshadowed by the activities of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. It was the work of IIAA in

---

[32] A brief history of the Cultural Relations Division's work is contained in a pamphlet printed by the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy entitled "Twenty Years of United States Government Programs in Cultural Relations," January 1959, pp. 8-10.

[33] Ibid, pp. 9-11.

international technical cooperation that served as an influential model for the programs later to be developed by the International Cooperation Administration. Fed by a sense of urgency derived from the circumstances of World War II, IIAA developed important programs of cooperation with Latin American governments in the fields of public health, agriculture, and education. For the execution of these programs IIAA created a unique instrument known as the servicio. Sharp describes the servicio as follows:

> By agreement with the host government, each servicio is jointly staffed by personnel of the institute and the government, and its activities are jointly financed by contributions from the government and the IIAA (on behalf of the United States). The servicio normally functions as a bureau within the ministry concerned (e.g., health). Under this partnership arrangement, the chief of the IIAA's field party acts as director of the servicio, his compensation being provided by IIAA. The servicio, although located within the administrative hierarchy of the ministry, enjoys substantial autonomy and operates under a special joint budget.[34]

Both the programs and the methods developed by IIAA were important forerunners of many current international programs.[35] IIAA programs, unlike many of the earlier technical missions described by Curti and Birr and much of the advisory work of SCC, had planned, long-range effects on the particular segment of a country's problems on which they were focused and they brought organized teams of experts from two countries into working relationships for extended periods of time. Although IIAA maintained discrete functional distinctions among its programs and emphasized discrete goals within the fields of public

---

[34] Sharp, op. cit., p. 5.

[35] Glick, op. cit., p. 17, says, "The major characteristics of the operations of IIAA during the eight years 1942-1950, prior to the announcement of the Point Four program, had an important effect on the character of the later Point Four program."

health, agriculture, and education, observers could not avoid the conclusion that IIAA was actually promoting the general economic development of under-developed countries without formally acknowledging this as a goal.[36] Multiple subject-matter programs aimed at broad social and economic changes affecting the path of development of a country were not part of its conscious arsenal.

Both SCC and IIAA, born in the atmosphere of the "good neighbor" policy, and brought to prominence by the urgencies of World War II, maintained their strength in the immediate postwar years, but soon succumbed to more ambitious national security and technical assistance policies of the government. Although both agencies had ceased to exist by 1953, they left important imprints on their successors. SCC became the first administrative model for the newly created Technical Cooperation Administration in 1950, and the discrete functionalism of the IIAA programs was evident in the early foreign aid efforts resulting from Point Four.[37] Thus an improtant legacy in the brief history of American technical cooperation with underdeveloped countries provided the initial base for the rapid expansion of this aspect of international relations.

When President Truman submitted the Act for International Development to Congress to implement Point Four, it was met with considerable wariness and hostility. Congress was not convinced, even in the light of unsettled world conditions during the late 1940's, that there was merit enough in "technical cooperation" to warrant the expenditure of American dollars. They feared a "sort of Marshall Plan"

---

[36] Sharp, op. cit., p. 5 and Glick op. cit., p. 48.

[37] An excellent brief history of the administration of U.S. technical assistance programs is contained in Glick, op. cit., pp. 30-50.

for underdeveloped countries or a "global WPA." To allay these fears certain restrictions were written into the law itself;[38] but most influential in reducing opposition to the Act for International Development were SCC and IIAA. Modest as their work had been in Latin America, it had been effective enough to win a considerable amount of grudging Congressional support. Assurances that the experiences of these agencies would be incorporated into the new Technical Cooperation Administration played an influential part in rescuing the Act from an antagonistic Senate.

Cooperation between the U.S. Government and American universities up to 1950 had been extensive but seldom highly formalized. The widespread use of university personnel to staff numerous government-sponsored technical programs has been mentioned in addition to those government programs involving the movement of faculty and students between American and foreign universities. Such activities grew in scope as the international involvement of the United States deepened between the two World Wars. Probably the first instance of American universities and the government entering into contractual relationships in the field of technical assistance in foreign countries occurred in 1951. At least the relationship established that year is most closely linked to the extensive network of university-government contracts presently operating under the banner of the International Cooperation Administration. In 1951, IIAA signed the University of Arkansas to an agriculture contract in Panama; the Economic Cooperation Administration

---

[38] The law prohibited the supplying of capital for economic development and emphasized the sharing of technology only. Also, Congress authorized an appropriation for only one year at a time, notwithstanding the fact that the Act for International Development was permanent legislation.

brought Cornell University and the University of the Philippines into a cooperative program; and the newly formed Technical Cooperation Administration started Oklahoma State University on its famous Ethiopian program.

The various government technical assistance programs spawned by Point Four inherited both program and administrative features from SCC and IIAA. First, these agencies helped to make the terms "technical assistance" and "technical cooperation" a part of the official vocabulary of the government. Technical missions had been in evidence before the advent of SCC and IIAA, but their small scale, limited aims, and generally short-term nature raised relatively few significant problems or issues in public policy terms. SCC and IIAA served to broaden the scope of international intercourse in technical fields. The result has been increased reliance on educators and educational institutions for operating personnel and backstopping. This is not to say that SCC and IIAA had extensive institutional relationships with American universities. They did not; but they did encourage university personnel to participate in foreign technical assistance programs and they did write one of the first contracts with a university for an international program.

The involvement of American universities in technical assistance programs has not only been related to the government's need to tap the manpower resources of universities. It has evolved also from the decision to train foreign nationals in the United States as part of many technical assistance programs. Combined, these two factors made cooperative relationships in international programs between government and universities a certainty. SCC and IIAA placed considerable reliance

on the training in the United States of Latin Americans who would replace the American technicians at a future date. This aspect of the work of SCC and IIAA highlights another legacy present international programs have accepted from the past. This is the assumption that Americans abroad under international programs operated by American universities and sponsored by the government are training their own replacements and that the operation of any of these programs by Americans will cease in the future. The hope is that cooperative relationships will remain, primarily between educational institutions, but Americans will retire from the day-to-day operations of these programs abroad, and host country nationals will follow through.[39]

The contract device, counterpart funds and personnel, formal requests for assistance from host countries, the servicio, and occasional conflict with diplomatic missions, all part of SCC and IIAA operations, persist in current government-sponsored programs operated by American universities. Thus while President Harry S. Truman, TCA Director Henry G. Bennett, and FOA Director Harold Stassen, among others, probably deserve much of the credit they have claimed for a "bold new program" and unique employment of universities, it should be acknowledged that there existed at least a partial foundation in the form of SCC and IIAA experiences for the union of government and university in technical assistance programs.[40]

---

[39]This basic assumption is part of all Congressional hearings relative to foreign aid and has been part of all the literature published by the various government agencies responsible for the administration of foreign aid since 1940.

[40]For an enthusiastic description of the uniqueness of Point Four see Jonathan B. Bingham, Shirt-Sleeve Diplomacy: Point Four in Action (New York: John Day, 1954), pp. 11-15.

From 1950 to the present, responsibility for the administration of government-sponsored technical assistance programs has passed through a variety of agencies. This process has resulted in some policy changes, mostly in terms of the magnitude of the technical assistance venture and the areas of emphasis. The exact administrative history of technical assistance programs is not especially significant for this study. Excellent short histories are available in Philip Glick's The Administration of Technical Assistance, in staff studies by committees of the Eighty-fourth and Eighty-fifth Congresses, and in Jonathan Bingham's Shirt-Sleeve Diplomacy. It is important, however, to trace the history of university involvement in technical assistance under these agencies which symbolized the elevation of technical assistance from a minor aspect of American foreign policy to a prominent "weapon" in the developing "cold war."

The Technical Cooperation Administration, established in 1950, shared responsibilities for technical assistance with the Economic Cooperation Administration and IIAA. TCA adopted some of the management practices of SCC. This meant that other government agencies were called upon for substantive assistance in the operation of many international programs. Where programs had a history of satisfactory operation, as in Latin America under IIAA and in Europe under ECA, TCA made little effort to alter them. IIAA efforts were bolstered by TCA activity, but not changed basically. In areas that were comparatively unacquainted with American programs of technical assistance, TCA began to formulate new programs. One result was that American technology came to be turned on the problems of the Near and Far East under government auspices to a degree never before attempted.

The Act for International Development, which formalized the administration of technical assistance, specified that private agencies be used in international programs "to the greatest extent practicable." This specific mandate, as well as necessity, encouraged TCA to expand the contacts IIAA and ECA had been developing with private agencies, including universities. In fiscal year 1951, the first year of the Act, TCA let contracts to private agencies for technical assistance projects in the amount of $3,740,542. In 1952 and 1953 the amount contracted for each year was double the amount in the previous year, and after that it increased even more rapidly.[41]

All of these developments were important preliminaries to the now prominent use of American universities as contractor for foreign technical assistance. The political climate provided an extremely favorable environment for the expansion of this device. Of this period a high level ICA official has said, ". . . the circumstances in the technical assistance field were just right for the university contract system. In part these favorable circumstances included a willingness on the part of foreign countries to engage in just such a program and a willingness on the part of universities here in the United States to engage in it overseas." But the potential of the situation might have been minimized had it not been for the interests and ambitions of a few university presidents and of some university-oriented persons occupying leadership positions in the American government's foreign aid apparatus.

To demonstrate the relationship of certain sorts of personalities to the rapid expansion of government and university cooperation in

---

[41] U.S. Senate, Eighty-fourth Congress, Government Utilization of Private Agencies in Technical Assistance (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, January 9, 1956), pp. 9-10.

technical assistance programs, the influence of three persons is mentioned briefly. The first is the late Henry G. Bennett, former president of Oklahoma State University and first administrator of TCA. The second is Harold E. Stassen, former governor of Minnesota, special advisor to President Eisenhower, the first director of the Foreign Operations Administration, successor to TCA. The third is John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University, active participant in government affairs during the Eisenhower Administration, and influential representative of the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities. This group of men contributed a unique blend of humanitarianism, missionary zeal, vision, political ambitions and insight, educational prestige, and administrative ability to technical assistance programs. ICA, and especially the university contract program, still feel the impact of their ideas today. Others have certainly been influential in determining the form and future of ICA-sponsored contracts with American universities, but none are mentioned as consistently by interviewees as are Bennett, Stassen, and Hannah.

As the president of a land grant university, Bennett had had numerous contacts with government agencies seeking assistance in carrying out a wide variety of programs. In particular, Bennett and Oklahoma State University had worked frequently and closely with the Department of Agriculture (USDA). Given the orientation of land grant universities in the United States this represented a "normal" relationship. Additionally, it provided Bennett with ample opportunities for developing numerous contacts with government personnel. From this base of cooperation, he moved with relative ease into the role of director of TCA in November 1950. In this capacity, he initially attempted to

coordinate the technical assistance activities of ECA, IIAA, and TCA while promoting the development of new programs directly under TCA. To a large extent program development still meant increased utilization of old-line government departments and the borrowing of personnel from non-government sources for relatively short periods of time. But at the same time, Bennett, in cooperation with groups with which he was exceptionally familiar, such as the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, gradually encouraged the growth of university contracts under TCA. In so doing, Bennett relied heavily on the earlier work of ECA and USDA in developing an agreeable contract arrangement with the land grant universities. In 1949, the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities formally accepted the contract idea.[42] There is little doubt that Bennett and Hannah played an active part in this acceptance. Therefore, Bennett arrived on the Washington scene familiar with the past history of American universities in technical assistance and with the future aspirations in this field of an important segment of the university population.

Once in Washington, Bennett set about his task of getting the fragmented technical assistance machinery functioning with some degree of coordination. It was a formidable undertaking, for IIAA was accustomed to doing things in Latin America in special ways, ECA worked in Europe to restore capital investment, and TCA surveyed the rest of the underdeveloped world with a small budget and a sense of bewilderment at the enormousness of the job ahead. Of this situation and Bennett's impact, Glick says, "It seemed for a while during 1951 that the force

---

[42] WE-66 and WE-98. Interviews with prominent representatives of and spokesmen for the land grant universities. See also, Glick, op. cit., p. 90.

of a single personality would be able to blend a good many discordant elements into a harmonious working organism. . . . His wisdom and capacity for leadership, buttressed by the prestige he derived from his position of strength in the White House and on Capitol Hill, were gradually, as 1951 wore on, enabling him to move from coordinator to administrator. All the agencies concerned were beginning to accept him as their leader. It became probable that through sheer strength of personality he would fuse the dissident elements and provide unified direction to the whole program. Before he had accomplished that feat, after thirteen months in office, he made an inspection trip to twelve countries in which Point 4 operations had been recently initiated; while flying into the airport at Teheran late in December, 1951, he was killed, with several members of his staff."[43] Bingham supports this analysis of Bennett's leadership and adds, ". . . a lovable man with a genius for inspiring people."[44]

Following Bennett's death, the task of orientation for TCA within the government administrative structure became increasingly difficult. Subsequent TCA leadership lacked the stature and ability and good fortune that had favored Bennett in his brief period of service. His successors possessed the same interest Bennett had in technical assistance (the fact that the operations of TCA expanded after Bennett's death provides some support for this), but they were unable to carve out a clearly defined place for TCA in the government. Their task was complicated by changes in the over-all structure of and policy toward foreign aid. During 1951-53 (from Bennett to Stassen), there was a

---

[43]Glick, op. cit., p. 42.

[44]Bingham, op. cit., p. 13.

concerted effort by Congress, such administrative agencies as ECA, and several presidential advisors to integrate military, economic, and technical assistance.[45] The result was the Mutual Security Act of 1951, with its director for mutual security, Averell Harriman, who was technically the overseer of the entire foreign aid program.

The Mutual Security Act of 1951 ostensibly made TCA one of several instruments designed to serve more directly the security objectives of the United States. Such an interpretation had mixed consequences for technical assistance. In the first place, the Mutual Security Act did not affect the daily operations of TCA in Washington directly, since TCA's expenditures were small compared to others in related fields. However, the act did affect overseas operations of TCA and has had side effects related to university attitudes toward technical assistance programs and to government pressure for universities to participate. Foreign countries cooperating in TCA programs were immediately alarmed by the security overtones of technical assistance under MSA coordination, notwithstanding the fact that there is little evidence to indicate that TCA altered the content or operation of its programs while associated with MSA during 1951-53. Mexico and Indonesia terminated their programs for fear of developing a quasi-military alliance with the United States.[46]

Diplomatic and TCA officials hastened to patch things up overseas by assuring foreign governments that involvement in TCA programs did not constitute an alliance with the United States. Most were sufficiently satisfied with such assurances or unconcerned with the whole

---

[45] Glick, op. cit., p. 43.

[46] Ibid, p. 43.

matter, if we may judge from the fact that the number of programs increased steadily from 1951 on. But the impact of combining national security interests with technical assistance through educational institutions is still evident among American universities. As this study will show, many American universities interpret their participation in government technical assistance programs as primarily a contribution to national security. They pronounce this a good and sufficient reason for university involvement. Others argue that a university is not an appropriate instrument for foreign policy and decline to participate. This debate is an important aspect of this study and will be discussed at length in subsequent chapters. For now, it is important to note that Stassen arrived on the scene in the midst of the integration process. His aims and ambitions at this juncture had important implications for American universities.

Glick describes as follows the establishment of the foreign aid complex which Stassen was named to administer upon the arrival of the Republicans in power:

> On June 1 (1953) the President submitted to Congress Reorganization Plan Number 7 of 1953, which established the Foreign Operations Administration (FOA). Harold E. Stassen, who had succeeded W. Averell Harriman as director for mutual security, was named director of foreign operations. The reorganization plan gave different treatment to the three agencies whose programs FOA was to integrate: (a) The military-assistance program remained in the Department of Defense, but the director of FOA was given authority to direct its operations; (b) the functions of MSA were transferred to FOA and MSA was abolished; (c) the functions of TCA were transferred to FOA, but TCA was not abolished. IIAA, as the regional arm of TCA for Latin America, was included in the transfer to FOA. The director of FOA was authorized to determine the internal organization structure of FOA.[47]

---

[47] Ibid, p. 46.

The integration of technical assistance with military programs was endorsed by the then Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. It appeared that Stassen would be accorded a relatively free hand in the foreign aid field, and, if possible, get the United States out of the foreign technical assistance business. Commentators on the history of American technical assistance programs, such as Glick, Sharp, Bingham, and numerous interviewees for this study, interpret Dulles' attitude toward TCA and FOA as an indication of the Republicans' desire to liquidate all technical assistance programs. However, critics of technical assistance failed to reckon with several significant factors. First, the ambitions of Stassen; second, the enthusiasm of influential segments of the public; third, the tenacity of TCA personnel; and fourth, the world political situation.

Stanley Andrews, administrator of TCA at the time Stassen became director of FOA, resisted the trend toward integration. Before being relieved of his TCA post, Andrews recommended that FOA should consist of two branches, one for security programs and a second for technical assistance programs. The recommendation was rejected and integration of technical assistance and security programs continued. Andrews has, however, stated in later conversations that he was one of those who suggested to Stassen that the government endeavor to expand its contract arrangements with American universities for technical assistance programs.[48] Given Andrews' prior association with university contracts as director of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations in the Department of Agriculture, this assertion is highly plausible. Thus

---

[48] WE-98. See also, Glick, op. cit., p. 47.

while Andrews' attempts to halt the integration of technical assistance and security programs were unsuccessful, his attitudes toward the use of universities as instruments possessed of important technical skills and capable of allaying the fears of technical assistance recipients became a part of FOA under Stassen.

Andrews, of course, was not alone in recommending expansion of the university contract program. Most persons who had had experience in IIAA or in the Department of Agriculture were generally familiar with contract programs involving American universities overseas and they probably found occasion to transfer their experiences to such agencies as TCA and FOA.[49] Moreover, the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities had as early as 1949 expressed a formal interest in the contract idea. In the midst of struggling with the problems of integrating and orienting the whole foreign aid program and confronted by the conflicting pressures from Congress for more military assistance on the one hand and from foreign countries for more technical assistance devoid of security strings on the other, Stassen sensed the potential of the university contract idea as a solution to a variety of problems and as a prop to his political situation.[50]

Under Stassen's leadership the formal integration of all foreign aid activities within the framework of FOA was completed. But beneath the surface calm of a new organizational form, the pattern of technical assistance was being changed. While Andrews' suggestions on the organization of FOA were rejected, other members of TCA who supported the

---

[49] WE-66. Interview with an official of ICA.

[50] WE-60, WE-71, and WE-66. Interviews with high-level personnel of ICA.

earlier efforts of Bennett to broaden the technical assistance programs and their objectives maintained their pressure within FOA. Their pressure, together with influences from host countries favoring technical assistance programs, contributed to the partial acceptance by Stassen of the idea that the essential task of technical assistance or cooperation was the promotion of the balanced economic development of the cooperating countries.[51] This represented a change from the narrower goals of such programs as IIAA and was hailed by supporters of foreign aid as an important forward step. But the impact of such a change in goals was dulled by the increasing mixture of technical assistance with military programs. However, uncomfortable as the blending of technical assistance with military programs was to many persons and institutions operating within the foreign aid organization, the number and scope of technical assistance programs increased during the existence of FOA. The negative feelings toward integration were possibly offset by the increased Congressional support for foreign aid on an integrated basis.

In his efforts to make FOA a viable directorate for foreign aid programs and to enhance his political position within the Eisenhower Administration, Stassen was alert to suggestions that might contribute to these objectives. One such was related to the increased use of American universities in technical assistance programs. It should be emphasized that this suggestion affected only a small part of FOA's operations and represented only a portion of the work done under the title of technical assistance. Notwithstanding the small size of the universities' contribution to FOA in 1953, Stassen and his staff saw in universities a way to handle three long-standing problems and to advance

---

[51]Glick, op. cit., p. 48.

certain political ambitions.[52] The three problems involved the following: (1) recruitment of qualified personnel, (2) Congressional support for technical assistance, and (3) host country suspicion of technical assistance programs and personnel.

Since IIAA days the government has been plagued by a shortage of qualified personnel to staff technical assistance programs abroad. The inducements of government employment have not been sufficient to attract all needed personnel away from private employment.[53] This has been particularly true of university personnel, in that such persons frequently consider government service as outside of their career pattern.[54] Recognizing this fact, among others, the Act for International Development emphasized contracting with private agencies for technical assistance service. Combined with IIAA's, SCC's, and the old-line departments', such as the Department of Agriculture's, experiences with American universities, this Congressional action provided sufficient incentive for FOA under Stassen to pursue a policy designed to expand the contractual relationship between government and universities. Without exception the eighty-seven government persons interviewed for this study stated that the university contract system has been attractive to the government because it has provided access to a

---

[52] WE-74, WE-69, and WE-60. Interviews with personnel associated with FOA during Stassen's tenure as director.

[53] The complexity of the recruitment situation is described in United States Senate, Eighty-fifth Congress, Personnel for the Mutual Security Program (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, February 1957). See also, Sharp, op. cit., pp. 32-33.

[54] The attitudes of university personnel relative to the influence of government service on their career patterns will be discussed in Chapter IV.

reservoir of skilled personnel otherwise unavailable. Early public information literature of FOA, such as "American Universities in Technical Cooperation," demonstrates the prominent influence of personnel pressures on the trend toward increasing the amount of participation by American universities in technical assistance.

Not only was Stassen faced with the problem of finding personnel to staff technical assistance programs. He was also constrained to counteract the suspicions overseas caused by the integration of technical and military assistance under his leadership. Again the universities seemed to provide a possible, if only partial, answer. There has existed a sort of "mystique" among leaders in American education that has "rubbed off" on politicians and government personnel, the core of which is, that university personnel can operate in the international milieu of technical assistance without engendering as high a level of suspicion as direct-hire government technicians generate in similar circumstances. Use of university personnel has appeared to be one way of minimizing the political implications of technical assistance.[55] The validity of this assumption is in the process of being tested, and the findings are varied and inconclusive. Under the aegis of the American Council on Education's Committee on Institutional Projects Abroad, the universities in cooperation with government personnel undertake reappraisal of the university contract system almost yearly. The

---

[55]Among the eighty-seven government persons interviewed for this study, this theme is second only to recruiting in importance. It was also prominent during the 1955-57 hearings on technical assistance conducted by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. See United States Senate, Eighty-fifth Congress, Final Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Technical Assistance (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 12, 1957), especially pp. 31-35.

most striking aftermath of these meetings, which are usually critical of government policies, is an increase in the number of technical assistance programs involving American universities.[56] The Department of State sponsored the Annapolis Conference mentioned in Chapter I to examine the proposition that universities can perform a unique function in technical assistance, and the Ford Foundation is currently pursuing a related inquiry.[57]

Thirdly, although many Democrats and TCA employees were convinced that the Republicans had every intention of destroying technical assistance or reducing it to insignificance, Stassen confounded the opposition and those who interpreted Secretary Dulles' indifference to technical assistance as its "death knell." Glick suggests that Stassen saw in American universities a strong pressure group which could be used to counteract the influence Senator Joseph McCarthy and other "right-wing" Congressional elements had on the future of FOA. This was the era when foreign aid was publicly discussed as a "rat hole" by leading politicians and publicists. Stassen, like most members of elite groups, was reluctant to have his relatively modest government organization destroyed before he had made adequate arrangements for his next upward step in the political hierarchy. In 1953, Stassen was able to mobilize successfully an important element of the American academic community, the land grant universities, in favor of increasing the number of university contracts. This expansion of university activity and interest

---

[56]The growth pattern is clearly shown in the quarterly reports of the International Cooperation Administration.

[57]United States Department of State, Annapolis Conference on International Education, April 4-5, 1959. A brief report of the proceedings was given limited distribution.

represented an important development in Stassen's campaign to construct an integrated framework for foreign aid. Moreover, it offset the complaints of Congressional critics relative to technical assistance by diverting attention from politics to the less sensitive area of education.[58]

Although the university contract system has failed to eradicate all the problems involved in technical assistance programs, it appears to have sufficient support as a complementary or auxiliary instrument of foreign policy to account for its continued existence and growth. Stassen's role in inducing American universities to participate in government-sponsored international programs which overtly joined technical assistance with education, and his role in widening the realm of international activity for universities, should be acknowledged. He is certainly not the "father" of the university contract system for technical assistance. He does not make this claim.[59] But he did utilize his background as a university president and ambitious politician as a support for his administrative position in FOA in such a way that American universities found themselves directly participating in the processes of international relations on a scale never before approached.

One device Stassen used in this enterprise was the advisory committee. He created an Education Committee for FOA composed of presidents of prominent American universities and representatives of important educational groups. The committee was charged with the responsibility for increasing the "educational aspect of technical

---

[58]U.S. Senate, Technical Assistance, pp. 9-15.

[59]WE-74. Interview with a very high level government official directly connected with FOA during its lifetime.

assistance programs." As the minutes of the committee's organization meeting indicate, this charge meant that FOA needed assistance in finding more universities and university personnel to meet the requirements of the agency in the technical assistance field.[60] As measured by the increase in the number of university contracts for international programs signed in 1955, the device was successful. The number rose from fifty-nine to eighty.

Subsequent minutes of the Education Committee and a memorandum dated October 19, 1955, to the committee members from William F. Russell, Deputy Director for Technical Services, strongly suggest that one of the most influential members of the committee was John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University. Further, Russell's memorandum requests specifically that Hannah focus his attention on problems related to the university contract program. Hannah's influence in this area dates back to 1949, when he was president of the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities. It was he who took the initiative on behalf of the Association to pledge the support of the member institutions for the implementation of the Point Four program. The Proceedings of the Association from 1948-1958 contain frequent references to Hannah's forceful role in encouraging American universities to participate in government sponsored technical assistance programs.[61] Russell Thackrey, long-time Executive Secretary of the

---

[60] Foreign Operations Administration, Education Committee, "Summary Minutes Meeting of January 24, 1955," mimeographed.

[61] The impact of Hannah's commitment to international programs on the Association has been significant if one considers the fact that the Association has devoted a steadily increasing amount of time to discussing his proposals on the ramifications of international programs from 1949 to the present. The Proceedings of the annual conventions of the Association from 1948-1958 demonstrate the members' growing concern

Ameri

credi

unive

both

that

nati

lzed

Prog

whic

was

Asso

Memb

Unse

pre

stu

American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, has credited Hannah and Bennett with providing the initial "push" to the university contract program.[62] Hannah's enthusiasm was contagious, both from the point of view of the land grant institutions and from that of FOA.

Other references to Hannah's exceptional interest in international programs sponsored by the government occur in meetings organized by the American Council on Education's Committee on Institutional Programs Abroad. Hannah's voice was strongest from 1955-57, during which time he served as chairman of the Committee.[63] In this role he was able to expand his influence beyond the boundaries of the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities and into the membership of the more broadly-based American Council on Education. Unsolicited statements to this effect were made by seven of the thirty presidents of universities with international programs included in this study.

Hannah's commitment to international programs has had a noticeable impact on his own Michigan State University. During the fifties, Michigan State continually increased its international activities, both under government and private sponsorship. The university has also been

---

with or interest in these activities, and Hannah's comments and the statements of such persons as Dean Rusk and Charles Brannan at the meetings suggest that Hannah was and continues to be active among the leadership group in the Association which has supported the idea that export of the "land grant philosophy of public service" to foreign countries is feasible.

[62] WE-53.

[63] For details of the Committee's activities see American Council on Education, University Projects Abroad and Blueprint and Experience, published in 1956 and 1958 respectively by ACE.

one of the leaders among universities attempting to find an internal administrative pattern of organization which would maximize the possible returns from international programs. The result is a complex network of interest and responsibility formally focused in the office of a Dean of International Programs. While this administrative arrangement is even newer than the programs which provided the stimuli for its development, it has elicited widespread interest among American universities.[64] Whether it will suggest solutions to the problems of policy and administration raised and examined later in this study can only be guessed at.

Although the activity of three men has been selected to indicate the variety of sources from which energy was derived to propel the government and universities into a large-scale, cooperative international venture, it should be re-emphasized that this is only one part of the story. One cannot ignore the less dramatic, but equally important, buildup international programs had through the work of FOA's predecessors, such as IIAA, SCC, ECA, and MSA. Significant foundations for technical assistance programs were constructed by them from 1939 through 1952. Upon these foundations, FOA and its successor, the International Cooperation Administration (ICA), has been built up much of their work. Important changes have been made in policy orientation, methods of operation, etc., but the core concept of international cooperation involving governments and universities, the beginnings of which have been well traced by Curti and Birr, has remained and been expanded. The

---

[64] All of the universities in the "large" and "very large" categories in this study made inquiries relative to the internal arrangements Michigan State had developed to handle international programs. Particular interest was expressed by Harvard University, which was in the process of examining administrative problems on an extensive scale, and by the University of California at Berkeley. See especially interviews BJ-97, G-13, BJ-32, BJ-16, BJ-15, and BJ-30.

impetus for change and expansion has come from such divergent sources as the squabbling between the government and American universities over the operation of their international programs and the increasing competition of the Soviet bloc in the field of technical assistance.

The Mutual Security Act of 1954 brought technical assistance full circle. Once again the Department of State assumed direct responsibility for technical assistance as the newly created International Cooperation Administration (ICA) replaced FOA in mid-1955. The following policy statement indicates clearly that technical assistance has been elevated to a significant policy position and that education is the key concept in the assistance process:

> Technical cooperation with the less well-developed nations of the world is a major phase of U.S. foreign policy, not only as an expression of the humanitarian interest and good will of the American people, but because the ultimate benefits to this country justify U.S. assistance on the basis of its contribution to our national interest and security. Our fundamental objective is to develop and maintain the defensive strength, political stability, economic growth, and social development necessary for the stability and security of the free world. Attainment of this objective requires American support of the efforts of the peoples of the free world to realize the full potentialities of their material and human resources. Technical cooperation has many facets, such as the improvement of health, agriculture, industry, or education, but all of them to be fully effective necessarily involve educational processes. Only by helping the less-developed nations to increase their own ability to do the job themselves can any lasting improvements be made. Education has a major role to play in every aspect of this program.[65]

---

[65] International Cooperation Administration, "Policy Statement: Education Policy," available to this writer in mimeograph form and later incorporated into descriptive literature published by ICA and a study prepared by the Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for the Special Committee to Study the Foreign Aid Program, U.S. Senate, Eighty-fifth Congress, entitled The Objectives of United States Economic Assistance Programs, January 1957.

Overt integration of foreign technical aid programs with military programs stopped abruptly with the creation of ICA as a semi-autonomous administrative unit within the Department of State. Dulles' earlier desire to divest the Department of State of some of its operating units remained unfulfilled, and under Congressional pressure technical cooperation was placed within the policy framework of the Department of State.[66] Military assistance programs were transferred to the Department of Defense. Thus, while both types of programs still derived their authority and financial support from the Mutual Security Act, responsibility for their policy orientations and operations came to be vested in separate departments of government. While exchange of information and coordination of policy exists to varying degrees between the Departments of State and Defense on international programs, the administrative separation prevails to the present.

This administrative separation of military and technical assistance did seem to allay a few reservations about American foreign aid motives prevalent among foreign recipients and American universities. But a feeling lingered, as it still does, that technical assistance had merely changed its guise and that it was becoming a more subtle and ingenious aspect of American foreign policy which found it advantageous to employ universities as instruments for the realization of short-range policy aims under the protective umbrella of education and humanitarianism. The extent of this uneasiness among American universities is explored in Chapter IV of this study.

While the last five years of the fifties saw the number of government-sponsored university international programs increase, there

---

[66] Glick, op. cit., p. 50.

have been no fundamental changes in the rationale which led to their development. The groundwork laid by ICA's predecessors has not been radically altered, although many minor and major changes in operating procedures have been made during the ICA period. It is at this juncture in the history of the government's interest in universities as a part of the machinery necessary to conduct international relations that this study begins to emphasize the attitudes and observations of government and university personnel collected through interviews.

Before leaving the background story of the university contract system mention should be made of at least two other significant government programs which have affected the international perspectives and activities of American universities. The first is the approximately seventy-five university-to-university affiliations which the United States Information Agency has promoted or is in the process of trying to develop. This program emphasizes the exchange of information between American and foreign universities with the ultimate hope that such a process will develop into a variety of cordial and useful methods of international intercourse which will be beneficial to all parties concerned, including the U.S. Government. The government puts relatively little money into these prospective affiliations, relying on an initial "push" of a few thousand dollars to get the project under way. After that, the burden of maintaining or expanding the program falls mainly on the universities involved. Interestingly enough, USIA is an independent agency of the government, having been removed from the Department of State in 1953.[67] Consequently, coordination of USIA's programs

---

[67]For a short account of USIA's work see Paul S. Bodenman, American Cooperation with Higher Education Abroad (Washington, D.C.:

with other government-university programs involves inter-agency co-operation. Physical and administrative separation of these programs has not developed, and probably could not develop, their complementary, mutually supporting potential.

A second type of program sponsored by the government which affects universities directly is the exchange-of-persons program. Known formally as the International Educational Exchange Program, this program is the responsibility of the International Educational Exchange Service (IES) of the Department of State. Although IES operations include such well known programs as those provided for under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts, and although these programs are an important facet of education in international relations, they are not the direct subject of this study since they do not meet the definition of an "international program" as used herein. They seldom have the elements of formal responsibility of a contractual nature falling on an American university nor are they organized in a substantive way that relates directly and continuously to an American university or foreign host institutions. The present study does not discount the importance or influence of the IES programs, but resources were not available which would permit this writer to accumulate sufficient evidence to evaluate them.[68]

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin 1957, No. 8), Chapter VII. Problems of inter-agency coordination are covered in a report by the Cultural Planning and Coordination Staff, Bureau of Public Affairs, Department of State, entitled "Coordination of the Educational Exchange Program of IES, Exchange Aspects of the Technical Training Activities of ICA, and Certain Cultural Activities of USIA," July 1956-June 1957.

[68]For official histories of IES programs see U.S. Department of State publications entitled "Swords into Plowshares" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, July 1956), and "International Educational Exchange Program, 1948-1958" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, November 1958).

An interesting phenomenon that is discernible in an examination of international programs and that might be attributed in part to IES is that literature dealing with the exchange of persons is replete with comments which assume that the language of education is universal and that cooperative educational programs can transcend if not ignore long-established national and cultural boundaries, and even that they tend to promote democracy. In the fifties these recurrent themes concerning education, universalism, and democracy are being put to the test, for the exchange-of-persons program is advertised and justified by stressing the proposition that "people-to-people" contact will lead to greater international understanding, and ultimately to peace.[69] The proof of this proposition is impossible at this stage in history, but this study will present some evidence which is suggestive as to the extent to which experience and ideals diverge.

This brief history of the growth of government and university cooperation in the international field, with special emphasis on the university contract system for technical assistance, has been designed to indicate some of the government-sponsored activities involving

---

[69] Ibid. See especially the introductory material and the framework of these publications. There is little doubt that the exchange-of-persons program is conducted with enthusiasm by IES and also that sometimes there is something akin to religious fervor in the atmosphere of certitude with which the problems of international communications are approached. Moreover, this writer is of the opinion that the government has assumed the earlier role of the religious missionaries, and has attempted to expand on the missionary proselyting process by bringing large numbers of foreign nationals to the United States for educational purposes. A suggestion that there might be important shortcomings and dangers in this approach is contained in a paper by Karl W. Deutsch entitled "Nationalistic Responses to Study Abroad" read at the 1952 Annual Meeting of the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors; the report is reprinted in the Association's Report of the Conference on International Educational Exchanges, April 23-26, 1952, pp. 9-20.

universities which have influenced the current international posture of the latter. To repeat, it is not an exhaustive history. Rather, it is a review of significant activities of the government in international education which have preceded the current situation. Care has been taken to suggest that there is no single event or reason that explains these developments. The inter-relationships of technological advances, international crises, and operating experiences of government agencies and universities, to mention only a few, have all had their impact on expanding the general role of American universities in international relations.

Private Foundations as Sponsors of International Programs

Before proceeding with the background of current university-foundation relationships and their relevance to international programs, it is important to establish some boundaries for this discussion lest it become too extensive. First, although there exist nearly 5,000 non-profit organizations in the United States which have been classified as foundations,[70] this study concentrates primarily on certain developments in three foundations. Occasional reference may be made to other foundations, but the three major foundations examined are Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie (Carnegie Corporation of New York). These three have been selected not only as an economy measure, but also because they are three of the largest foundations in terms of resources and spending. Together they spend over twice as much as all other foundations combined. Ford alone spends four times what the second largest foundation, Rockefeller,

---

[70]See the First Annual Report (1956) of the Foundation Library Center, New York, for a listing of foundations by (1) asset categories and (2) methods of reporting their activities. A standard reference work on foundations, American Foundations and Their Fields (New York: American Foundation Service, Seventh Edition, 1955), describes 3,500 "true" foundations.

normally spends in a year and ten times the annual spending of Carnegie.[71] They dominate foundation spending in the international field. Of the sixty-two foundation-sponsored international programs reported in The International Programs of American Universities and utilized in this report, fifty-three have received financial support from the Rockefeller, Ford, or Carnegie foundations. Thus, while the approximately 4,997 other American foundations may be important examples of philanthropy in their own ways, their histories are much less significant for the purposes of this study.

The private foundations are second only to the government as external sponsors of the international programs of American universities. The International Programs of American Universities reports that of the 382 international programs in operation at the end of 1958, ninety-five or 24.6 per cent received their financial support from the government and sixty-two or 16.3 per cent were supported by foundations.[72] Although the foundations support nearly two-thirds as many international programs involving American universities as does the government, the financial contribution of the foundations as compared to that of the government is not proportionate to the numbers of programs involved. Dwight Macdonald suggests that signs of the decline of the foundations as the most generous patrons of the universities were becoming evident in the 1920's.[73] This does not mean that the dollar amount of foundation support for universities has dropped, but

---

[71]Dwight Macdonald, The Ford Foundation: The Men and the Millions (New York: Reynal and Company, 1956), p. 48.

[72]Ibid, p. 48.

[73]Macdonald, op. cit., p. 47.

that it has, since then, been overshadowed by the rapidly increasing amounts of money the government has allotted to universities. The dollar amount of the foundations' contributions more than doubled in the early 1950's when the giant Ford Foundation began to dispense money in earnest. Even this influx of new foundation money into the stream of funds earmarked for educational projects failed to match the millions of dollars the government was pouring into international programs, not to mention a variety of other government-sponsored projects involving universities, at the same point in time. Large though the contributions of foundations to education have been, observers and friends of foundations admit that the "golden days" of the foundations have passed and they are now in their "silver era."[74]

Notwithstanding the relative decline of the foundations' monetary contribution to American universities, the foundations remain one of the most important sources of funds for the support of universities and the development of scholarship. A review of the annual reports that several of the large foundations issued during the period 1950-58 indicates that education has steadily increased its share of the funds distributed by these foundations.[75] While this is not true of foundations which have been established for specific, fixed purposes or to support a single substantive field, it does tend to describe the trend of giving

---

[74]For a sprightly examination of this proposition see Macdonald, op. cit., especially Chapter III. A more conventional account of the "decline" of the foundations is available in Abraham Flexner, Funds and Foundations: Their Policies Past and Present (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952). Flexner's association with the foundations is usually traced to the beginning days of the first "giants," Rockefeller and Carnegie. He is probably best known in foundation circles for the impetus he has given to the Rockefeller Foundation's interest in medicine.

[75]Reports used in this survey were those of the following foundations: Ford, Rockefeller, Carnegie, Kellogg, and Falk.

among

availa

show t

field

tutio

such

their

an in

est k

educ

stan

publ

acti

tim

e.g

cou

mem

pro

co

ex

in

among those foundations which possess the overwhelming share of resources available to philanthropic organizations. The same foundation reports show that there is an increasing tendency for foundations to equate the field of education with educational institutions, and especially institutions of higher education. As any standard history of foundations, such as Andrews' Philanthropic Foundations, will show, foundations since their period of rapid growth in the twentieth century have always had an interest in education and educational institutions. But their interest has increased through time and has become more sharply focused on educational institutions than at any previous time. Earlier, a substantial share of foundation funds had been used in direct programs of public health, medicine, and private charity. Increased government activity in these same fields, especially during the New Deal era, has diminished the over-all impact of the foundations.[76]

Seeing their leads followed by more comprehensive organizations, e.g., the various governments, foundations have pursued two basic courses as responses to a changing situation. First, they have complemented government operations in particular fields. This has meant providing support for a part of a larger problem area which is not fully covered by government operations. Medicine and public health are excellent examples of this development. Given the magnitude of funds involved and the increasingly public nature of many foundation fields,

---

[76]This development is outlined in Macdonald, op. cit., Chapter III. See also Raymond B. Fosdick, The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), p. 300: "In fields like public health and agriculture the Foundation has demonstrated the merit of new ideas--so completely, in fact, that its programs have frequently been taken over by governments, and people have voted to tax themselves to maintain the demonstrations."

the foundations do not entertain any illusions of competing with government funds. They are generally ready to shift their fields when their support and impact are welcome but relatively insignificant in terms of total problem solving. One of the major themes of Flexner's Funds and Foundations is that foundations have the responsibility to use their "free money" to point the way for later government intervention in a problem area and/or to stimulate public interest in problem areas.

Pursuit of the first course tends to lead to the second, for once foundation leaderships see, or think they see, the funds of their organizations decline in "creative value" as a result of the support and/or intervention of powerful parties like governments they begin their search for "more challenging areas." Currently much of their quest for creativity has pointed them toward education as a field.[77] There is no assurance that foundations, assuming they persist for an indefinite period, will continue to maintain their present level of interest in and support of educational institutions. Support for activities that one can generally label as "educative" will probably always be a feature of foundation policy, but changes in public attitudes toward educational institutions may result in a sharp decline in foundation support, not merely the relative decline that is presently visible. Most large foundations have, in their short histories, tended to redirect their resources to new fields when they perceived a decline of their impact on a field. This may have important implications for American universities, among others.

---

[77]Both the search for more creative fields and the current interest in education are well documented in the policy statements of the "Big Three" foundation presidents prefacing their annual reports since 1950.

A relatively new, and as yet only partially explored, third possibility for foundation-university international programs is that instance in which foundations continue support for a program previously financed by the International Cooperation Administration or some other government agency. This is generally not a simple case of a foundation rushing in to "save" a program that shows signs of impact, but which the government can no longer support for any number of reasons, such as political reallocation of funds, changes in policy emphasis, etc. Most likely any such development has its origin in the fact that a foundation has had an early and continuing interest in the country or area in which a particular program has been operating. This may be reinforced by a coincidence of subject-matter interest. Thus, the foundation may have done important "advance" work which has coincided with government interest in a particular area. The government responds with an important program, frequently involving an American university. The time comes for withdrawal of government support for a particular international program, and a foundation which may have strongly influenced the pattern of action steps in to continue support of the program, generally on a reduced scale.

Although pursuit of this course of action is comparatively rare, there is feeling in ICA and foundation circles that the possibility of its expansion should be explored. Dean Rusk, President of the Rockefeller Foundation, combines criticism of the ICA university-contract system with support for expansion of foundation efforts to "supplement things which the government can no longer finance."[78]

---

[78] American Council on Education, Education Without Boundaries (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1959), pp. 26-40.

Serious problems of a political nature are raised when any private organization working in a foreign country associates itself with government programs. Both the foundations and the government are aware of the possible shortcomings of such an approach, but at the same time both are concerned that the impact of the initial effort by the government and the universities will be lost if no follow-up is provided. As the following chapters indicate, attitudes of those few university, foundation, and government persons who have been exploring the problem have not crystallized.

If government intervention in areas previously serviced by such private organizations as foundations has contributed to the redistribution of funds by these organizations, and if this redistribution has had important consequences for the field of education, for educational institutions, and for international programs, then the influx of academic personnel into foundation administration is significant. Increased academic representation in foundations probably has been both a result of and a contributor to the foregoing developments. Looking at the "Big Three" foundations during the 1950-58 period, one can detect the increased numbers of academic personnel in these foundations' organizations as well as an increasingly academic emphasis. For example, in 1955 the Rockefeller Foundation began to include the names and highest academic degrees of its administrators in its annual reports. While such changes in themselves prove nothing of great import, they do provide clues to changing attitudes. In a generalization covering foundation personnel who are responsible for screening requests for grants ("philanthropoids" is the term used by Frederick P. Keppel, former president of the Carnegie Corporation), Macdonald states that in

most

tuti

Four

the

bee

fou

den

rid

ten

pro

In

con

sp

wr

da

ar

ch

di

gr

ar

ly

ca

ar

most cases their previous employment has been with an academic institution.[79] As such persons as Fosdick in The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation have pointed out, academics have always had an influence in the operation of the major foundations, but their presence has never been so apparent as it is today. In a sense, the present trend in foundation administration toward expansion of opportunities for academics is self-reinforcing. Movement into educational fields has provided the logic for this development, and once started the familiar tendency in bureaucracy toward recruitment of like-minded souls has provided the energy for its maintenance and expansion.

This is not to suggest that foundations are irrevocably pointed in the direction of supporting institutions of education. Previous comments about the impact on foundation policy of other agencies' spending suggest otherwise. However, interviewees for this study on university campuses displayed somewhat possessive attitudes about foundation resources, indicating that they feel that universities' claims are of the first order of priority.[80] One clue to the possibility of change in the patterns of foundation giving, and university faculty display a tendency to overlook this, lies in the socio-economic backgrounds of the trustees of the various foundations. Using the 1950-58 annual reports of the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations, and the 1953-58 annual reports of the Ford Foundation, one can see that education has had a minimum representation at the trustee level. Trustees are generally men of business and finance whose roots are not in

---

[79] Macdonald, op. cit., pp. 96-99.

[80] This attitude is explored more fully in Chapter IV.

education.[81] It is at this level that final decisions on grants are made and basic policies are formulated which affect the course of any foundation. The work of the intermediate level, the administrators who channel information to the trustees from the prospective grantees, is extremely important, especially in the eyes of those requesting funds, but they are not the captors of the trustees. Macdonald, among foundation historians, would accord them the most power, while writers like Flexner, Fosdick, and Andrews emphasize the importance of decisions by trustees relative to the foundations' basic courses.

The growing numbers of academic personnel in the administrative ranks of foundations not only have contributed to the foundations' current high level of interest in educational institutions, but have also served to promote a "community of interest" between the foundations and educational institutions. The philanthropoids and the academics "speak the same language." This fact alone makes contact with foundations an easier matter for university personnel than it is for many other applicants for foundation assistance. Having made contact and possibly having negotiated a grant, the academic and the foundation feel that they can pursue independent courses with mutual confidence and respect.[82] Since accountability is minimal, friction is practically non-existent. In this happy state of camaraderie, foundations and educational institutions and personnel set out to "push back the frontiers of knowledge." To emphasize the fact that foundations and universities

---

[81] For pointed commentary on this see Macdonald, op. cit., pp. 95-98. The problem of academic representation among foundation trustees is covered indirectly in Fosdick, op. cit., Chapter XI.

[82] The correctness of this statement is debated in Joseph C. Kiger, Operating Principles of the Larger Foundations (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1954), pp. 74-80.

have much in common, interviewees at large universities that have both government and foundation support for different international programs delight in relating how much "easier it is to work with foundations than it is with the government." The reason that such is the case is usually summed up with a phrase like, "We have the same viewpoint as the foundations and we use similar administrative practices," or, "We trust each other."[83]

Another development which has been part of the recent expansion of foundation interest in more narrowly defined educational programs is the foundations' increased emphasis on institutions as opposed to individuals. In the late 20's, 30's, and 40's, foundations laid fairly heavy emphasis on grants to individuals. The emphasis had its "ups and downs" and was the subject of heated debate in and around foundation circles.[84] But it persisted. As the 50's arrived and problems of amazing size and complexity emerged from the aftermath of World War II, the individual grant tended to be buried in the avalanche of large grants to institutions. Ford led the way in this development. To ease the problems of administration and to shed its embarrassing wealth quickly, the Ford Foundation entered into a frenzied state of giving. In a fashion that set the press, educational, and medical circles to gasping, Ford announced programs entailing the distribution of over 500 million dollars beginning in 1955.[85] The recipients were numerous, but

---

[83] An excellent example of this attitude is available in a series of interviews by the author at a large, western university. See BJ-15 through BJ-33.

[84] A severe early critic of "shotgun grants," as he called them, was Abraham Flexner. For his stinging criticisms see Flexner, op. cit., Chapter V.

[85] Macdonald, op. cit., pp. 165-174.

virtually all of them were well-established institutions. In this atmosphere, the individual grantee was lost from public view and the ideals of "risk" or "venture" capital, so much a part of earlier foundation giving, were transformed into gigantic projects in "relatively safe areas of human behavior."[86]

The three large foundations discussed in this study seem to subscribe to the view that it is much better and easier to dispense large sums of money to established institutions than it is to give large numbers of individual grants. It is better because large grants tend to have a greater impact on the problems which are under examination. It is easier because the processing of a $5,000 grant to an individual is much more time-consuming than the process of a $5,000,000 grant to a well-known university, for example.[87] Bolstered by these arguments, the foundations have steadily increased their institutional giving without providing comparable increases in the area of individual grants. The impact of such a vigorous institutional emphasis on educational institutions has particular relevance for this study.

To summarize very briefly, current foundation attitudes toward education have been influenced by or have developed from the following factors and events:

---

[86] The consequences of this development are well covered in William H. Whyte, Jr., "What are the Foundations Up To?" and "Where the Foundations Fall Down" (Fortune, October and November, 1955, respectively).

[87] This development and the arguments which surround it are covered generally by Kiger, Operating Principles of the Larger Foundations; Macdonald, The Ford Foundation; Fosdick, The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation; and U.S. House of Representatives, Eighty-second Congress, Hearings before the Select Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations ("Cox Committee"), Tax-Exempt Foundations (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953).

1) The intervention of government in fields formerly financed or aided primarily by private foundations.
2) The alteration in courses of action and methods of giving on the part of foundations as a result of a wider welfare orientation of public agencies.
3) The expansion of international interest on the part of foundations as a reaction to the consequences of major wars and depressions.
4) Reorganization of foundations to include increased numbers of academics at the administrative level, but without a similar development at the trustee level.
5) The general "questing" nature of foundations and their interest in dispensing "creative money."
6) Increased institutional orientation of the foundations.
7) Responsive reaction to foundation practices on the part of educational institutions.

Developing concurrently with the foundations' interests in institutions of higher education has been their international orientation. Both Rockefeller and Carnegie early developed programs in the international area. Rockefeller emphasized medicine and public health, primarily in Latin America and the Middle and Far East. Carnegie, reflecting its founder's ancestral background, focused on the British Commonwealth. These early interests and programs have received a forceful impetus for expansion as the United States has increased its international responsibilities and commitments, giving the problems of the world new meanings for Americans. Following World War II, the American government and universities expanded their interests in the educational

aspects of international relations in a manner that has been complementary to the activities of foundations. This triad of interest groups possesses an important potential for international impact through programs which are broadly educational.

The confluence of interest and activity of the three parties is, of course, part of a larger pattern. Each has had prior experiences in the international area, particularly education, each has been affected by the shifting events and power patterns related to international politics, and each has a stake in the future development of the world and mankind. In terms of this study, the important result of this confluence has been the selection of the American university in general by the foundations and government as an instrument through which to perform certain types of international activities. Both foundations and government (as has been previously mentioned) have found the universities to be convenient, interested, and unique organizations capable of participating in international programs. Moreover, universities are virtually dependent on external funds for any extensive, large-scale international contacts. Thus, the patterns of cooperation developing between universities and foundations on the national level since the 1920's have become the basis for their mutual interest, while international political developments and improved methods and demands for international communications have contributed the stimuli for extending these relationships to the international arena.

In this general environment favoring foundation sponsorship of university participation in international programs, the interactions of the government and the foundations are of special interest. Their impact has fostered an important development in the distribution of

foundation resources between national and international programs. The government's part in developing international programs utilizing American universities has been briefly traced. But to understand the present posture of foundations vis-à-vis the international area and American universities, one must add another aspect of the government's influence. Although foundations generally preceded government as sponsors of international programs involving universities, they soon found their activities matched by the government. By the early 1950's foundations became acutely aware of the fact that the government had entered the field of international education, via cultural exchange, fellowships, technical assistance, etc.[88] Once again, the government had followed the lead of the foundations in entering a problem area; however, the government also had its IIAA experiences to build on. The foundations have been encouraged by the government and universities to remain in the international education field notwithstanding government intervention. Since the problems related to the international scene are so gigantic and complex, there is no present evidence to suggest that the foundations might withdraw in search of new fields. The contrary is the case if the increasing allocation of foundation resources to international programs is any guide.[89]

---

[88] For an example of one foundation's reactions see the Annual Report of the Carnegie Corporation of New York for 1959, p. 11. Generally, Carnegie responded by increasing its commitments to activities it believed would complement the educational exchange activities of the government.

[89] While the three large foundations used in this study have all steadily increased their contributions to programs with an international orientation during the 1950's, the case of the Carnegie Corporation is of particular interest. Excluding its somewhat fixed obligation to British Commonwealth programs, Carnegie is restrained by the nature of its original charter from sponsoring programs overseas to any appreciable extent. This, if interviews with foundation personnel and the

The impact of the Ford Foundation and its comparatively large resources on foundation policies has been significant in all substantive areas.[90] For present purposes, the introduction of Ford money into the international area, especially with reference to its use by American universities, and the significance of this development is of particular interest. Among American foundations, Rockefeller had been, up to the 1950's, the undisputed leader among spenders for programs outside of the United States. Latin America and parts of the Middle East have been aware of Rockefeller's programs since the earliest days of the foundation. But during the 1950's, Rockefeller relinquished first place among foundations to Ford, and in the international field, Rockefeller has, during the same period, seen its financial contributions overshadowed by Ford. By 1959, Ford was spending directly on international programs over three times as much as Carnegie was spending on all activities, and three-fourths as much as Rockefeller was spending on all of its operations.[91] While foundations do not generally engage in overt competition, Ford's impact on international programs has been one of several influences stimulating other foundations to give increased attention to international problems. No foundation presently in

---

annual reports of Carnegie are significant, has been a bit uncomfortable, especially in the light of the government's international programs and Rockefeller's and Ford's impressive international commitments. To compensate, Carnegie has steadily increased its expenditures for programs based in the United States, but having international ramifications. For example, the continued support of numerous "area studies" programs and of a program at Syracuse University aimed at teaching "overseasmanship."

[90] A feeling for this impact is conveyed by Macdonald, op. cit., Chapter III.

[91] These comparisons are based on the financial statements contained in the annual reports for the three affected foundations.

existence can hope to overtake Ford, even if it wanted to. One cannot ignore the leadership Ford has provided among foundations during the present decade. That leadership has provided the support for increased numbers of American universities to realize some international ambitions.

The high point thus far in the rising tide of foundation expenditures for international programs is the year 1959. Available data indicate that 1960 will be an even bigger year. Two examples may serve to demonstrate the strong current of enthusiasm foundations display with reference to the participation of American universities in international relations.

First, it is interesting to note that the Carnegie Corporation, which through most of its history has emphasized activities in the United States and a relatively fixed commitment to the British Commonwealth, in 1959 took as its theme "The American University in World Affairs." In its annual report for 1959, the thirteen page report of the president is entirely devoted to the development of this theme, and over half of "The Year in Review" section of the report recounts the support Carnegie has provided for universities in world affairs. Although Carnegie had shown signs of building up to this position during the 1950's through the pattern of its grants, the report for 1959 constituted a forceful statement that the corporation was committed, for the present at least, to an aggressive program linking American educational institutions to world affairs.

The following extracts from the Carnegie annual report for 1959 are indicative of that organization's attitudes:

> Since World War II, our national leaders have insistently warned us that we must recognize our responsibilities in the world and learn to meet the challenges they entail. At

> least one segment of the American public--the academic world--has taken these warnings seriously. Few people have any idea of the vigor and imagination with which the colleges and universities have responded. They are rapidly emerging as a new source of strength for the nation in our international dealings.
>
> . . . . The universities are not new to the international scene. On the contrary, they have a long and distinguished record of international activity. But the scale of this activity has increased immeasurably. This is not traceable solely to an impulse on the part of the universities themselves. There is much in the world situation that makes it inevitable. There is, for example, an increasing recognition of the fact that ideas are weapons. It is ironic that the United States, whose early dynamism as a nation owed everything to the vitality of certain key ideas, had to learn again at the hands of the totalitarian nations that ideas are potent.
>
> Another circumstance in modern world affairs that forges a role for the universities is that nations are increasingly eager to place before the world the full panoply of their intellectual, educational, and aesthetic achievements.
>
> An even more important circumstance is the rise of technical assistance as an activity. Most technical assistance activities are carried on by professional men, and a high percentage of them have university connections.
>
> But behind all the specific reasons for the rise of the universities in world affairs is the fact that educated talent, technical competence, and professional skills are indispensable in coping with the complexities of modern civilization. In this sense the emergence of the university as a factor in international affairs is simply a counterpart of its emergence as a central and influential institution on the domestic scene.[92]

A second example, very similar to the first, is the present strong support the Ford Foundation is supplying for American universities working abroad. In the same manner as Carnegie, but perhaps slightly ahead of Carnegie chronologically, Ford has, during the 1950's,

---

[92]These comments are extracted from President John W. Gardner's message in the Annual Report of the Carnegie Corporation of New York for 1959, pp. 11-24.

steadily turned its attention more intensely to international problems. The theme of the 1958 annual report[93] of the Ford Foundation is "The World Imbalance in Education," which turns out to be only a slight variation on the Carnegie theme of "The American University in World Affairs," emphasizing the imbalance in educational opportunities as between the highly developed and the less developed nations. To correct the imbalance, Ford allocated nearly 40 per cent of its spendable resources in 1958 to the international aspects of this problem. This, as has been indicated previously, represents the single most important source of private support for American universities in international programs, and the percentage committed to this area has increased every year since the creation of the Ford Foundation.[94]

President Henry T. Heald of the Ford Foundation chose the following language to express the foundation's outlook:

> Education, like peace, has become a world-wide problem, one and indivisible with the well-being and survival of mankind. Today, ignorance is a burden society can no longer afford.
>
> . . . . At a time when it can least afford to, American society tends to overlook the world-wide framework in which its educational difficulties are set. The causes, such as the exploding birth rate, the mass of new knowledge, and the deep desire for education, and the consequences--the overburdened school facilities, the shortage of teachers, the downward trend in the quality of education--are mirrored or dwarfed by like conditions in almost every other country in the world.
>
> The gap between the most-advanced and the least-advanced areas is widening, not shrinking. Virtually all American children now attend elementary school, and two out of three complete high school. But only half of the earth's 500 million children between five and fourteen have primary

---

[93]The report for 1959 was not available at the time of writing.

[94]See both Macdonald, op. cit., Chapter 7, and the annual reports of the Ford Foundation.

> school facilities, and only one in ten can look forward to secondary education.
>
> The world imbalance in education means that efforts far greater than any of the past must be made to bring merely the rudiments of education to vast areas of the world. Such efforts, of course, are made increasingly imperative by the demands of these people for self-government and a better life. Half of the world's population is trapped in a vicious circle. Shortages of educated manpower, from farmer to scientist, severely restrict development of economic resources, while limited economic resources hinder the education of teachers and the building and equipping of schools and colleges. The circle can be broken only by the dedicated, self-sacrificing efforts of the peoples involved and by generous outside assistance in establishing the educational institutions they require.
>
> The world imbalance in education also means that for many years to come the relatively small, intensively educated portion of the earth's people must bear most of the responsibility for man's intellectual growth. Only the most highly developed and affluent educational systems, from the elementary grades through graduate school, can furnish the bulk of the education and research essential to cope with the complex problems all over the world that cannot be ignored. This imposes grave responsibilities on Western, particularly American, education.
>
> Can man's educational resources meet the challenge? This may be the key question of our time; indeed, it may be the key question of all human history.[95]

Given a situation in which such favorable attitudes toward education and international relations are so strongly expressed by key decision-makers in large foundations, and a situation in which the circumstances of man's existence and future have a striking international dimension, it is not surprising to find many American universities in a frenzied state of adjustment to the necessities of international programs. Even a casual glance at American universities today will reveal activities which suggest that the academic community is making serious and careful program, operating, and administrative

---

[95] These comments are extracted from the Annual Report of the Ford Foundation for 1958, pp. 11-13.

preparations for an intelligent reaction to the growing internationalism of the foundations. The same glance will reveal symptoms of "foundationitis" among academics, namely, the belief that the way to the philanthropoid's heart is through a large international program within the institutional framework of an established university. How effectively American universities will utilize the opportunities offered to them by the foundations to expand their participation in international relations remains a matter of conjecture. Details of the impacts of these developments are presented in the remaining chapters of this study.

Independent Activities of Universities on the International Level

Thus far American universities have been primarily pictured as responding to stimuli from external sources for the development of international contacts. The importance of these stimuli for the expansion of the universities' roles in international relations through international programs is recognized as extremely important, but it should be indicated that universities have made their own contributions, also. While much of what has been presented as background material for this study tends to draw attention to the relative passivity of the universities as contributors to the current expansive trends in international education, there exists an essential active aspect of universities' internationalism that antedates the twentieth century interest and support on the part of such organizations as governments and foundations. This international activity of American universities, although modest in size, has shown its own type of dynamism, and in so doing has supplemented, complemented, and stimulated the interactions between universities and the external sponsors of international programs.

The earliest ideas concerning universities emphasized the international aspects of such institutions. Paris, Bologna, and Salerno, usually mentioned among the original models for present institutions of higher education, were centers to which scholars, both student and faculty, migrated from all parts of the civilized world. The migrant scholars represented a variety of ethnic and cognitive groups, but they had a unity of purpose in education. Education dramatically transcended lines of racial and cultural distinction. Having undergone numerous physical changes wrought by such important phenomena as the growth of nationalism and religious separatism, universities of today bear only slight physical and administrative resemblance to those of medieval times,[96] but the idea that man's quest for knowledge is universal has survived and persists today, and importantly, shows signs of new vigor.

Haskins says of the relationship between twentieth century universities and medieval universities (after cataloguing their physical differences), ". . . that the university of the twentieth century is the lineal descendant of medieval Paris and Bologna. They are the rock whence we were hewn, the hole of the pit whence we were digged. The fundamental organization is the same, the historic continuity is unbroken. They created the university tradition of the modern world, that common tradition which belongs to all our institutions of higher learning, the newest as well as the oldest, and which all college and university men should know and cherish."[97] This common tradition has

---

[96]The development of universities is covered in Charles H. Haskins, The Rise of Universities (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1923), and S. S. Laurie, The Rise and Early Constitution of Universities (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1891).

[97]Haskins, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

served historically as an avenue for international intercourse in education.[98] It has been temporarily and/or partially disrupted by major cataclysms such as wars and the narrowing influence of certain religions and of nationalism. But as Haskins suggests, and as the current resurgence of activity in international education demonstrates, the tradition has never been lost entirely.

On the bases of this common tradition, of the desire of men to expand their knowledge, and of the paucity of educational centers, educational travel has been a part of a university education from the very beginning. Not only have universities always been few in number, thereby requiring travel by many scholars. They have also been relatively specialized in terms of the subject-matter areas in which they could lay claim to particular expertise. Extremes of duplication have never been characteristic of the universities, notwithstanding their location in different countries. Thus, it has always been common for advanced students of a particular field to travel to the cities or countries in which instruction in their fields of interest was offered. If a man desired instruction in several fields, he wandered from university to university until his interest and education were "satisfied."[99]

As nationalism progressed, belief in the necessity of traveling to a large number of universities to complete one's education declined; for nationalism encouraged the development of diversified universities within one country supposedly capable of meeting the technical

---

[98] For development of this theme see especially Métraux, op. cit., pp. 2-6.

[99] Ibid, p. 4. The story of Pantagruel's, the giant of Rabelais' Gargantua and Pantagruel, visits to nine universities to complete his education is recounted by Métraux.

requirements of "an education."[100] But educational travel received an important spur from another direction just as its basis appeared to be challenged. The new development was in the form of international travel as a capstone to a period of formal study within a national university. Particularly in the cases of junior members of national elites, there was emphasis upon the "grand tour" during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[101] Although the term "grand tour" is seldom overtly included in the rationale for many current student travel programs and "junior year abroad" programs, its influence is significant. Concepts of democracy, mass education, and utility have reduced the currency of the term "grand tour," but the notion of educational travel which it involved has persisted.

In summing up the early internationalism of universities and scholars, Métraux says,

> By the end of the eighteenth century, then, there had developed in Western society two principal motivations for study abroad: it was a way of acquiring knowledge when centers of learning were few, and a means of completing the educational process by contacts with other people and other mores. As a social phenomenon, cross-cultural education was almost entirely subject to individual initiative often motivated merely by current fashion, but sanctioned by a well-established tradition. As an educational practice, however, it tended to evolve and progress, adapting itself to trends in educational theory and regional and cultural conditions.[102]

The impact of nationalism served to transfer these motivations from the very general level of the world to the more specific national levels. The reorientation of universities on a nation-state basis did

---

[100] Haskins, op. cit., pp. 29-31.

[101] Métraux, op. cit., p. 5.

[102] Ibid, p. 6.

not destroy contacts among universities, but it did contribute to a significant change in the character of these contacts. The rise of independent national states tended to reduce, at first, the number of wandering scholars. But they were rapidly replaced by renewed educational intercourse, which eventually became relatively formalized and/or regularized. The impact of large-scale organization, which was so much a part of the growth of nation-states, on universities helped to foster the development of formal exchanges of scholars between recognized institutions in different countries. Standards of all types became more prominent, schedules were adhered to, and the granting of degrees grew more systematic. Such developments when joined to the motives of acquiring knowledge of and contact with peoples of other cultures, which have been part of the common tradition of education, opened the way for the evolution of those relationships between universities which this study recognizes as international programs.

Concurrent with the identification of universities with nation-states was the increase in scientific and intellectual developments. The causal relationship between these two developments is still a subject of historical controversy, and its outcome, while interesting, is not crucial to this study. But the fact that scientific and intellectual advances were made within the context of a nation-state system is important, for the form of that system laid the groundwork for "a complex system of intercultural relations among scientists and scholars."[103] Having created associations within their respective nations along professional lines, the academics used them as avenues for international communications and through them built an elaborate

---

[103] Ibid, p. 7.

system of international associations which met regularly in international congresses and conferences. Thus, another systematic element was added to the international relations among scholars and institutions of higher education.

Another step along the way to the current state of university-related international activities followed close on the first stages of nationalism. Imperialism, wars, and growing international contacts among elite groups served to create the impression that some nations were "more advanced" than others. In an era of growing nationalism, it is not surprising to see that those classified as "retarded" endeavored to rid themselves of such a label by acquiring some of the attributes of the more advanced nations. Their attempts led to a marked upsurge in foreign study on the part of faculty and students shortly after the 1860's.[104] American universities felt the impact of these developments only slightly, for they had yet to be compared favorably with their venerable European predecessors.[105] American elite groups were still receiving at least part of their education abroad. University education of the highest prestige was still almost the exclusive possession of Europe.

During the period just covered, American universities were not prominent in international education. They maintained international contacts and utilized the work and examples set by leading universities

---

[104] The size of this movement is commented upon by Métraux, op. cit., p. 8, on the basis of statistics provided by Reinhold Schairer, Die Studenten im internationalen Kulturleben (Münster in Westfalen, 1927), Chapter I.

[105] Only one American university has been engaged in an international program that began before 1900 and continues to the present. See IROP, op. cit., p. 29.

in other countries, but they were too young and too unrecognized to have a noticeable impact on foreign universities. Most of their energies were focused on their own growth problems within a society which was undergoing rapid change. Like most other American institutions at the turn of the century, universities were largely self-oriented and mostly immersed in essentially parochial concerns. The first major breakthrough occurred in conjunction with World War I. The international "coming of age" of the United States was recognized, albeit with some shock, and the elevation of the United States to the rank of a world power became a matter of concern among educated Americans. In the aftermath, American universities, encouraged to a large extent by the experiences of their staffs during the war, embarked on many international programs.[106] Some were affiliated with religious organizations, as has been indicated in the early part of this chapter, but most were sponsored by university groups alone or in conjunction with private funds.[107]

As international educational activity came to be institutionalized through formal affiliation with American universities, 1920 represented an important turning point. American universities were not completely unaware of foreign universities, for many of them were actively following German models,[108] prior to 1920; but they had made only the

---

[106]The period 1920-29 saw a marked increase in the number of international programs started and still continuing. See IROP, op. cit., p. 29.

[107]For an example of how influential persons contributed to the atmosphere promoting the expansion of international educational programs, see Nicholas Murray Butler, The University and the International Mind (New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1931).

[108]Métraux, op. cit., p. 13. See also Gustavus Ohlinger, The German Conspiracy in American Education (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1919).

smallest efforts to establish formal relationships with foreign universities or related agencies abroad. The most famous examples of pre-World War I affiliations are probably those of Yale, Harvard, and Oberlin in the Far East. Beyond these examples, there were few vigorous efforts to provide a regular basis for the international interchange of materials and persons among educational institutions qua institutions. The intellectual and political atmosphere during and immediately following World War I, however, favored the growth of internationalist attitudes among elite groups, including those influential in American universities.

The initiative for the development of programs in international education at this time came almost entirely from private individuals and groups.[109] The government played mostly an indirect role, as has been indicated. But foundations like Rockefeller, Guggenheim, and Carnegie provided stimuli and financial assistance for universities to seek overseas contacts. The experience of university staff and students during the war fired a wave of enthusiasm for foreign study and for the formal exchange of students and faculty.[110] Thus, at this time, one finds the University of Delaware and Smith College embarking on the now famous "junior year abroad" programs. Suddenly by 1923, there were over 7,000 foreign students in the United States; and the spiral has continued upward from that time. By 1929, over 700 organizations, some of them

---

[109] Ibid, p. 15.

[110] A brief history of these developments is contained in United States House of Representatives, Committee on Government Operations, Eighty-fifth Congress, Second Session, Government Programs in International Education (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959), pp. 31-33.

universities, were sponsoring student and faculty exchanges.[111] As is shown in The International Programs of American Universities,[112] many of these exchanges never became formalized to the extent that they can be classified as international programs, and many others ceased to exist as the Great Depression spread through the world. But those that were developed represented the beginning of university initiative in international programs and have since the inter-war period been used as a reference point for the numerous international programs now operating as "university-sponsored." That is, they are primarily supported by student and university funds.

Today, the growth of university-sponsored international programs between 1920 and 1940 seems modest compared to the growth period following World War II. Of the 382 international programs in operation at the end of 1958, forty were supported entirely out of university funds, seventy-eight were supported jointly by university funds and by fees charged to students participating in such programs, and forty-four were supported by university funds with some outside assistance. Thus, 162 or 42.5 per cent of the current international programs depended primarily on American universities for their continuance.[113] The American Council on Education reports that such activities currently cost American universities over six million dollars in non-reimbursable expenditures.[114] Although this expenditure is small as compared to the expenditures of

---

[111] Métraux, op. cit., p. 16.

[112] See especially Tables 2D and 2E, pp. 29-30.

[113] IROP, op. cit., Tables 2X, p. 47.

[114] American Council on Education, "International Educational Activities of American Colleges and Universities," published in mimeographed form, April 17, 1957.

the government and foundations for similar purposes, it represents a significant amount in terms of the disposable income available to universities. In the present context of financial pressure on universities, six million dollars is precious. Therefore, the fact that universities choose to make such expenditures tends to refute the popular impression that universities are like giant blotters, absorbing outside funds as they become available without committing their own resources to international programs.

The major portion of expenditures for international programs made by American universities has been made by private institutions. Such factors as tradition, the relative newness of strong public universities, and the local responsibilities of public universities have acted to hinder the growth of international expenditures by these institutions. But perhaps the most important deterrents have been the specific prohibitions by fund-granting agencies, in most cases state legislatures, relative to the expenditure of public monies for international purposes.[115] These practices tended to keep the internationalist impulses of public institutions pent up until the advent of government spending for university-operated international programs. Linked to public universities' vigorous service orientation, the funds for "international extension work" offered by IIAA in 1940 appeared as a way to broaden the impact of public universities. Consequently, the pre-ICA period of government financing for international purposes was dominated by the public health and agriculture programs of public universities. Also in this context, the quick responses of such persons as Bennett

---

[115]The story of the financial restraints imposed on state institutions by the legislature, and the weaknesses of such a system, is related in Malcolm Moos and Francis E. Rourke, The Campus and the State (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1959).

and Hannah to the Point Four program on behalf of the public universities take on a new logic. Public universities simply lacked the "free funds" to pursue international programs, and this made them largely dependent on shifts in attitudes among political elites.

Public universities have moved swiftly in the past ten years to compensate for their initial lack of participation in international affairs. The record indicates strongly that American universities have not been passive participants in the development of international programs. First, public universities have been the most active single group in the field of ICA-sponsored university contracts.[116] Bennett and Hannah stand as examples of the vigor with which public universities have pursued government funds for international purposes. Secondly, public universities are actively engaged in establishing themselves as prime recipients of foundation grants for international programs. In contrast to their experience in government circles, public universities find themselves competing with formidable private universities for foundation favor. Notwithstanding the earlier relationships between foundations and private universities, the public universities have made striking progress in attracting foundation funds.[117] This may well be one aspect of the arrival at the forefront of American education which some public universities have experienced since World War II.

---

[116] IROP, op. cit., pp. 23-24. Examination of the quarterly reports issued by ICA indicates clearly the dominant role of public universities in government contract programs.

[117] The annual reports of Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller show the steady increase in the number and size of grants to public universities since 1953.

The numerical increase in international programs since World War II is striking.[118] A check of the program descriptions in The International Programs of American Universities indicates that the major sponsors of the new programs started during the period 1945-50 and still operating were universities and foundations. In the atmosphere of internationalism following the war, and before the political implications of American international prestige became expressed in government policies of technical assistance, the universities started numerous student tour and study-abroad programs, and sought out foreign universities with which to exchange faculty and students. This latter development usually involved foundation assistance in financing, thereby giving the appearance of more active foundation participation than may have been the case. It was only in the last years of this period that foundations and the government came to dominate international program spending, although universities operated the programs. The first years represented an upsurge of student and faculty interest combined with an unprecedented influx of foreign students to the United States.

Amid the shifting patterns of interest, American universities did some things in international programs that such institutions as foundations and the government could not easily do. They made the first hesitant steps to capture, preserve, and transmit the educational values accruing from their international experiences. The first manifestations were changes in course content and offerings, curricula changes,

---

[118]See IROP, op. cit., p. 29, for comparative figures.

institution of area studies and international relations majors, etc.[119] The value of the results thus far is debated in many institutions, but the search for ways to relate international participation to the university campus continues. In the final analysis, it is in this area of educational impact of international programs at home and abroad that the contributions of the universities may overshadow those questions clustered around financial arrangements. If the educational results do not appear justifiable, universities may be faced with the necessity of retreat and/or a serious redefinition of their general educational role.

On the basis of a survey of its affiliated institutions, the American Council on Education concluded apropos of the international activities of American universities:

> Educational institutions believe that the human mind will dictate the course of the future. When minds search together for the common heritage of truth, a cross-fertilization of ideas and understanding results. This is an educational process that takes place without regard to national boundaries. It has a vital part to play in insuring a future of peace and progress. . . . Because of these convictions, American institutions have supported international educational activities--their own and those sponsored by the government.[120]

---

[119]This entire development is chronicled and examined in a series of books sponsored by the American Council on Education. The series title is "Studies in Universities and World Affairs." The following books have been published to date: Howard E. Wilson, American College Life as Education in World Outlook (1956); Cora Du Bois, Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States (1956); Vincent Baker, World Affairs and the College Curriculum (1959); C. Dale Fuller, Training of Specialists in International Relations (1957); John Gange, University Research on World Affairs (1957); Cyril O. Houle and Charles A. Nelson, The University, The Citizen and World Affairs (1956); and Fred Cole and Richard W. Sterling, World Affairs in Institutions of Higher Education in the South (1958).

[120]It is interesting to note, and perhaps indicative of the thinking of academics and the American Council on Education in particular, that this statement differentiates only between government and university programs. Such statements seem to betray an implicit assumption on the part of those who so pronounce that somehow only money

> The growth of international educational activities has been haphazard. Different government and private programs have developed at different times to meet different purposes. Confusion has resulted--confusion which threatens to obscure the basic educational process involved and to jeopardize the effectiveness of the national effort. . . . American colleges and universities believe that 'the time of testing and trials has passed,' as one institution has phrased it, and that order must be established in this area at the instigation of American higher education.[121]

These examples concerning the ways in which both public and private American universities have expressed their interest in international relations demonstrate that universities are not simply passive instruments of fund-granting organizations. Their instrumental nature will be explored further, but for now it seems appropriate to stress the fact that the influence of American universities themselves is part of the story of how international programs have come to occupy a prominent place today in American higher education. This influence has blended with that of religious organizations, government, and foundations to create, in part, roles which American universities currently perform in international relations. The examples are far from exhaustive in that they do not cover every aspect of university interest, but they may convey a sense of the complexity of the relationships among the actors with whom this study is concerned.

---

received from the government for international programs is of a special character. While this assumption is frequently made in academic circles, as the interviews used in this study will show, it is not an accurate description of the patterns of interaction existing between universities and foundations, not to mention religious organizations.

[121]American Council on Education, "International Educational Activities of American Colleges and Universities," published in mimeographed form, April 17, 1957, p. 4.

CHAPTER IV

PERCEPTIONS OF KNOWLEDGEABLES ABOUT ACTS PERFORMED BY UNIVERSITIES THROUGH INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

In Chapter I (see pp. 6-9) the concepts of status and role as developed by Ralph Linton were introduced. Linton states that the two concepts are integrally related, in that role is the dynamic aspect of status. Further, any particular status or role is derived from situational factors as well as from the perceptions of the person or persons occupying a status and performing the related role or roles.

The historic situational factors which have contributed to the development of a general status-definition for American universities in international relations were described in Chapter III. Admittedly, this brief record of the past activities of various institutions does not provide a complete picture of the situation in which the international status of American universities evolved. But it is suggested that the data provided represent some of the most significant situational factors which have contributed to the present international status of American universities. Incomplete as this aspect of the picture may be, it does convey the impression that the international status of American universities has undergone relatively rapid change, and that the roles of American universities in international relations have increased in number and possibly in importance.

It is the purpose of this chapter to present data on the perceptions held by knowledgeables concerning the universities' general international status and roles. The data are derived from the 303 interviews conducted for this study. In those interviews, knowledgeables in the field of international programs were encouraged to make statements indicating some of their perceptions relating to acts performed by universities participating in international programs. The statements were distributed into three categories representing: (1) statements about what kinds of acts universities are expected to perform, (2) statements about how universities are expected to perform such acts, and (3) statements about why universities are expected to perform such acts.

The knowledgeables from whom the statements were obtained included 193 persons who were directly identified with the universities in the sample used in this study, twenty-three persons who held official positions in the Ford and Rockefeller foundations and Carnegie Corporation, and eighty-seven persons who were employed by the U.S. Government in positions closely related to international programs. The statements made by each of these three types of knowledgeables are described and analyzed separately in this chapter; however, greater attention was given to statements made by university personnel, since their perceptions of their roles and those of universities constitute a focal point of this study.

The 303 interviewees were permitted considerable latitude by the interviewers in the formulation of their responses. The questions asked the interviewees were very general. The interviewees were encouraged to talk of international acts related to universities both in

terms of their own universities and of all American universities. By "opening up" the interview situation at the outset through the use of such very broad questions, the interviewers attempted to obtain indications of the respondents' general attitudes toward international programs. From this general level, the interviewers then attempted to move the respondents toward indicating the more specific types of international acts they thought universities might appropriately perform, and toward discussing how and why these might be carried out. The respondents were not directly presented with a number of alternatives from which they would select the ones which best described their attitudes. Instead, choice was suggested generally in terms of broad ranges of possibilities which might lead the respondents to formulate their own answers.

Accuracy and Validity of Data

Admittedly, many factors detract from the exactness with which perceptions about what acts American universities perform internationally and why and how they perform such acts can be extracted from a diversified population of respondents reacting to very general questions. To reduce the number of difficulties which might arise in interpreting "open-ended" responses, normal interviewing safeguards were used, including uniform interview instructions and schedules of questions, prompt recording of the interviews from notes, and arrangement of interviews in advance. Given such safeguards and the common focus of interest of the respondents, it seems reasonable to assume that the statements made by the various types of respondents represent rather accurately the public or semi-public attitudes of this particular sample of knowledgeables with respect to certain aspects of the participation of

American universities in international relations through international programs.

In assessing the validity of the responses obtained during this study, it is important to be aware of the fact that the respondents were themselves considerably involved in the statuses and roles about which they were making statements. Also, the group of knowledgeables in this relatively new area of education (new primarily with regard to its size and impact) is quite small. Their small numbers would favor awareness of what others in the same field are thinking, saying, and doing, and might reduce their candor. Notwithstanding the fact that all respondents were given assurances of anonymity, each reader must probably evaluate in his own way the extent to which the responses represented the "real," personal attitudes of the respondents relative to international programs, as distinguished from the "public" portion of the respondents' perceptions. It is the writer's opinion that the responses, taken as a whole, represent combinations of private and public attitudes and perceptions.

Undoubtedly, also, the statements express the respondents' "individual" views to a considerable degree rather than the "official" views of their institutions. But since these "individual" views unquestionably have been developed within the frameworks and environments of these institutions, it seems reasonable to assume that they are useful indicators of the more generalized attitudes about international programs which have currency among knowledgeable American educational leaders and sponsoring organization leaders at large.

Finally, the reader should be aware of two other aspects of the data used in this chapter. First, Tables 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13

are presentations of the frequencies with which certain kinds of statements about international acts performed by American universities are made by knowledgeables identified in this study. Since some respondents made more than one statement which was applicable to the particular question posed by the interviewers and since all such responses were tabulated, the number of responses occasionally exceeds the number of respondents. Second, since all such responses are included in the following tables, it is possible that the data tend to reflect more strongly the statements, and consequently the perceptions, of those who spent a considerable amount of time with the interviewers than of those who spent less time with the interviewers. The impact of the differential interview durations on the validity of the data presented and discussed in this chapter cannot be accurately ascertained. It can be stated, however, that, as a rule, the respondents were provided with as much time as they seemed to feel they needed to answer the questions posed by the interviewer. If the interview was cut short, it was on the initiative of the respondent. In general, it is the writer's observation that no crucial problems related to interview length arose during the interviewing for this study which caused a significant number of respondents to make fewer statements than they desired.

Previously Collected Data

Studies of similar kinds of expectations and perceptions held by university personnel (not including representatives of sponsoring organizations) have been reported in at least two other instances. One study was conducted under the auspices of the American Council on Education (ACE), and reported in a bulletin of the Council issued in 1957 under the title, "International Educational Activities of American

Colleges and Universities: Report of Survey of Member Institutions of the American Council on Education." Another was completed in 1958 by the Institute of Research on Overseas Programs (IROP), Michigan State University, and the findings are included in The International Programs of American Universities: An Inventory and Analysis. Portions of the ACE report are directly relevant to the materials used in this chapter, especially those dealing with the purposes of international programs and the means of carrying out such programs. Therefore, results of the ACE study and this study will be compared as appropriate. To a lesser extent, the IROP report has some comparable data. The IROP data were gathered from international program coordinators, the ACE questions were directed to university presidents, and the respondents for the present study represented various levels of university personnel as well as some non-university persons. Notwithstanding these differences in the populations queried, there are enough similarities in the respondent populations to make comparisons fruitful, especially since any evidence is scarce. It should be noted that these studies were conducted in different years, but years not far apart, running from 1956 to 1959.

Findings

In making statements of how universities are expected to perform international acts, the respondents appeared more secure and were more explicit than when they made statements dealing with what and why. They had a better grasp of the resources which universities could apply to international activities than they had of the types of acts which conceivably might become part of the general roles of American universities in international relations. When the respondents came to grips with why American universities should perform international acts, they appeared

least securely anchored to supporting facts or to the supporting folklore of academia. In such circumstances, their expectations represented a mixture of educational piety, humanitarianism (sometimes secular and sometimes semi-religious), careerism, government policy, foundation influence, and individual soul-searching. Thus if one could picture expectations in terms of propinquity to the person expressing them, one might construct a picture in which expectations about how would be most closely associated with the respondent as an individual, those about why associated with the individual respondent and with many others, and expectations about what between the two.

Types of Acts Universities are Expected to Perform Through International Programs

The knowledgeables from universities and sponsoring organizations were asked to specify those kinds of acts which they understood from all their sources of information to be expected of universities in international programs. Thus, the respondents were not asked at first to indicate the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the international activities of American universities, but merely to look about them and to state what kinds of actions they and others expected from universities in international relations. As they looked about them, they generally were inclined to list several kinds of acts, of fundamentally different natures. At this point, it was suggested to the respondents that they narrow the field of expected acts down to the one or more types of acts, to which they attached the highest degree of expectation that they would be performed. In this manner a number of off-hand observations were eliminated, and the expected acts were more clearly described. Generally their remarks provided sufficient information to permit placement into the following categories, which have been used below in Tables 6 and 7:

1) Political -- Acts which respondents apparently perceived as contributing directly to international peace and harmony or to the quest for such goals, and/or acts which they apparently perceived as directly in support of national policy in the international area, as expressed by the overt political apparatus of the state.

2) Ideological -- Acts which respondents apparently perceived as attempting to alter the value and belief systems of other societies. Specifically, this tended to mean acts the respondents perceived as encouraging other peoples to view the United States and its democracy favorably and to view the Soviet Union and its form of communism unfavorably.

3) Humanitarian -- Acts which respondents apparently perceived as contributing to the general upgrading of the conditions of humanity. Such acts emphasize concrete concern for the welfare of other men and for man's "innate" right to a "better" life.

4) Cross-Cultural "Understanding" -- Acts which respondents apparently perceived as contributing to increased comprehension and/or understanding of cultures and habitats that are not part of one's own national or cultural tradition. Respondents' comments on such acts tended to emphasize an expectation of general improvement of the "human condition" through cross-cultural communications and the resultant "understanding."

5) Educational -- Acts which respondents apparently perceived as primarily designed to contribute to the institutionalized

training of individuals through contact with the formal educational agencies of another country. Such acts tended to be overtly labelled as "educational" enterprises, as distinct from those other aspects of international programs which may have incidental educative value but which conventionally are primarily classified by other standards.

6) Economic -- Acts which respondents apparently perceived as intended to contribute primarily to the means of satisfying the material wants and needs of other societies. Many of the ICA-financed international programs involving universities fall under this classification; their use of educational institutions tended to be viewed as instrumental.

7) Other -- Acts which do not correspond to the descriptions for categories 1-6. For example, the assumption that American universities can act as a sort of "supermarket" from which foreigners can select any kind of assistance and/or cooperation they desire.

As shown in Table 6, administrators and teachers at American universities, on the basis of the frequency with which they made statements indicating their expectations about the acts American universities are to perform through international programs, put the most emphasis upon acts which were classified primarily as educational, economic, and cross-cultural. Among university administrators, the expectation that universities will perform educational acts was more frequently avowed (34.0% of all statements tabulated) than the expectation that they will perform economic (27.0%) and cross-cultural (19.4%) acts. While teachers ranked these classes of acts in the same order, the frequency

TABLE 6

FREQUENCY OF STATEMENTS BY UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL ABOUT THE TYPES OF ACTS UNIVERSITIES ARE EXPECTED TO PERFORM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THROUGH INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Types of Acts (1)	Classification of University Personnel							
	Administrators Responding (N=152)		Teachers Responding (N=126)		Students Responding (N=25)		All Univ. Personnel Responding (N 303)	
	No. of Statements Made by Adminis. (2)	% of 322 Statements Made by Adminis. (3)	No. of Statements Made by Teachers (4)	% of 271 Statements Made by Teachers (5)	No. of Statements Made by Students (6)	% of 41 Statements Made by Students (7)	Total No. Statements Made by all Univ. Personnel (8)	% of 634 Statements Made by all Univ. Personnel (9)
Political	19	6.0	14	5.1	0	0.0	33	5.2
Ideological	19	6.0	16	5.9	0	0.0	35	5.6
Humanitarian	18	5.6	23	8.6	2	4.9	43	6.9
Cross-Cultural	63	19.4	44	16.2	15	36.6	122	19.2
Educational	110	34.0	106	39.1	24	58.5	240	37.8
Economic	87	27.0	63	23.2	0	0.0	150	23.6
Other	6	2.0	5	1.9	0	0.0	11	1.7
Total	322	100.0	271	100.0	41	100.0	634	100.0

with which educational acts were mentioned by them increased relative to the other types of acts. Among teachers, educational acts comprised 39.1 per cent of the stated expectations, while economic and cross-cultural acts constituted 23.2 per cent and 16.2 per cent respectively. Basic agreement on the relative unimportance of political and ideological acts existed between teacher and administrator respondents, if we may judge from the low frequency with which each of these groups mentioned these kinds of acts.

The similarities in ranking of expectations among university personnel are not surprising, since there is normally a fairly large amount of interaction between administrators and faculty concerned with international programs. From this interaction there emerges a sharing of beliefs as to what the present state of international affairs holds for universities. If the administrators are inclined to weight the economic acts a bit more heavily than teachers, it may be because the administrative group has more intimate and sustained contact with the principal sponsors of the programs. The teachers' more intense involvement in the academic functions of the university might tend to incline them toward avowing the belief that, since universities are primarily institutions of education, it is primarily educational acts that should be expected of them. However, despite any stereotyping of the teacher as immersed solely in educational pursuits, Table 6 indicates that a significant number of statements were made by teachers which indicated an awareness among this class of respondents that universities are expected to make economic contributions in the field of international relations. How these expectations affect the roles performed by American universities in international relations is examined in Chapter V.

If the academic and administrative decision-makers (the sample consists almost exclusively of persons who have formal decision-making authority, frequently said they believed that American universities are expected to make substantial contributions directly to the means of satisfying the economic and material wants and needs of other societies, then it is not unreasonable to suggest that universities' efforts to do so might increase in the future, barring any drastic changes in the government's foreign aid program. High-prestige universities such as Princeton and Yale may protect their "educational integrity" by staying on the fringes of economic development programs, but their reluctance does not, apparently, deter scores of other universities from fulfilling the expectation that universities will engage in such programs, even if they were once considered outside the call of universities.

The student reaction is included in Table 6 merely as peripheral material. It is not assumed that it represents accurately the views of all student knowledgeables in this field. However, the fact that the student respondents said they expect universities to perform acts that are primarily of an educational and cross-cultural nature should come as no surprise to persons familiar with the literature on student experiences.

Government personnel who have responsibility for some aspect of international programs or who are knowledgeable on the subject differ markedly from university personnel in their appraisal of what acts are expected of American universities in international relations (see Table 7). While a large percentage of statements made by university personnel indicated that they acknowledged a responsibility for assisting the government to promote the economic development of other countries,

TABLE 7

FREQUENCY OF STATEMENTS BY NON-UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL ABOUT THE TYPES OF ACTS UNIVERSITIES EXPECTED TO PERFORM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THROUGH INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Types of Acts	Classification of Non-University Personnel							
	Govt. Pers. in U.S. Responding (N=37)		Govt. Pers. Overseas Responding (N=50)		Foundation Personnel Responding (N=23)		All Non-Univ. Pers. Responding (N=110)	
	No. of Statements Made by Govt. Personnel in U.S.	% of 87 Statements Made by Govt. Personnel in U.S.	No. of Statements Made by Govt. Personnel Overseas	% of 113 Statements Made by Govt. Personnel Overseas	No. of Statements Made by Found. Personnel	% of 61 Statements Made by Found. Personnel	Total No. Statements Made by all Non-Univ. Personnel	% of 261 Statements Made by all Non-Univ. Personnel
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Political	23	26.5	37	32.8	2	3.2	62	23.8
Ideological	17	19.5	13	11.5	3	4.9	33	12.7
Humanitarian	3	3.4	4	3.5	8	13.2	15	5.8
Cross-Cultural	10	11.5	22	19.5	12	19.7	44	17.0
Educational	16	18.4	17	15.0	18	29.5	51	19.6
Economic	18	20.7	20	17.7	18	29.5	56	21.1
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	87	100.0	113	100.0	61	100.0	261	100.0

university respondents did not often move beyond this classification and declare that universities' international programs are expected to perform political or ideological acts (see Table 6). Indeed, a high official of a prominent eastern university stated that political acts are totally foreign to the primary purposes of great universities. Moreover, he stated, political involvement detracts from the educational efforts of universities and saps their energies.[122] It is the opinion of this writer, after analyzing the interviews conducted for this study, that university personnel are extremely reluctant to support overtly a substantial mixture of politics and education.

A similar reluctance was not evident in the statements made by government personnel who were familiar with university programs overseas (see Table 7). Government respondents in this area of international education and politics appeared to emphasize the operational aspects of foreign relations and how universities "fit into" the government's overall political and ideological objectives. Since universities are prone to de-emphasize statements about political and ideological activities, any approach which tends to use universities as instruments of politics and ideology might be expected to be a source of irritation.

As Table 7 shows, government respondents at home and abroad stated frequently that universities are expected to perform political and ideological acts overseas. In effect, 46.0 per cent of the statements by government respondents in the United States, and 44.3 per cent of the statements by government respondents overseas, characterized universities as political and ideological actors in the service of the American government. These two classes of administrators did not ignore

---

[122] BJ-73.

expectations relative to other kinds of acts universities might perform, but they seemed to perceive such acts as distinctly secondary. Statements made by government respondents in the United States indicating that economic acts are expected of universities constituted 20.7 per cent of the statements made by this class of respondent, and those suggesting economic and cross-cultural acts accounted for 18.4 per cent and 11.5 per cent of the responses tabulated respectively. Government respondents overseas tended to have a slightly different perspective. Nearly 20 per cent of the statements tabulated for this class of respondents indicated that cross-cultural acts are expected of universities through participation in international programs, and 17.7 per cent of their statements suggested economic acts and 15.0 per cent educational acts. Such expectations suggest that part of the reason that universities and ICA, for example, have engaged in a considerable amount of argument about international programs[123] is that they possess significantly different expectations about the relative emphasis to be placed on the different sorts of acts universities are expected to perform. Such a fundamental discrepancy could hardly bode well for favorable operational relationships between the universities and government sponsors.

Interestingly, foundation respondents expressed a pattern of expectation about university acts in international programs which is somewhat similar to the pattern of expectations expressed by university

---

[123]The nature of these arguments has been suggested in Chapter III. Examples of the arguments are available in the proceedings of the annual conferences involving universities and government personnel under the auspices of the Committee on Institutional Projects Abroad of the American Council on Education. The recent Annapolis Conference cited in Chapter I, p. 3, represents the high-level government interest in settling disagreements about what acts are to be performed by whom.

personnel (see Table 6, Column 9 and Table 7, Column 7). Foundation respondents made statements suggesting humanitarian and economic acts with slightly greater relative frequency than university respondents. But the over-all pattern of expectation appears to represent a greater degree of actual and/or potential harmony between university and foundation personnel as to the kinds of acts that can be expected of American universities in international relations than between university and government personnel. The basic orientations of the philanthropoids as outlined in Chapter III provide a clue to why their expectations tended to parallel those of the university respondents. The philanthropoids are recruited primarily from university campuses; thus they tend to share certain attitudes about and values of the academic community.

In evaluating expectations of these knowledgeables about what acts are expected of American universities in international relations, it seems appropriate to indicate the types of international acts American universities actually perform or have performed. Table 8 gives some data on these acts. Data reported in the IROP study[124] on the 382 international programs involving 184 American universities were adopted to the categories used in the present study for classifying international acts. Such adaptations were based on the program descriptions provided in Part II of the IROP study. The data on which Table 8 is based are one year older than those used as the basis for this study, but it is this writer's belief, on the basis of foundation statements, ICA quarterly reports, and interviewing at American universities, that while the numbers of international programs have increased since the IROP

---

[124] Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, The International Programs of American Universities: An Inventory and Analysis (East Lansing, Michigan: The Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, 1958).

study was released, the types of acts performed and the relative frequency of their performance have not changed significantly.

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF UNIVERSITY INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS REPORTED TO BE PERFORMING PARTICULAR TYPES OF ACTS

Types of Acts (1)	Number of Programs Reported to be Performing Particular Types of Acts (2)	Percentage of 382 Programs (3)
Political	4	1.2
Ideological	21	5.5
Humanitarian	37	9.6
Cross-Cultural	135	35.3
Educational	86	22.5
Economic	99	25.9
Total	382	100.0

Generally, American universities report that they are actually performing the kinds of acts--cross-cultural, economic, and educational in that order of program frequency--that university and foundation respondents stated they expected of universities. The major differences between the relative frequencies of acts universities reportedly perform through international programs (see Table 8) and the relative frequencies with which university and foundation respondents said they expect such acts of universities center around the relative importance of cross-cultural and educational acts (compare Table 8, Columns 2 and 3, with Table 6, Columns 8 and 9, and Table 7, Columns 6 and 7). Statements by

university and foundation respondents tended to emphasize, on the basis of numbers of mentions, the primacy of educational acts over cross-cultural acts, while in terms of actual performance it would appear that cross-cultural acts are performed in more international programs than educational acts. The frequently stated expectations of all government respondents that political and ideological acts will be performed (see Table 7, Columns 2-5) diverge sharply from the actual pattern of acts reportedly performed by universities. Relatively few of the programs described in the IROP study reported performance of acts which were classified as political and ideological, yet government respondents made frequent statements suggesting that they felt that universities could be expected to operate in these areas.

Several significant factors appear to emerge from relations between the data on expectations stated by representatives of the major actors and the data on the kinds of acts American universities apparently perform or have performed through international programs. First, there is a basic similarity between what university and foundation respondents said they expected of universities and what acts are said to be actually performed. Second, the stated expectations of university and foundation respondents are similar. Third, economic acts are reported as the second most frequently performed category of acts and they are a prominent part of the stated expectations of all respondents. Fourth, there is a marked difference between the relative frequencies of the stated expectations of government respondents and the relative frequencies of those of other types of respondents; and between expectations of government personnel and the reported actual performance pattern of universities in international relations.

The fact that universities apparently tend to perform those acts most frequently said to be expected of them by their own personnel and foundation personnel may indicate that many persons closely associated with American universities and their international programs are satisfied that universities are not violating their traditional statuses and roles. Such is not the case everywhere and at all times, but there is very little evidence to indicate that universities are obsessed with guilt feelings about participating in "wrong" or "unsuitable" activities through international programs. However, as Chapters V and VI will show, dissatisfaction with the ways in which universities have carried out their actions, and are carrying them out, is an important area of controversy.

Amid both the agreement and disagreement among respondents about what acts are expected of universities, economic acts are prominent among the frequently stated expectations and frequently performed acts. This seems to be a fairly recent phenomenon. Undoubtedly, the growing importance of economic acts is primarily the result of the government's recently and vigorously increased interest in the less-developed areas of the world, and secondarily the result of foundations' expanding their overseas operations markedly. As the examination of the guiding hypotheses for this study in Chapters V and VI will show, the fact that there has been increasing use of American universities to promote the economic development of foreign countries apparently has not raised as many questions among university personnel, to judge from respondents' comments, as have the operational relationships which have evolved from the agreement by universities to perform economic acts. It should be recalled that most of the economic acts in international programs are

performed by land grant and other public universities which have a historic commitment to applying their resources directly to the welfare of society. Thus, economic acts tended to be perceived by those land grant respondents who mentioned them as expected acts, falling within the "proper" scope of university activities. The same respondents did not, however, express similar approval of the operations being carried on under international programs having primarily economic goals.

One of the most significant findings that emerged from the interview materials was that the stated expectations of university respondents differed considerably from those of government respondents. The functional differences between universities and the government, and the differences in socially assigned responsibilities as between the two institutions, are sufficient to suggest that differences between perceptions of persons associated with the respective institutions should be anticipated. But relatively few respondents, especially among university personnel, made statements which indicated that they had anticipated important differences between university goals and operations and those identified with the government. It appears that university respondents had originally felt that universities were capable of functioning adequately within the framework of international programs if the goals of the programs were described broadly in terms of improving the conditions of human existence. But shortly after the universities made their commitments to perform international acts in close relationship to the government, turmoil and disillusionment set in. This development is mirrored in most of the statements of those respondents familiar with government-sponsored programs. Attempts to reconcile the respective expectations of university and government

personnel as to what acts can be performed internationally by universities continue to the present.

How Universities are Expected to Perform International Acts

Having indicated the respondents' expectations as to what kinds of international acts should be performed by American universities, it now seems appropriate to consider how the respondents believed such acts are to be carried out. In this regard, university personnel were asked to indicate their most important expectations in the following three areas: resource utilization, operational arrangements, and source of funds. A parallel line of inquiry among sponsoring organization personnel produced responses which were strikingly similar; therefore, they are not reproduced in tabular form as are the responses of university personnel. Foundation respondents almost always said they considered it the responsibility of the universities involved in international programs to formulate the means for performing international acts. Most frequently their responses indicated that they favored university-to-university relationships involving an exchange of personnel, primarily faculty. Government respondents most frequently suggested international programs involving university-to-university arrangements as well as closer relationships among the participating universities, government departments in the United States, and government missions overseas. This latter course was frequently mentioned by government respondents despite the earlier feelings of the contract program originators that university programs would de-emphasize the possible political implications of foreign aid.[125] As the following tables indicate, closer

[125]The history of this idea is covered in Chapter III.

affiliation between the operating agencies of the government and universities in performance of international acts was not mentioned by university respondents as a reasonable expectation.

Resource Utilization

It was found that the university respondents' expectations as to how university resources should be used in international programs fell into five categories of acts, as follows:

1) Bringing foreign persons, both students and faculty, to the United States. Generally this would involve the training, study, teaching, and participation at an American university on the part of the foreigner.

2) Sending United States faculty and staff abroad. Such persons could be sent abroad with or without reference to a particular educational institution within the host country.

3) Sending United States students abroad. Students could be abroad with or without reference to a particular educational institution within a host country.

4) Exchange of Personnel. Persons could be exchanged between the United States and a cooperating country; generally this would involve arrangements between specific educational institutions in both countries.

5) Exchange of material items. This involves the exchange of such items as books, research findings, educational materials, films, written advisory materials, etc., between the United States and a host country. Such arrangements generally have an institutional focus at each end of the communication channel.

In terms of resource utilization, most American university respondents said they believe that the international acts of universities should involve sending American faculty and staff overseas. Table 9 shows that 57.3 per cent of the university administrators and 66.7 per cent of the teachers appeared to expect that the major resource that a university should use in international programs is its own personnel. Apparently implicit in this belief was the assumption that such personnel can contribute most through international programs by going abroad. These expectations parallel the data presented in the IROP study as to the reported "types of operations" which characterize international programs. According to that study, universities reported that they were utilizing their resources in such a way that their major international operation was the sending of faculty and staff abroad.[126] The conclusion drawn in part from this fact by the authors of the IROP study, namely, that American universities believe they primarily "export" knowledge, is further substantiated by the data gathered for this study and presented in Table 9.

Although the individual motives of each of the respondents used in the present study for their being involved in international programs were not explored systematically, sufficient comment was made by the respondents to indicate quite clearly that the majority of them were originally motivated to participate in international programs by the possibility of travel abroad. This attitude probably is a major factor in the frequent expectation (see Table 9) that universities should use their personnel abroad as part of international programs. Some observers, especially those in ICA, indicated in their responses that the

---

[126] IROP, op. cit., Table 2H and pp. 34-35.

TABLE 9

FREQUENCY OF STATEMENTS BY UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL ABOUT PRIMARY WAYS IN WHICH UNIVERSITIES ARE EXPECTED TO CARRY OUT INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Methods Universities Are Expected to Utilize (1)	Classification of University Personnel							
	Administrators Responding (N=152)		Teachers Responding (N=126)		Students Responding (N=25)		All Univ. Personnel Responding (N=303)	
	No. of Statements Made by Adminis. (2)	% of 152 Statements Made by Adminis. (3)	No. of Statements Made by Teachers (4)	% of 126 Statements Made by Teachers (5)	No. of Statements Made by Students (6)	% of 25 Statements Made by Students (7)	Total No. Statements Made by all Univ. Personnel (8)	% of 303 Statements Made by all Univ. Personnel (9)
Bringing For. to U.S.	34	22.4	20	15.9	8	32.0	62	20.5
Sending U.S. Faculty & Staff Abroad	87	57.3	84	66.7	0	0.0	171	56.5
Sending U.S. Stu. Abr.	12	7.9	10	7.9	11	44.0	33	10.9
Personnel Exchange (i.e., 1+2 &/or 3)	6	4.0	10	7.9	6	24.0	22	7.2
Exc. of Material Items	5	3.2	2	1.6	0	0.0	7	2.3
Other	8	5.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	2.6
Total	152	100.0	126	100.0	25	100.0	303	100.0

Note: Each respondent was asked to indicate his primary expectation as to how resources should be utilized; therefore, the number of statements in Table 9 is the same as the number of respondents.

intensity of the desire of American university personnel to travel abroad appears to have waned, at least temporarily. They report that ICA and the universities now find themselves encountering considerable difficulty in recruiting university personnel to staff international programs.[127] Much of the novelty for university personnel of overseas work has apparently worn off after ten years of fairly intense activity. Moreover, reported improvements in some university reward structures for overseas work have not yet offset the decline of foreign travel as the single most important inducement to university personnel to leave their campuses. Despite some signs of a declining level of interest in working abroad in international programs on the parts of many university persons since the peak period of the mid-fifties, it seems likely, on the basis of respondents' statements, that most American university personnel who are aware of international programs still believe that universities have their most significant impact internationally through the device of sending their faculty and staff abroad.

The considerable interest shown by university respondents in bringing foreigners to the United States deserves comment (see Table 9). Having foreigners on American university campuses as a means of contributing to international programs was mentioned in the responses of 22.4 per cent of the university administrators and 15.9 per cent of the teachers. It was second, in number of mentions, to having American university personnel abroad. In a sense, an assumption that this type of resource utilization is important may be related to the previously mentioned assumptions about the United States' being in a favorable position to "export" knowledge. Respondents frequently stated that the

---

[127] WE-59, WE-62, and WE-71. Interviews with ICA officials.

foreigner can learn a great deal by attending American universities, and that this learning experience represents a positive contribution of American universities to international relations. There was a notable emphasis on the superiority of American education over foreign education.

It was not uncommon for respondents who had worked on American campuses with ICA and large foundation programs to state that the foreigner (called a "participant" in ICA jargon) studying in the United States is the "main hope" for a "permanent impact" by the universities on the foreign country in question. Therefore, it would seem too hasty to assume that the fact that American university respondents said most frequently that they believe universities utilize their available resources for international relations best by sending their own personnel abroad implies that they felt that no other way is important. Bringing foreign students to the United States had considerable appeal for all parties concerned, since it tends to reduce the staff strains on American universities, is relatively inexpensive for the Americans (though certainly very expensive for most of the foreigners), avoids problems of incorporating Americans into behavior patterns of less-developed areas, etc. Such programs, however, do appear to have a medium-range or long-range impact on the development of the cooperating countries, in contrast to the supposed more immediate but possibly ephemeral impact of a university mission in a foreign country. Because the whole adventure in intensive international education and development through the use of universities is in an embryonic stage, the relative merit of the long-range and medium-range programs as compared with the short-range programs has not been ascertained.

Of the data in Table 9, those which deal with American students abroad and with personnel exchange are of peculiar interest since much

has been said in this country about the benefits of face-to-face communications with persons from other cultures and about the wonders and benefits of living in other cultures. While much of this type of thinking is apparently involved in developing programs which involve sending American faculty and staff abroad and bringing foreign persons to the United States, the primary emphasis among responding American educators seemed to be one of telling others how Americans "do it." There was, of course, a secondary emphasis on learning something about others from interaction on these levels, but this was vague and elusive. Fulbright programs, junior-year-abroad programs, study-tours, student exchanges, etc., however, have long been justified or rationalized on the basis of their important contributions to international education, international relations, and the well-being of mankind. Yet programs involving American students abroad and exchange programs were seldom mentioned by university respondents as primary ways in which universities are expected to carry out their programs (see Table 9).

Operational Arrangements

The second area dealing with how universities are expected to perform international acts is that of operational arrangements. The respondents' statements about operational arrangements they expected for carrying out universities' international programs fell into the following four categories:

1) Direct University-to-University. Under these arrangements the universities involved undertake to conduct the international programs directly between themselves, expecting that minimal influences will be exercised by third parties. In such cases, the main interactive processes occurring

between the universities are under their more or less exclusive control. Emphasis is on universities as whole institutions.

2) University-to-University-through-Sponsor. Under these arrangements the functional and/or operational aspects of the international programs are primarily the responsibility of the universities involved, but are coordinated directly and continuously with the sponsoring agencies. Involvement on the part of the sponsors is continuous, direct, overt, and persuasive.

3) Branch of University in Foreign Country. Under these arrangements, an American university undertakes to establish a branch institution in a foreign country, to be used primarily by American students. The main purpose of such an arrangement is to combine the values and goals of an American type of education with a foreign environment appropriate to the subject-matter being taught.

4) Non-institutional Arrangements. In this case, emphasis is on relations between specific types of persons--faculty, staff, and students--from universities as contrasted with the "university as an institution" emphasis of the other arrangements. The faculty, staff, and students maintain, however, a university identification.

Perhaps the most significant information reported in Table 10 is that American university respondents stated most frequently that they must have institutional support to perform effectively abroad. Table 9 indicates the strong preference university respondents show for university

TABLE 10

FREQUENCY OF STATEMENTS BY UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL ABOUT WHAT KINDS OF OPERATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS UNIVERSITIES ARE EXPECTED TO UTILIZE IN CARRYING OUT INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Kinds of Operational Arrangements Universities Are Expected to Use (1)	Classification of University Personnel							
	Administrators Responding (N=152)		Teachers Responding (N=126)		Students Responding (N=25)		All Univ. Personnel Responding (N=303)	
	No. of Statements Made by Adminis. (2)	% of 152 Statements Made by Adminis. (3)	No. of Statements Made by Teachers (4)	% of 126 Statements Made by Teachers (5)	No. of Statements Made by Students (6)	% of 25 Statements Made by Students (7)	Total No. Statements Made by all Univ. Personnel (8)	% of 303 Statements Made by all Univ. Personnel (9)
University-to-University	118	77.7	84	66.7	14	56.0	216	71.3
University-to-University-through Sponsor	14	9.2	10	7.9	0	0.0	24	8.0
Branch of University	13	8.5	9	7.1	10	40.0	32	10.5
Non-Institutional	7	4.6	23	18.3	1	4.0	31	10.2
Total	152	100.0	126	100.0	25	100.0	303	100.0

Note: Each respondent was asked to indicate the one type of operational relationship that was most expected; therefore the number of statements in Table 10 is the same as the number of respondents

personnel as international travelers and workers. According to the data in Table 10, university respondents seemed to expect university personnel to act internationally within the framework of a university-to-university relationship rather than as individuals in a non-institutional framework. So pervasive has been the rise of institutional identification that 216 or 71.3 per cent of all university personnel interviewed for this study said that they expect international programs to be recognized as the institutional responsibility of those universities which serve as the donors or recipients of participating personnel.

In stating their expectations about university-to-university operational relationships, the respondents also suggested that in those programs in which agreement exists between two universities to undertake international programs jointly, the probability increased that such programs would have considerable impact on the participating parties. While they offered little concrete evidence to support such feelings, their responses indicated that they had a tendency to believe implicitly that the lone professor, for example, stood little chance of "making his mark" in international programs without a broad institutional identification and framework in which to operate. The decline of foundation interest in individual as compared to institutional grants, as reported in Chapter III, and the rapid growth of large-scale government programs apparently tend to reinforce the feelings of university personnel that the university as an institution stands for more than the university person as an individual in international relations.

However, Table 10 also indicates that while university respondents most frequently stated that they expect university-to-university operating relationships to dominate international programs, they did not say that

this arrangement should be expanded to include the sponsoring organizations. Only twenty-four or 8.0 per cent of the responses suggested that the university-to-university-through-sponsor arrangement might be the most realistic and desirable expectation about what the operational characteristics of international programs should be like. As is commonly known, universities are fiercely proud of their real or imagined independence of non-educational forces.[128] Thus, the mere suggestion that the sponsor should be involved in operating an international program appears likely to subject the suggestor to considerable verbal chastisement, or if he is of the academic community, cries of "traitor."

Source of Funds

While many university respondents may show reluctance to share operational control of international programs with non-academic organizations, they are acutely aware of the fact that universities depend on outside organizations for funds to support their participation in international programs. Thus, when university respondents were faced with the issue of how to perform international acts, they expressed expectations about probable sources of funds for such activities. The following are the four major types of organizations to which university respondents' expectations of financial assistance related:

1) University. Available from this source are appropriated funds, endowments and income from endowments, student fees, contracts, and other funds which are formally identified as

---

[128] For extensive commentary on this aspect of university life see "Administration in the Halls of Ivy: A Symposium," Public Administration Review, Winter 1960.

being within the province of university control to a considerable degree.

2) Foundation. Available from this source are specific grants for particular international programs involving a given university or universities. It is assumed that such support is limited in terms of time and amount of funds.

3) Government. Available from this source are contracts or grants for specific international programs.

4) Other private sources. These sources include funds from religious organizations, specific solicitations, limited gifts, etc.

It should be emphasized that the data presented in Table 11 do not necessarily represent the stated preferences of university respondents as to the sources from which funds ought to come, but rather, the data represent the sources from which university respondents most frequently said they expect to get funds for international programs. Bound up in such expectations were notions and ideas about the relative wealth of the various sources and their propensities to deal with universities. Without exception, the university respondents felt that ideally they would prefer to have their own funds for international programs; but, since their income-producing capacity is extremely limited, any expectations along such lines were discredited as unrealistic by approximately ninety per cent of the respondents.

Up to this point, there has been fairly close agreement between university administrators and faculty as to how universities are expected to perform international acts. But in the area of expectations concerned with the probable sources of funds for international programs, these two

TABLE 11

FREQUENCY OF STATEMENTS BY UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL ABOUT THE SOURCES FROM WHICH UNIVERSITIES CAN EXPECT TO RECEIVE FUNDS FOR CARRYING OUT INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Sources of Funds (1)	Classification of University Personnel							
	Administrators Responding (N=152)		Teachers Responding (N=126)		Students Responding (N=25)		All Univ. Personnel Responding (N=303)	
	No. of Statements Made by Adminis. (2)	% of 293 Statements Made by Adminis. (3)	No. of Statements Made by Teachers (4)	% of 245 Statements Made by Teachers (5)	No. of Statements Made by Students (6)	% of 29 Statements Made by Students (7)	Total No. Statements Made by all Univ. Personnel (8)	% of 567 Statements Made by all Univ. Personnel (9)
University	30	10.3	21	8.5	17	58.6	68	12.0
Foundation	107	36.5	141	57.5	6	20.7	254	44.8
Government	151	51.5	79	32.3	4	13.8	234	41.2
Other Private	5	1.7	4	1.7	2	6.9	11	2.0
Total	293	100.0	245	100.0	29	100.0	567	100.0

groups held quite different views. That is, 51.5 per cent of the statements made by university administrators indicated that they expect government support for international programs, and 36.5 per cent of their statements suggest that they expect such support from foundations. University teachers almost reversed the order of frequency of their stated expectations: 57.5 per cent of their responses indicated that they expected foundation support and 32.3 per cent that they expected government support.

When the respondents elaborated on these expectations, the teachers showed a preference for foundation support, grounded in what appeared to be their belief that foundation money is "better" than government money since the former has fewer strings attached to it. To support this preference on their part, the teachers relied primarily on general references to "keeping politics and education separate" and similar cultural myths of American society. Further questioning revealed that many of those teachers who had negative feelings about government support had had or were aware of adverse administrative experiences with the government related to international programs. They cited numerous examples of administrative errors and shortcomings in international programs which they attributed to the government. Such examples, as well as the persistent doubts teachers tended to express about administrators generally, appear to have influenced teachers to the extent that they frequently overlooked the obvious fact that the government has more at stake in international programs than foundations and that the government far outspends the foundations in the same field. Thus, many university teachers either attempted to ignore the over-all dimensions of international programs and the inability of foundations

to support operations of the present magnitude on a continuing, expanding basis, or they were suggesting limiting the programs to the capacity of non-government sponsors.

Statements by administrative respondents did not depreciate the contributions of foundations to international programs, but while acknowledging the possibilities of support from the foundations, they often made statements indicating that they were aware of the considerable growth potential in the area of government-supported international programs. Having been more actively engaged in seeking out money for universities than most faculty members, administrators may be more astute in their evaluations of the potentials of certain sources of funds, and may tailor their expectations accordingly. Throughout the interviewing process, administrators complained of many "shortcomings" in the operations of government-sponsored programs and generally spoke highly of foundation programs. But despite their apparent preferences for foundation-sponsored programs, they claimed to be "realistic" in their expectations about possible future sources of funds for the growing international involvement of universities. Operating from this "realistic" position, they frequently claimed that the only reasonable expectation about sources of funds is the one involving increased reliance on the government for support. In a broad sense, trends of support for education in general in the United States reinforce the administrators' expectations.

Combining the statements of all university respondents relating to the probable sources of funds to support international programs (see Table 11, Columns 8 and 9), it is apparent that the most frequently stated expectations in this area divide into two almost equal groups.

Statements suggesting that foundations are the most promising source of funds for international programs appeared with slightly greater frequency than those suggesting that the government could be expected to provide funds. The difference in frequency was slight--44.8 per cent favoring foundations and 41.2 favoring the government--but the definite cleavage into two substantial groups could indicate that the academic community has not made any decisions which would tend to exclude either of these two types of sponsor for international programs. However, the high frequency of statements naming the government as an expected source of funds represents a substantial departure on the part of university personnel from the kinds of supports universities relied on during the earlier history of international programs.

More striking than the possible confusion or disagreement among classes of university respondents as to the sources from which support for international programs might be expected is the difference between these stated expectations and the reported pattern of sponsorship. The IROP study reported that of the 382 international programs in operation at the time of the study, the largest number received some support from the government. That study also mentioned a fact about sponsorship which is not included in Table 11, namely, that "the normal pattern is one of joint financing using two or more sources of funds."[129] Acknowledging this fact, one can see from the data in the IROP study that the government has a financial stake in more programs than any other single organization and that its total investment exceeds that of all other organizations combined.[130] Given this state of affairs, it is

---

[129] IROP, op. cit., p. 46.

[130] Ibid, Table 2X, p. 47.

difficult to explain logically why university respondents failed to incorporate this fact into their stated expectations about where money comes from for international programs. The most probable explanation is that the university respondents as a group were not aware of the exact dimensions of the government's intervention in international education processes. They perhaps knew of an increase in government activity in this area, but they had not yet assessed its impact.

Why Universities are Expected to Perform International Acts

The most complex aspect of international programs is that dealing with why universities are expected to perform international acts. From the history of international programs, and especially their recent history, there is some evidence to indicate that universities have frequently agreed to participate in international programs without clearly deciding why they were expected to do so. We find the American Council on Education, the Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, the U.S. Government, and university leaders, among others, attempting to determine with some greater degree of clarity why universities have responded as they have to expectations tending to draw them more directly into international relations. Such studies began considerably after the universities had entered into substantial international commitments, which suggests that possibly some universities acted somewhat impulsively and, later, paused to consider more carefully what they had done. Groups such as ACE's Committee on Institutional Programs Abroad engage in reappraisals of university participation in international programs almost annually. Searching questions relating to the programs are frequently posed by conferences on international development

as well as by sections of professional organizations such as the American Political Science Association. The result has been that American universities have begun to formalize their views about why international programs are appropriate university activities and to harmonize such views with the expectations of sponsoring agencies, and with basic government policy.

Tables 12 and 13 show what university and non-university personnel stated they believe to be the major expectations as to why universities perform international acts. The kinds of "reasons" used in Tables 12 and 13 are the same as those used in the IROP study.

The statements of university respondents indicating why universities are expected to perform international acts are fairly evenly distributed among the following three reasons, which are ranked (see Table 12) in terms of the frequency with which they were mentioned: (1) development of the cooperating countries abroad, (2) general advancement of knowledge, and (3) strengthening of the U.S. university. This order appears logically consistent with the previously reported statements of university respondents as to what acts are expected of universities in carrying out international programs (see Table 6). As shown in Table 6, university respondents most frequently stated that educational and economic acts are expected of universities in international programs. Obviously, both of these types of acts are related to the development of the cooperating foreign countries. Moreover, if the statements about "general advancement of knowledge" and "development of the cooperating country" in Table 12, Columns 8 and 9, are combined, that combination (approximately sixty per cent of the statements) is almost the same as the combination of statements made in the "educational" and "economic"

TABLE 12

FREQUENCY OF STATEMENTS BY UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL ABOUT "THE MOST IMPORTANT" REASON WHY U.S. UNIVERSITIES ARE EXPECTED TO CARRY OUT INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Reasons for International Programs (1)	Classification of University Personnel							
	Administrators Responding (N=152)		Teachers Responding (N=126)		Students Responding (N=25)		All Univ. Personnel Responding (N=303)	
	No. of Statements Made by Adminis. (2)	% of 152 Statements Made by Adminis. (3)	No. of Statements Made by Teachers (4)	% of 126 Statements Made by Teachers (5)	No. of Statements Made by Students (6)	% of 25 Statements Made by Students (7)	Total No. Statements Made by all Univ. Personnel (8)	% of 303 Statements Made by all Univ. Personnel (9)
General Advancement of Knowledge	20	19.7	36	28.5	23	92.0	89	29.4
Development of the Coop. For. Country	53	34.9	43	34.2	0	0.0	96	31.7
Strengthening of the U.S. University	43	28.3	31	24.6	1	4.0	75	24.8
Support of U.S. For. Policy Objectives	33	15.2	14	11.2	1	4.0	38	12.5
Other	3	1.9	2	1.5	0	0.0	5	1.6
Total	152	100.0	126	100.0	25	100.0	303	100.0

Note: Only the reason given as "the most important" by each respondent is recorded in Table 12; therefore, the number of statements is the same as the number of interviewees.

TABLE 13

FREQUENCY OF STATEMENTS BY NON-UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL ABOUT "THE MOST IMPORTANT" REASON WHY U.S. UNIVERSITIES ARE EXPECTED TO CARRY OUT INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Reasons for International Programs (1)	Classification of Non-University Personnel					
	Govt. Personnel Responding (N=87)		Found. Personnel Responding (N=23)		All Non-Univ. Personnel Responding (N=110)	
	No. of Statements Made by Government Personnel (2)	% of 87 Statements Made by Government Personnel (3)	No. of Statements Made by Foundation Personnel (4)	% of 23 Statements Made by Foundation Personnel (5)	No. of Statements Made by all Non-Univ. Per. (6)	% of 110 Statements Made by all Non-Univ. Per. (7)
General Advancement of Knowledge	0	0.0	2	8.7	2	1.8
Development of the Coop. Foreign Country	32	36.7	14	60.9	46	41.8
Strengthening of the U.S. University	1	1.2	4	17.4	5	4.5
Support of U.S. Foreign Policy Objectives	53	60.9	3	13.0	56	50.9
Other	1	1.2	0	0.0	1	1.0
Total	87	100.0	23	100.0	110	100.0

Note: Only the reason given as "the most important" by each respondent is recorded in Table 13; therefore, the number of statements is the same as the number of interviewees.

categories of Table 6, Columns 8 and 9. Such data suggest that the university respondents may be more consistent in relating what universities do in international programs with why they do it than casual observation might indicate.

While Table 12 shows that university administrators and teachers agreed, in terms of frequency of statements, on the predominant place of "development" in the rationale for international acts, these two groups diverged on other important points. First, in their statements the teachers tended to minimize to a greater degree the importance of supporting American foreign policy objectives than did administrators (11.2% of their statements as compared to 15.2% of the administrators'). Secondly, teachers apparently attached considerably more importance, on the basis of the relative frequency of their statements, to the advancement of knowledge as a reason for international acts than did administrators (28.5% of the statements tabulated as compared to 19.7%). The frequencies of these expressed attitudes appear consistent with those shown in relation to how universities are expected to perform international acts. For, in the latter instance, administrators made more frequent statements which favored government support than did teachers. Such attitudes may have contributed to university administrators' admitting more often than teachers the interrelatedness of American universities and government. Sociologists such as Robin Williams suggest that educational institutions are charged with the responsibility of perpetuating the dominant myths of American society, including political myths.[131] It is reasonable to assume that universities do not and can

---

[131] Robin Williams, American Society (New York: Alfred Knopf, Inc., 1951), pp. 265-303.

not completely disregard this responsibility simply because they operate internationally. This is only to suggest that the separation of politics and education are not as complete as many might have us believe.

Government respondents (see Table 13) apparently felt that university goals and political goals mix, for in 60.9 per cent of their statements they asserted that universities can be expected to support American foreign policy objectives through international programs. They tended to support this belief with a secondary group of statements suggesting that universities can be involved appropriately in the development of foreign countries. Government respondents' statements almost completely ignored the possibility that universities might be involved in international programs primarily to strengthen themselves and to advance knowledge in general. This distribution of statements by government respondents seems to suggest that in this particular instance government personnel perhaps do not believe their own public statements about the value of international programs to universities, statements they have often used to recruit universities to the fold. When choices involving identification were made, government respondents tended to identify with the major goals of their own occupational reference group, i.e., the government bureaucracy, and not with universities. Thus, political policy was of first importance in the statements of most government respondents, and anything the university could construe as a direct benefit to itself from participation in international programs was incidental and secondary. In so saying, it can be assumed that the government respondents tended to believe that everyone benefits from the successful pursuit of national policy goals, and that any other goals must be considered as subsidiary goals.

As expected, in view of the already demonstrated closeness of universities and foundations, statements by personnel of the latter generally showed a high degree of agreement, both in terms of content and relative frequency, with statements by university persons about expectations as to why universities are expected to perform international acts (see Tables 12 and 13, Columns 5 and 6). While foundation respondents did not mention as frequently as did university respondents "advancement of knowledge" and "strengthening of universities" as reasons why universities are expected to participate in international programs, neither did they link the universities very often to the government by their statements. This is not surprising, for to do so would link the government and the foundations to a greater extent than foundations probably were willing to admit publicly. At the same time, the foundations' interest in the "development" category, as expressed in terms of its frequent mention by foundation respondents, is probably closely linked to their own major international interests, which are mostly of a developmental nature.

As has been noted, other groups have previously asked university personnel to indicate why American universities participate in international programs. The first study, conducted and reported by the American Council on Education during 1956 and 1957, asked the following question of the presidents of 852 member institutions: "What are your views as to the broad purpose of international educational programs?" ACE received 433 responses to this question.

To gain perspective, some of the differences between the ACE study and the present study should be mentioned. The ACE study polled a somewhat more restricted class of university personnel, i.e.,

presidents, than did this study. In so doing, all presidents of universities with ACE membership were queried by questionnaire, and over fifty per cent responded. This meant that most of the respondents had never been directly associated with international programs, but were speaking primarily from indirect information. The present study, in comparison, has used, as its basic population, all university personnel who were considered knowledgeable in the field of international programs, irrespective of their university positions. In every case, the president was one of the knowledgeables, but since over 300 interviews were conducted, presidents constituted less than ten per cent of the respondent population. Unlike the ACE study, this study used a sample of the 184 universities with reported international programs; therefore, attention was focused on participating institutions. Lastly, interviews were used as the primary instrument of data collection, while mailed questionnaires were used in the ACE study.

Not only did the approach and techniques differ in the two studies, the nature of the questions asked by each was somewhat different. In the ACE study, the phrasing of the question was such that respondents' possession of information about why universities performed international acts was implied in the question. The ACE report of the study indicates clearly that the researchers acted as though they knew that the respondent university presidents knew the central reasons why universities in general felt certain international activities were appropriate for universities. The present study approached the problem in a less structured way, since its purpose was not precisely the same as that of ACE. Thus, ACE limited the respondent to one or more of six possible choices, while this study used open-ended interviews and then classified the responses into four basic categories.

Table 14 is an adaptation of the ACE report:

TABLE 14

BROAD PURPOSES OF UNIVERSITIES' INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS, ACCORDING TO PRESIDENTS OF UNIVERSITIES WITH ACE MEMBERSHIP

Purpose of Programs (1)	Number of Responses by Presidents		
	No. Selecting (2)	No. Objecting to (3)	No. Consider Secondary (4)
1. Encouraging of common understanding among nations	309	0	21
2. Strengthening of educational, scientific, and cultural resources of mankind	242	1	19
3. Enabling people of the U.S. to learn about, and benefit from their association with, peoples of other nations	191	2	44
4. Developing the economic or social structure of the cooperating foreign country	123	10	41
5. Acquainting the people of other nations with the strength and progress of the U.S.	89	21	53
6. Combatting Communism	88	17	59

Note: The number of selections exceeds the total number (405) of university presidents who answered this question in the ACE study, because some made more than one selection.

A fundamental problem in interpreting the ACE data arises from the fact that one does not know which responses were made by university presidents representing universities with international programs and which were made by university presidents with no direct participation

in or knowledge of programs. Moreover, it would be useful to know how many presidents of the larger institutions answered the question posed by ACE, since such universities presently have the largest numbers of international programs. It is possible that some universities with very active international programs are not included in the ACE results, for ACE's own tabulation[132] shows that only thirty-seven large to very large universities out of a respondent population of 405 answered the question from which the data for Table 14 were derived.

With these problems in mind, one can see in the ACE data tabulated in Table 14 some differences from the data presented in Table 12. The data in the present study emphasize the frequency with which the various respondents attach importance to expectations about the performance of economic acts. The ACE respondents ranked economic types of activities as fourth in importance out of a total choice of six purposes. Those respondents, who were all university presidents, displayed a strong tendency to stress the broad aims of encouraging "common understanding and strengthening the resources of mankind" over the more direct and concrete aims of developing another country economically. This is contrary to the reaction of university administrators in the present study, who tended to favor the more "practical" acts.

The somewhat less positive phrasing of purposes Five and Six in Table 14 may have contributed to their low ranking by university presidents; however, this ranking of purposes compares favorably to a ranking the relative frequency with which they were mentioned by all respondents in the present study. Interestingly, these purposes are characterized by the ACE respondents as "objectionable" far more frequently than are

---

[132]American Council on Education, op. cit., p. 14.

all other purposes combined (see Table 14, Column 3). Given the reported attitudes and statements of all university respondents in both studies, there is apparently considerable reluctance on the part of universities to incorporate overtly political objectives into their programs.

Unlike the present study, which suggested that university personnel were not eager, if we may judge from the frequency of university respondents' statements, to support foreign policy objectives directly through international programs, the ACE study finds the university presidents in a contradictory posture. Out of 384 replies, ACE found that 307 university presidents said that "program planning and development of educational policies" for international programs should be shared on an equal basis with the government or should "remain in the hands of the government."[133] ACE concludes by stating that American universities think it highly desirable to develop a partnership arrangement with the government. It is difficult to see how university presidents can reconcile full or partial operational and planning control by the government with their stated beliefs about the major purposes of international programs.

The ACE report described the following statement submitted independently by a university as an "interesting opinion:"

> It is essential that the Government continue to determine broad national foreign policy objectives within which private agencies must operate. Within these objectives, however, Government should recognize the tradition of autonomy and independence of our institutions of higher learning and of other voluntary agencies and should allow these institutions freedom of decision in all those professional and technical aspects of programs in which these institutions and agencies are best qualified to make decisions.[134]

---

[133] Ibid, p. 11.

[134] Ibid, p. 11.

Such a statement fairly accurately describes the "ideal" positions of many university administrators and teachers interviewed for the present study. Since two years separated the studies, the changing of attitudes suggested by a comparison of the ACE report and the present study may be indicative of the development possible closer cooperative relationships between universities and the government in the field of international programs. What may actually have been lacking in the government-university endeavor in international relations, according to the top financial officer of a large western university, has not been the creation and growth of cooperative relationships (they have existed all the time), but the realization and acknowledgment of their existence and implications.

The Institute of Research on Overseas Programs has contributed the second study relevant to a determination of why American universities perform international acts. The IROP study completed in 1958 reports the opinions of certain persons on the home campuses of participating universities. Such persons frequently bear the title of "coordinator" and can be found anywhere in the administrative hierarchy of a university, but they most frequently fall somewhere near the "middle management" level. Table 15, utilizing the same categories that are used in the present study, shows what program coordinators reported to be the reasons why their universities adopted international programs. The responding coordinators were asked to rank the four possible reasons indicated in Tables 12, 13, and 15. When reasons ranked respectively first, second, third, or fourth in importance were scored, respectively, 4-3-2-1, the following results were obtained:

TABLE 15

RANKING OF COORDINATORS' OPINIONS AS TO THE REASONS THEIR UNIVERSITIES HAVE ADOPTED INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS[135]

Reasons for Adoption of Programs	Points received on the Basis of Coordinators' Ranking
General Advancement of Knowledge	746
United States Foreign Policy Objectives	722
Development of the Cooperating Country	678
Strengthening American University	613

The writers of the IROP study noted the contrast between their findings and those reported in the ACE study. They attributed these differences to two factors: (1) the questions were presented in different ways, with markedly different wording, and (2) coordinators responsible for on-going programs were queried in the IROP study, but university presidents were queried in the ACE study.[136] Combining statements of presidents, coordinators, teachers, and students (see Table 12), the findings of the present study in the area of "why international programs?" are closer to those reported by IROP than to those of ACE. Part of this greater similarity is probably related to the fact that both the IROP study and the present study worked with respondents within universities that had international programs. But there the similarity ends, for IROP like ACE used mail questionnaires which offered the respondents a precisely limited number of choices. As has

[135] IROP, op. cit., pp. 50-51.

[136] Ibid, pp. 51-52.

been explained, the data-gathering procedures used in this study differed considerably from those used by IROP and ACE.

While the reports of the three studies relative to why American universities perform international acts, as summarized in Tables 12, 14, and 15, may tend to leave the impression that the state of thought on this question is confused if not chaotic, such may be only partially the case. As has been mentioned in Chapters I and III of this study, university personnel appear to be somewhat bewildered about the impacts and implications of international programs. Although international programs in general are not new to universities, the large-scale programs involving whole universities are the offspring of a very recent era in international relations. In such circumstances, perhaps one can sympathize with universities in their struggles to comprehend the ramifications of their present international activities.

Amidst the confusion, there is evidence in the findings of the three aforementioned studies that American universities have consistently felt rather strongly that they have been primarily "exporters" in the educational field since World War II. In an administrative sense (more money, new staff, added prestige, etc.), some universities may have gained at home, but few of the respondents appear convinced that the overseas "imports" resulting from the venture have had a significant, substantive influence on American education and/or culture. Closer attention will be devoted to this proposition and its implications in Chapter V.

Summary and Conclusion

Judging from the statements of knowledgeables in the field of international programs, the following appear to be prominent expectations

held by them at the time they were interviewed with regard to what universities are expected to do in international relations, how universities are expected to do such things, and why universities are expected to perform in such a fashion.

1) a. University respondents stated most frequently that they believed that universities are expected to perform international acts that are primarily economic and/or educational in nature. Apparently they are seldom expected to perform political or ideological acts.

b. Non-university personnel representing sponsoring organizations stated they believed, by a small margin of frequency, that universities can be expected to perform political acts through international programs. The second most frequently stated expectation of this group was that universities are expected to perform educational, cross-cultural, and economic acts. Those respondents emphasizing that political acts are expected were almost exclusively government personnel, and those emphasizing expectations about other kinds of acts were almost exclusively foundation personnel.

c. Such stated expectations by all parties are not wholly in accord with the reported pattern of international programs presently operative. Currently operative programs appear to be primarily in cross-cultural and humanitarian fields.

2) University respondents most frequently stated they believed that international programs should be performed primarily through the sending of American faculty and staff abroad, and that such personnel should be abroad within the framework of a university-to-

university relationship. Financial support for the programs was to be expected almost equally from government and foundation sources, according to the statements of university personnel.

3) Statements by university respondents as to why American universities are expected to perform international acts fell with almost equal frequencies into the following three categories:

   a. development of the cooperating country

   b. general advancement of knowledge

   c. strengthening of American university

   The frequencies with which universities openly supported execution of American foreign policy objectives through international programs were very low. This is in contrast to the frequent statements of non-university respondents that American universities' international programs are expected to support foreign policy objectives.

The data indicate that the American universities engaged in international programs, if the interviewed personnel speak for them, identify primarily with service symbols. They serve the nation and they serve the world through the skilled employment of specialized knowledge. In performing such services, they stress their independence, and underscore it by insisting on special operational arrangements as a precondition of service. This "service-for-other-persons" orientation is somewhat inverted by the universities' preoccupation with the monopolization of this service activity by their own personnel. They do not appear to promote sharing the work with other types of personnel, such as government officials. These educators' satisfactions are intimately connected with personal involvement possessing a high reward potential. The rewards in the minds of university respondents are primarily personal

and only incidentally institutional in many cases, although some universities manipulate international programs for prestige purposes. The data tend to suggest that university personnel in their personal, stated expectations and symbol attachments are attempting to personalize international programs within the university structure. The possibilities of this development and some potential ramifications are explored in the following chapters.

In looking back over their decade of intensified involvement in and awareness of international programs, university respondents spoke as though they are still unclear as to the effects of international programs on American universities or the roles of universities in international relations. They appeared caught in a web of doubts about the appropriateness of university participation in international programs, hopes for improvement in the international arena, strivings for prestige, and fears of diminishing independence. Given this web, it is not surprising to find considerable divergence of opinion among university personnel.

CHAPTER V

EXAMINATION OF THE GUIDING HYPOTHESES (PART I)

Three major sets of hypotheses (see Chapter I) were developed as guidelines for this study. Thus far the general context in which the hypotheses are to be tested has been explained by means of the historical materials in Chapter III and the hypotheses have been tested to some extent against the respondents' statements about those things that are expected of universities' international programs (Chapter IV). We may now examine the hypotheses further in the light of the interview data gathered for this study. Since the data do not lend themselves to highly sophisticated statistical analysis and interpretation, it is not claimed that they provide sufficient evidence for rejection or acceptance of any of the hypotheses. Frankly, the data are more suggestive than definitive, and they offer only a first description of activities and sets of relationships in a rapid state of change.

To facilitate the reading, the hypotheses and sub-hypotheses are repeated in this chapter. Following the statement of each hypothesis and sub-hypothesis, the relevant data from the 303 interviews are described.

Hypothesis I:

> Since most American university personnel do not differentiate between the sorts of demands various societies place on their elites of knowledge, they tend to believe that the primary educational role of American universities in international relations is to provide more or less uniform academic training for all persons, irrespective of their national backgrounds or social status; and that such training will and should equip all those persons with a variety of skills especially valued by literate, industrialized societies.

Hypothesis I was approached from several directions in the interviews. The interviewers did not ask the respondents to explain or describe in any precise manner their perceptions of the expectations any society holds relative to elites of knowledge. Instead, the respondents were asked, in effect, to compare the social demands to which elites of knowledge in the United States must respond with the same class of phenomena in other societies about which they had knowledge. The respondents usually described important features of demands made upon elites of knowledge, but did not formulate elaborate descriptions of the dynamics of elites of knowledge in various societies. Sophisticated and well-considered replies hardly could be expected to result from a relatively brief interview focused on international programs. However, the process of thinking and talking about possible similarities and differences among elites of knowledge yielded the following suggestive material:

1) American university respondents felt strongly that their society expects them to expend their major efforts on activities which will contribute most directly to the equipping of members of their society with basically utilitarian skills.[137]

2) American university respondents felt strongly that other societies whose nationals attend American universities expect that such persons will emerge from their American educational experiences equipped with those skill attributes which are the usual outcome of an American education, and that such skills will be useful in their own societies.

---

[137] This is in general accord with the findings of sociologists. For example, see Robin Williams, American Society (New York: Knopf & Co., 1952).

Given these initial reactions to questions aimed at eliciting some comparative comments from the respondents, it is apparent that amplification of the remarks is in order. The reader will recall that 303 American university personnel contributed their comments about what roles American universities are performing in international relations through international programs. An emphasis which might be characterized as a "service emphasis," as described after numeral 1), above, was quite clearly the primary characteristic of over sixty per cent of the responses. The second most significant grouping of responses about what is expected of elites of knowledge in the United States took the form of such common educational phrases as "pushing back the frontiers of knowledge," "adding to man's storehouse of knowledge," and "the pursuit of truth." The university respondents then, tended to perceive American elites of knowledge, with whom they identified themselves, as, in the first instance, responsive to if not subordinate to the demands of other elite groups, and even of mass groups, in society. They did not feel that elites of knowledge dominate or that such groups are especially strong within the total context of American society. Educational elites tend to exhibit more dependence than independence and/or leadership generally, according to most of the respondents. This is not to suggest that the respondents felt that university personnel did not make crucial contributions to American society, but rather, to indicate that university personnel do not occupy the most important, strategic power positions in the United States.

Imbued with a feeling of service to society and mankind generally, American university respondents appeared to maintain a similar or closely related posture toward those foreigners who participate in

American university education as a result of international programs. (See comments following numeral 2 above.) Apparently confident of the universities' contributions to the growth of American well-being, over seventy per cent of the university respondents stated they believe that leadership groups in other societies expect the same things of an American education for their nationals as Americans expect for their own nationals. In taking this approach American university respondents stated very frequently that foreigners educated in the American way will move upward in the power pyramids of their respective nations just as university-educated Americans (as opposed to university teachers) tend to dominate the American power pyramid.[138]

Although the foregoing attitudes appeared to be widespread among the university respondents, several other factors which should be noted appeared frequently in the respondents' statements. First, almost half of those who expressed themselves in the foregoing ways also expressed considerable dissatisfaction with such a role for universities as well as its implications. This group of "dissenters" emphasized that "society" expected the foregoing kinds of activity of the elites of knowledge, and that they as part of the elite group saw this as only one facet of a multi-faceted general role the universities and their personnel were performing for society. Such emphasis by the respondents on a qualifying statement appears to be a possible manifestation of the discomfort many American university respondents felt about their status in society.

---

[138]This proposition has been critically examined in John Useem and Ruth H. Useem, The Western Educated Man in India (New York: Dryden Press, 1955), especially Chapter 4; and John W. Bennett, et al., In Search of Identity (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958), especially Part II.

Second, in addition to justifying an approach which does not differentiate between the demands various societies place on their university-educated members, and which assumes that American education provides a key to the well-being of all men, about twenty per cent of the respondents also made statements which indicated that they believed the power elites of those nations that send their nationals to be educated in the United States want American skills imparted. To substantiate this, the respondents cited numerous examples of political leaders and deans and presidents of foreign universities who insisted on regular degree programs for their nationals who attend American universities. The respondents tended to feel that such leadership groups want academic degrees for their nationals even if it means possible Americanization of their nationals. Such influences by foreign elites as well as the attitudes and activities of those foreigners studying at American universities with whom the respondents had contact, apparently seemed to the majority of American university respondents to minimize the problems of transferring skills learned in one culture to another culture.[139]

Of course, a large part of the educational processes in which American university personnel interact with foreigners occurs outside of the physical framework of an American university. Although international programs result in many foreigners being on American campuses, these same programs are also vehicles through which great numbers of

---

[139]Despite considerable research and theoretical writing which questions the ease of cultural transferability or at least enumerates the considerable difficulties involved in such a process (e.g., Homer Barnett, Innovation: The Basis of Cultural Change (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953)), a significant number of American university personnel assumed important parts of the American experience can be exported almost intact.

American university personnel go abroad.[140] While abroad under international programs, however, American university personnel, according to recent evidence, appear to perform very much the same kinds of functions they performed at home.[141] Whether the content of their activities differs significantly abroad is a matter of conjecture. It appears somewhat unlikely that the American university personnel would have altered their behavior abroad so markedly that it no longer represented what they customarily did under similar titles in the United States. Thus, over eighty per cent of those university respondents who had worked abroad in international programs stated that the substance of what they did abroad did not differ from their home efforts. The circumstances in which they operated were usually quite new, but even under new conditions, these respondents most frequently emphasized, their role was one primarily of imparting American skills and achievements to the cooperating country. Consequently, we find the American university respondents stating that many university persons operate abroad not as imaginative, creative innovators, but as conveyors of methods and ideas which they think have been successful in the United States. Confronted with this development and by the popular suspicions concerning foreign programs, a minority of university respondents questioned the appropriateness of such activities under university auspices. A few of the respondents actually condemned international programs "out of hand" during the interviews. As we shall see when

---

[140] Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, The International Programs of American Universities: An Inventory and Analysis (East Lansing, Michigan: Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, October 1958), pp. 37-38.

[141] Ibid, p. 39.

examining the sub-hypotheses, an elaborate explanation of this type of role has been provided by the university respondents affected by it.

Perhaps because "equality" is one of the sustaining myths of American democracy, considerably less than half of the American university respondents considered national differences and social status of the foreigners to be a significant variable in the conduct of international programs. The air of assurance among the university respondents that the nature and content of university programs should be very similar for all persons irrespective of their socio-cultural backgrounds appeared very strong. The respondents indicated that they had made a variety of "adjustments" to accommodate the particular needs of some foreigners on American campuses, but in so doing they generally felt that the basic qualities and characteristics of an American education remained intact.[142] The same group also tended to agree that such qualities were primarily skills and knowledge appropriate for literate, industrialized societies.

The comments of the respondents thus far suggest quite strongly that Hypothesis I represents a fairly accurate description of the general perceptual framework within which university knowledgeables construct their images of the primary international activities of American universities. Although this group of university personnel has had close contact with international programs, the group's major psychological commitment tends to remain with the broad "system" of higher education in the United States. Such a commitment, heavily reinforced

---

[142] For supporting and related comments see Institute of International Education, Committee on Educational Interchange Policy, College and University Programs of Academic Exchange, pamphlet issued March 1960, pp. 7-10.

by the American cultural experience, appears to result in a primary emphasis on the "exporter" role, as was noted earlier. This often means that many international programs represent an effort by American universities to be "supermarkets"[143] from which elite groups from other societies select according to their perceptions of their needs and the willingness of someone to pay for the choice. In the selection process several influences tend to have the effect that the selected culture traits are not substantially altered through the process of transfer or attempted transfer from the United States to another country. First, the foreign selectors are frequently operating from the disadvantage of weakness, misinformation, etc., when making their choices. Those at the greatest disadvantage are, of course, persons from extremely underdeveloped countries, which frequently lack the strength and stability to formulate and demand programs appropriate for their needs. Second, sponsors, as we have seen, are prone to support international programs which are representative of the important areas of strength, imagined or real, of American higher education. An underlying assumption of their support appears to be that the utility of these areas of strength will not be lost through cross-cultural interaction and transferance. Third, American universities and their personnel seem to take considerable pride in their achievements, and when such achievements involve them in international programs, they tend to incorporate those achievements into the operation of their programs in their original or ideal form.

---

[143] This position was vigorously championed at a May 1960 meeting at the University of Michigan concerned with international development programs. It is strongly condemned in Walter Adams and John Garraty, Is the World Our Campus? (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1960).

Having said this much about their perceptions of American universities as part of the broad phenomenon of international relations, the university respondents tended to suggest that such activities may have much less than the desired impact on other societies. Thus, while this group of respondents stated that fundamentally American universities do abroad what they do at home and that the education or experience they offer foreigners in the United States is comparable to that offered to their own nationals, they also acknowledged serious doubts that the efforts of American universities have had or will have a significant, enduring impact on cooperating countries. Their feelings might be summarized in the following way:

TABLE 16

COMMENTS BY U.S. UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL ON ASPECTS OF THE IMPACT OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS ON COOPERATING FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Aspects of the Impact	% of 303 University Persons Who Said:			Total
1. Acceptability of impact to cooperating countries	Programs have considerable acceptability	Programs have modest acceptability	Programs have minimal acceptability	
	10.0	45.0	45.0	100.0
2. Extent of impact on cooperating countries	The extent of programs' impact was considerable	The extent of programs' impact was modest	The extent of programs' impact was minimal	
	10.0	35.0	55.0	100.0
3. Duration of impact in cooperating countries	Duration of impact was fairly permanent	Duration of impact was moderate	Duration of impact was brief	
	10.0	50.0	45.0	100.0

This rather gross and unsophisticated picture of how this group of American university respondents said they felt about the impact of international programs on cooperating countries is presented primarily to indicate that such persons were not by any means confident of the outcome of their previously described operational methods and assumptions. Moreover, in speaking of impact in this context, the reference is to intended or explicit goals of given programs. Consequently, the university respondents evidently felt that they are a long way from realizing most of the announced goals of international programs. Notwithstanding the possibility that university efforts may not have always "hit the mark," the university respondents frequently expressed awareness that universities may have had considerable "unintended" impact abroad. Indeed, such "unintended" impacts have provided the raw material for the bulk of critical writing about universities in international programs.

Interlaced with these stated doubts on the part of university respondents about the over-all impact of international programs was a belief that the foreign "participant" who studies in the United States possesses a potential for impact on his home society that is greater than that possessed by Americans who work in that society. Most of the respondents said they believed that the content of such impact is essentially American in character; that its incidence is continuing; that its full flowering will occur at some time in the future; that its extent will be widespread; and that its staying power will be enormous. Such a belief, stated by over eighty per cent of those respondents who have had direct contact with participant programs, appears to be another manifestation of their commitment to the exporter role, which reinforces

the respondents' already stated beliefs in the efficacy of training non-nationals in the behavior and skill patterns used by Americans. Also, the respondents' emphasis on the enormous value of participants who return to their countries, relieve Americans operating there, and assume leadership positions, highlights some of the doubts and reservations many university respondents held relative to their own effectiveness in foreign countries, notwithstanding their personal desire to have an overseas experience.

While most of the international programs which emphasize American students abroad and foreign faculty in the United States would seem to imply the "importation" of non-American skills and knowledge and thereby influence upon the American outlook on the world, there is also an export side to that story. With regard to American students abroad under international programs, there existed a feeling among nearly ninety per cent of the respondents that an important role of such students is as "ambassadors of America." They did not deny or strongly discount the educational value to Americans of such programs or the "other-cultural" effects they have on American students, but they mentioned with a frequency suggesting great approval the diffusion by the students of American cultural traits.[144] University respondents, in their statements, balanced the impact of the foreign professor on

---

[144] Since the development of the Smith and Delaware study-abroad programs before World War II, the study-abroad idea has escaped critical or hostile evaluation. The value of the programs was never seriously questioned, although isolated university professors suspected that the student didn't get as much academically out of them as he would have out of an equal amount of time in an American university. Consequently, the impact of the highly critical appraisal of the programs by Garraty and Adams in international education circles has been substantial. See John A. Garraty and Walter Adams, From Main Street to the Left Bank (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1959).

American education by statements indicating that many such persons are Americanized and incorporated into university faculties permanently, that few have extensive, lasting, contacts in the United States, that most are overwhelmed by their American university environment and experiences, and that most leave the United States carrying away far more than they left. The net impression among university respondents appeared to be that the United States has so much to offer in the field of higher education technique and substance that only the most hardy who come in contact with it can avoid being impressed.

If in many of these responses related to Hypothesis I, American university respondents seemed to be "begging the question" or seemed to be ambivalent, such may well have been the case. What emerged from the respondents discussing the kinds of things implicit in Hypothesis I is a picture of a group of people, assumed to be knowledgeable in the area of international programs, who expressed a variety of doubts about the abilities of university personnel in specific kinds of programs and situations, but who have a stable commitment to a particular type of institution, the American university, and to its educational contents and methods. This suggests that American university respondents believed that they have the important essentials to put into international relations, but that the appropriate framework for action is lacking. This belief will be examined in greater detail in the discussion of Hypothesis III.

Materials presented in Chapter IV indicate the kinds of acts American universities are expected to perform in international relations (for a summary see Tables 6 and 7). With that as background, the respondents' comments have been analyzed to determine their perceptions

of the kinds of outcomes and impacts international programs have with respect to the international arena in general. Thus, in Chapter IV we were introduced to the acts themselves, and at this point we are concerned primarily with the impact of these acts in terms of Hypotheses I (Ia, Ib, and Ic).

Hypothesis (Ia):

> American university personnel tend to believe that through participation in international programs American universities are contributing significantly to the training/education of foreign elites/leaders.

It has been suggested in this study that to a large extent American university respondents indicated in their statements a belief that those foreigners who are involved in cooperative and/or training relationships with Americans through international programs represent actual or potential leaders in their own countries. When asked specifically about the characteristics of this group of foreigners, university respondents commented as follows:

1) Approximately seventy per cent drew the typical foreigner's profile as, (a) a person carefully selected for his experience, (b) a person representative of his country's aspirations, (c) a person capable of functioning as a vehicle for cultural diffusion, and, (d) a person destined to replace the skilled foreign personnel presently operating in his country.
2) Approximately fifty per cent viewed him as about the equal of the average American student at his academic level, after making allowance for language differences.
3) Less than ten per cent were seriously concerned about the home societies' abilities to absorb fruitfully those persons

who have been the objects of American training. This important subject which has received considerable attention in the literature on underdeveloped areas is seldom examined critically by many university personnel, if the comments of the interviewees involved in this study were representative.

4) Almost all of the respondents stated that since they as educators tend to deal with elite groups and/or sub-elites, and since they are immersing such groups in the "American experience," the result will be a more friendly posture on the part of the cooperating countries toward the United States.

The pervasive belief among the university respondents that universities are working with actual and/or potential leaders of other countries through international programs may have resulted from their oversight of at least two significant facts. In the first place, about fifteen per cent of the respondents either stated or suggested that many of the non-nationals selected for contact with American university programs appeared to be "expendable" in their societies. That is, some countries simply cannot afford to release elite personnel even temporarily, no matter what the long-range benefits may be. The immediate attempts to stabilize control and encourage national development in some underdeveloped countries demand the full-time attention of all the elites, actual or potential, even those of early college age. Thus, when opportunities for participation in an international program involving work in the United States, in particular, are presented, such opportunities must frequently be foregone or filled with persons who can be spared. Frequently the person who can be spared has little future as

a leader in his own country. The general nature of the American respondents' comments seemed to indicate that they thought of social mobility in broad, ideal American terms. Consequently, it apparently seemed natural to them to assume that education in the United States would enhance upward mobility, or guarantee eliteship, of all foreigners who experienced it. It appears probable, then, that universities in general may have an important "blind spot" in their perceptions about the kinds of persons they are training.

It has already been stated that the university respondents made some fairly facile assumptions about how readily American-trained foreigners are re-absorbed in their home countries.[145] Also, it has been pointed out that research on this aspect of international education offers very little evidence to support such assumptions. The general trend of such research findings is cautious to pessimistic on the subject. Therefore, very critical re-examination of Hypothesis (Ia) by universities seems to be an appropriate suggestion.

A second oversight on the part of university persons might exist in the area of what kinds of elites result from contact with American university experiences. From participation in international programs there may very well result several kinds of personnel types. One could be the elite type who returns to a place in his society in which he can exercise great influence. This was the ideal case apparently envisaged by most university respondents. A second could be the person who is temporarily expendable and who will return to his society to pick up the old things he left, and never will alter them radically. A third

---

[145] An example of this highly optimistic point of view is Harold E. Snyder, When Peoples Speak to Peoples (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1953).

could be the person who returns from his international program experiences to find his way to elite status blocked. Equipped with new skills and concepts as a result of his experience and unable to utilize them to his satisfaction, such a person may become part of a counter-elite structure threatening the existence of the recognized elite structure. Evidence on the frequency of occurrence of the third alternative is just barely beginning to emerge.[146] Less than five per cent of the respondents mentioned this last development directly, although several who chose other alternatives suggested that it is possible for international programs to breed dissident elements.

Hypothesis (Ib):

> American university personnel tend to believe that through participation in international programs American universities make significant contributions to the international policies of the United States.

and

Hypothesis (Ic):

> American university personnel tend to believe that through participation in international programs American universities make significant contributions to the general welfare of mankind, e.g., to humanitarian activities, expansion of educational facilities, diffusion and growth of knowledge, mutual understanding, etc.

The data in Chapter IV about what kinds of acts are expected of American universities in international relations suggest that the universities are sometimes performing acts which they felt were not expected of them by all parties involved in international programs. This situation has apparently generated considerable ambivalence if not

---

[146] Early questioning voices were raised in Gunnar Myrdal, An International Economy: Problems and Prospects (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956) and Rich Lands and Poor (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957); and earlier in Bert F. Hoselitz (ed.), The Progress of Underdeveloped Areas (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952).

confusion among university personnel as to how one comes to grips with the problems raised. Given these unsettled conditions, it was not surprising to find similar confusion among the university respondents when questions about the impacts or outcomes of the international programs were raised.

Just as the university respondents tended to deny or ignore the fact that American universities are frequently expected to perform political acts through international programs (see Table 6), they tended to deny that those acts universities do perform contribute directly to the short-range and/or medium-range international policies of the United States Government. In other words, the respondents rejected overwhelmingly the view anticipated by Hypothesis (Ib). This appears, however, to be a surface rejection; for upon probing, the respondents showed signs of objecting to the impact suggested by Hypothesis (Ib) because to them it implied direct support of the American Government's foreign policy. The graduate dean of a large Ivy League university denied with considerable heat what he believed to be the political implications in questions related to this hypothesis.[147] Any questions which involved the universities in direct political impact related to the international policies of the United States consistently evoked primarily negative responses. That this may be an unrealistic view of international programs on the part of universities has already been suggested. The lack of realism involved in such perceptions and the disservice to international programs and American universities which appears to result from such perceptions were described by Richard Adams at a conference on

---

[147] BJ-73.

international development.[148] Adams stated that a major portion of what universities do in conjunction with other countries through international programs bears the American political imprint. His listeners, most of whom represented American universities, responded with various degrees of outrage and offense.

By comparison, it appeared to be a simple matter for the respondents to identify themselves with program impact of a more humanistic, less nationalistic and less specific nature as outlined in Hypothesis (Ic). Nearly every university respondent asserted that actual or potential humanitarian, educational, etc., benefits could flow from international programs. Questions which suggested that programs with such orientations might make positive, but indirect, contributions to American international policies were received with equal approval. Thus, from all of the confusion about what kinds of acts American universities are expected to perform and what general outcomes might result, there appeared to emerge a feeling among the university respondents that universities through international programs are committed to do worthwhile, humane things, that such things will improve the world situation, and that such improvements have an indirect, favorable effect on the United States. The issue of the directness of relationships between universities and politics is far from resolved domestically, and barely formulated internationally.[149]

---

[148] Remarks by Dr. Richard N. Adams, Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Michigan State University, at the International Development Conference, University of Michigan, May 17, 1960.

[149] The latest discussion in this area occurred at the Seventeenth American Assembly, May 6-8, 1960. For a report of the meeting see Douglas Knight (ed.), The Federal Government and Higher Education (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1960).

Hypothesis (Id):

> American university personnel tend to believe that international programs provide an impressive demonstration of the nature and importance of foreign persons and events, and that this makes a positive contribution to the education and development of most American university personnel, both students and staff.

All but a small minority of the university respondents agreed that their participation in international programs increased their awareness of things foreign. Approximately sixty per cent of the respondents concurred in describing their experiences related to international programs as "impressive." By this they generally meant a favorable impression. About twenty-five per cent were less enthusiastic about their impressions, but still positive in their perceptions. The remaining fifteen per cent were either indifferent or negatively impressed. Whatever the direction of the respondents' feelings, they almost all asserted that international programs left a mark on them and the institutions they represented. Of course, it must be acknowledged that since all of the respondents are knowledgeables in the field, a contrary result would have been very surprising. Although this study offers no systematic data to describe the views of non-knowledgeables on the same subject, enough incidental data were gathered to hint at a strong "don't know and don't care" attitude "as long as they don't affect me," among the non-knowledgeables.

Over seventy per cent of the respondents said they increased their valuation of foreign things and persons by becoming aware of things and persons foreign through international programs. For those persons and publics already favorably disposed toward internationalism, any such process which tends to increase the value of things foreign in the eyes of an elite group such as university personnel represents a

significant advance. Only a very few persons devalued the "foreign" after their experiences with international programs. Not only did those who had a positive reaction to their experiences increase their valuation of other cultures, but they also claimed to have gained a more "realistic" picture of the rest of the world. About forty per cent of those who had "positive" images of foreign cultures admitted that they had created their original favorable images of those cultures almost entirely through the eyes of others, never having experienced for themselves that which they extolled. International programs had given them an opportunity for direct experience, and they felt that their former images had been altered in the direction of more concreteness. Significantly, the process did not dim their favorable attitudes, but tended to give these attitudes new meaning which the respondents described as "realistic."

As long as the question of the impact of international programs was kept on a personal or very general level, the respondents reacted positively to them. Thus, the university respondents overwhelmingly said they felt that international programs have had a significant impact on them as persons. They have increased their international awareness, they have improved their financial positions, they have satisfied completely or partially long-felt desires to travel, they have increased their social prestige levels, etc., through contact with international programs.[150] Depending on their ages, professional statuses, and academic ranks, the respondents felt they gained or lost professional stature as a result of their international program experience. Generally, if the respondent were old, a full professor, and at or past his

---

[150]For a critical appraisal of these kinds of impacts on university personnel see Adams and Garraty, op. cit.

professional peak, he tended to value nearly all aspects of his experience positively. If the respondent were moderately young, below or at the associate professor level, and in the midst of professional acclaim or "just arriving," he tended to be quite ambivalent in his personal evaluation of the experience once he had acknowledged the aforementioned improvements in his position. These comments are most appropriate for university respondents who participated in the large-scale ICA and foundation programs. Since smaller programs tend to be more of a personal venture or responsibility, the likelihood that they will result in negative personal images is apparently small.

These types of personal impacts and images reflect current uncertainties, misgivings, misunderstandings, etc. about how university personnel are rewarded, within the framework of their most valued society, the academic community, for service related to international programs. The most persistent personal concern among university respondents was finding aspects of international programs which could be used to justify promotions, or at least recognition, on university campuses. Depending again on the respondents' perceptions of their professional and university statuses, they expressed satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the current methods of gearing academic rewards to participation in international programs. Those most secure expressed few misgivings, and those least secure were overwhelmed with concern and disappointment. Over seventy per cent of all the respondents, however, suggested that much remains to be done before academic-professional rewards for the individual are satisfactorily related to international programs.

Hypothesis (Ie):

> American university personnel tend to believe that international programs are important sources of stimulation, through the presence of non-nationals on American university campuses and because of the foreign experiences of university personnel, for changes in curricula, for expansion of all activities related to international events, and for the growth of cosmopolitan attitudes among university personnel.

Separately or in combination, the presence of foreigners on American campuses and/or the foreign experiences of American university personnel are sources of stimulation for universities, according to ninety-five per cent of the respondents. Of this group, eighty-five per cent described the stimulation as worthwhile in terms of the effects produced.

The "favorable" group above praised international programs for the following reasons, listed in order of frequency of mention:

1) The programs increased awareness and interest in international affairs among students and faculty.
2) The programs emphasized cultural differences and similarities.
3) The programs enriched the content of courses by providing ready cross-cultural examples.
4) The programs improved "world understanding."
5) The programs fostered the expansion of activities associated with international events.
6) The programs fostered curricular changes favoring increased international content of courses.[151]

The few who dissented recognized the stimulation as important, but questioned the wisdom of its expansion throughout universities. The

---

[151]For a related and more detailed examination of this kind of impact see Harlan Cleveland, et al., The Overseas Americans (New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1960), especially Part Four, "The Meaning For Education."

crux of their doubts was that perhaps American universities are being over-stimulated by the glamour of international programs. Further, such over-stimulation might result in an inappropriate allocation of university resources which would ultimately damage implementation of the over-all responsibilities of the universities to American society. Some put it bluntly by saying that the best way to expand any program on certain campuses was to "give it an international dimension," real or imaginary. Probably this is an exaggeration in the vast majority of instances, since it was mentioned by only a small percentage of the respondents, but it does reflect a degree of anxiety among university personnel who are generally involved with and well disposed toward international programs. It seems probable that if the remainder of the American academic community were confronted with the same question, their reactions might offer support to the dissenters.

From a broad point of view, Hypothesis (Ie) describes a widespread perception the university respondents have had or still have about one facet of the impact of international programs on American universities. That the hypothesis is not specific about the changes wrought by international programs on "Curriculum X," or that the data offer no precise areas of agreement is readily admitted. Most attempts by the interviewers to elicit from the respondents concrete examples of changes which could be related primarily to international programs met with very little success. Occasionally a respondent would cite the development of a course or the establishment of an institute as a direct outgrowth of an international program, but this occurred rarely. The majority of respondents preferred to state that changes in the "general attitude" toward international affairs had occurred, thereby maintaining a high level of generality and a low level of commitment.

Hypothesis (If):

> American university personnel tend to believe that participation in international programs tends to enhance the prestige of the universities involved.

Only thirteen of the 303 respondents stated that international programs had detracted from the prestige of American universities in general. As long as the question was formulated to include all aspects of the classes "university" and "international program," the university respondents generally said they could detect some increase in the status of universities and relate this increase in status to international programs. The precise degree to which universities' prestige had been enhanced was far more controversial. Of those respondents seeing signs of greater prestige, fifteen per cent described it as "considerable," twenty per cent as "moderate," forty per cent as "modest," and twenty-five per cent as "very slight."

Second, only ten per cent of the respondents seemed to feel that their own universities had suffered any diminution of prestige as a result of participation in international programs. Such a decline was usually linked to a remembrance of an embarrassing failure or incident related to an international program in which their institutions were involved. As might be expected, a direct correlation existed between a respondent's own feelings that his university's ventures had been successful and his perception of his university's prestige level. No respondent described his university's international programs as "successful" in his own scheme of evaluation and then cited a loss of prestige by his university as a consequence of the programs.

However, respondents frequently pointed out what they felt were program "failures" at other universities which led to a decline in the

prestige of those universities. Sixty per cent mentioned such failures on the parts of other universities. There appeared to be a strong tendency for the respondents to be critical of specific universities and their international programs, but when the total picture involving all universities was presented for evaluation and comment the respondents' statements were far less critical. Thus, in the process of generalizing, many areas of contention and disagreement were smoothed over by the respondents.

Fourth, the university respondents tended to feel that if participation in international programs has had a positive effect on university prestige, the effect has been greatest on the universities' prestige in the eyes of persons outside the academic profession. But on the professional level, among university personnel themsleves, there appeared to be somewhat less confidence and solidarity. Basically, the doubts about prestige enhancement apparently have been confined to university circles and a few immediate audiences, and the general public has been given glowing accounts of international programs by universities for the most part. It is only since 1959 that the disagreements about the value of international programs have begun to attract much attention in the mass media.

Hypothesis (Ig):

> American university personnel tend to believe that in many cases participation in international programs results in additions to university faculties and the development of new areas of interest and competence.

In a sense, Hypothesis (Ig) is an amplification or extension of Hypothesis (If); therefore, respondents tended to greet it with the same level of acceptance which they accorded the foregoing "prestige" hypothesis. Hypothesis (Ig) was developed by the author as a result of

examining the questionnaires returned for the IROP study. Those questionnaires indicated that approximately seventy-five per cent of the universities having fairly large-scale ICA and foundation programs (ninety-six out of a total of 184 international programs could be described as "fairly large scale") had recruited personnel from other universities to staff their programs at least in part.[152] This being the case, it seemed probable that such "recruiting" and "borrowing" might lead to permanent additions to the staffs of the borrowing universities.

While discussing the relationship of international programs to university prestige the interviewers interjected questions aimed at testing Hypothesis (Ig). At those universities having only small, academic programs involving student tours, student exchanges, faculty exchanges, or visiting professors, no evidence was found to substantiate the hypothesis. A few isolated examples of new faculty members being hired for or as a result of international programs were found, but there was evidence that many other factors may have been relevant, also. But at universities responsible for the ninety-eight "assistance-type" programs, sixty-five per cent of the respondents made positive reference to the utility of international programs as a means of adding staff. Naturally, most of the staff additions proved to be temporary, but in numerous instances the respondents said that the additions were or would be permanent. The head of the economics department at a large western university felt that his university's international programs were excellent ways to attract and examine people it could not otherwise hire.[153]

---

[152] See The International Programs of American Universities, Table 2J and pp. 37-38.

[153] BJ-20.

This was independently substantiated by a vice-president of the same university[154] and by the coordinator of one of the university's programs.[155] Thus, it appears that international programs may have had a significant impact on personnel recruitment at certain kinds of universities.

Two other aspects of personnel shifts resulting from international programs should be mentioned although they cannot be explored presently for lack of data. First, there is an important negative side to the impact of international programs on the "professor-hours" available to universities. In addition to any outside staff hired, if any is hired, nearly all universities handling large programs must invest their own staff time. During the initial stages of the development of international programs and in their peak operating years, this investment represents a loss of "professor-hours" at home for the universities involved. As the programs taper off, many universities, as has been indicated, have realized a net increase in the number of faculty members on campus. This increase the university respondents tended to attribute to international programs. However, many other universities, about one-third, either find themselves with the same number of faculty or fewer than when they started. In both cases, the universities have suffered a loss of "professor-hours." Such time can, perhaps, never be recaptured, and this disturbs a small, vociferous minority of the affected respondents. But others cited gains in international awareness, character broadening, etc., as factors which offset the losses suffered in time.

---

[154] BJ-15.

[155] BJ-16.

Second, the oft-ignored effect on smaller universities of the staff additions to large universities with large international programs is that the smaller schools are frequently deprived of some of their best staff. In recruiting, the larger universities tend to scour the smaller universities for top individuals, if the comments of respondents at twelve large universities were representative. Once discovered, such individuals are lured away by substantial monetary, professional, travel, etc., inducements which can seldom be counteracted by the smaller universities. Judging from the comments of those who have been successful recruiters for international programs, the return rate of such persons to their original points of hire is very small.

Hypothesis (Ih):

> Notwithstanding the foregoing (Id-Ig), the impact of international programs on American university campuses has created mixed attitudes of disappointment, confusion, indifference, and hostility among university personnel toward the programs.

Data presented as part of the examination of the foregoing hypotheses have indicated that there exists a strong undercurrent of negative attitudes among university personnel which are mixed with fairly positive attitudes observed at the level of casual discussion. Although the interviewers' probes beneath this surface optimism were not always successful, enough were successful to suggest that the basic attitude of optimism about the impact of international programs on American universities may have a shaky foundation. Of the 163 interviewees who responded to some degree of probing, over half attached some phrase to their responses indicating that they wished to qualify their opening statement of belief in the positive effects of international programs. This group of "doubters" expressed forebodings about unwanted

consequences from international programs. Here are some of those that were mentioned most frequently:

1) International programs could cause over-expansion of staff, commitments, and faculties on the basis of the temporary affluence caused by international programs. Sponsors of the programs had offered universities no assurances of long-range support, so universities might face embarrassing dislocations should funds cease to be provided.

2) International programs tend to warp long-accepted standards of professional judgment. While nearly all the respondents appreciated the immediate rewards of the programs, many appeared apprehensive about the long-range effects on the academic profession and the universities.

3) International programs tend to place emphasis on the "operator" personality as opposed to the academic personality. Both administrators and teachers frequently decried the rise of "operators," who, they claim, have seized upon international programs to travel on "junkets" and to build themselves "empires." Such misgivings were expressed twice as often by the teachers as by the administrators.

It is apparent from these examples of stated attitudes that university personnel presently may be faced with an uncomfortable dilemma. The data presented thus far show that the vast majority of the knowledgeables said they derived pleasure and satisfaction from their contact with international programs, and they felt that the programs have a generally favorable impact on all parties concerned. But there is enough evidence to suggest, though not to prove, that university respondents felt that

their present pleasures may lead to future disappointments and damage to their cherished universities. This area of exploration is beyond the scope of this study, but appears to be a fruitful area for further research.

According to the knowledgeables interviewed in this study, the non-knowledgeables represent the main base among academicians for negative to neutral feelings about international programs, and a significant number of non-knowledgeables possess mere fragments of information about international programs, which fragments they use to develop adverse opinions about the programs. Frequently, the respondents claimed, such opinions were gained as the result of lost administrative battles (generally over the allocation of university resources) with the proponents of international programs. Having lost such battles, the non-knowledgeables tended to become hostile, according to the knowledgeables. Sixty per cent of the respondents stated that they had to "fight" important segments of their universities to establish and maintain international programs. Five per cent stated that such forces had defeated proposals for international programs. But overt hostility was only one of a complex of attitudes which the respondents felt hindered international programs and reduced the positive impact, from their points of view, of the programs on universities.

Equally important to the knowledgeables was the sea of indifference and confusion they faced. Straining the influence of international programs through a heavy "filter" of indifference and confusion tended to result in a greatly minimized impact, according to the respondents. Forty per cent of the respondents said that they had experienced considerable difficulty in transferring a significant degree of their

enthusiasm for things international to fellow academicians. A frequent lament was that "no one cared to hear about my overseas work," or "no one used me as a resource person," or "I can't show my slides to anyone."

On the basis of interviews with 303 knowledgeables, it appears that the positive impact of international programs on American campuses may be overrated. The greatest impact seemed to be on the minority group of university personnel who constitute the class of knowledgeables, but beyond that group the impact tends to be dissipated rapidly. The theme suggested earlier that international programs are "enriching" an unintended audience is reinforced through an examination of Hypothesis (Ih). Those who know about the "international dimension" are apparently having their knowledge and beliefs reinforced for the most part, and those who don't know appear to be learning far less through international programs than was hoped for by some.

Hypothesis (Ii):

> Notwithstanding (Id-Ig), the fact that American universities, through international programs, make unique contributions to international relations, to other societies, and to American education is hardly evident among those university personnel who have had any contact with their institutions' international programs.

Not only did most of the university respondents say that they and their universities have altered their roles in international relations primarily through expansion and extension of existing educational structures, as indicated by the data offered in explanation of Hypothesis I, and not through fundamental changes in these; they also appeared to feel that the kinds of contributions which flow from this type of role extension by universities do not represent new creativeness or great inventions in the field of activities known as "international relations." Further, although the respondents cited minor changes which had occurred

in their universities, in other societies, and in the techniques of international relations through international programs, very few respondents suggested that these changes might be a prelude to other more basic changes in the field of international relations and in the characters of the major affected actors. Fewer than ten per cent of the respondents foresaw major changes in American higher education as an outgrowth of international programs. The vast majority displayed a steadfast conviction that American universities would remain essentially the same despite the ferment of international programs. This attitude is especially striking in the light of such current discussions of impending changes in the character of higher education as are represented by the 1960 American Assembly[156] and in the Public Administration Review for Winter 1960. Both of these discussions point strongly to "significant" changes in higher education and ascribe a part of the force for change to the international area, especially as it involves the U.S. Government, foundations, and universities.

The data suggest that there is among university personnel a strong resistance to far-reaching changes in the university. Questioning of the interviewees tended to indicate that perhaps what they were reacting most forcefully to was the possibility that universities might be in danger of losing some of their prized independence to sponsoring organizations. Over seventy per cent of the respondents suggested such a possibility. Moving a bit further, it became apparent that the same group of knowledgeables carried with them considerable belief in the adage that "he who pays the piper calls the tune." Both Harlan Cleveland and Edward W. Weidner, representing academic research organizations

---

[156]The American Assembly, The Federal Government and Higher Education (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1960).

concerned with the broad problems and implications of such activities as international programs,[157] have stated at professional meetings and in print that perhaps university autonomy can best be insured by dispensing governmental and foundation funds for international programs through an organization similar to the National Science Foundation. This arrangement is explored in greater detail in a forthcoming book by Edward W. Weidner.

Given these findings, it appears that at the day-to-day operational level of international programs, university respondents could readily admit to changes, but that these kinds of changes were thought of primarily as growth factors. Acknowledging this type of growth, university respondents then appeared fairly adament in their conviction that fundamental changes affecting universities at the institutional level have not occurred, and will not occur within the foreseeable future, as a result of international programs. It should be noted, however, that while the majority may have been defending the status quo, important "leadership" universities in international programs may be setting patterns which will upset the apparent rigidity of the majority. Michigan State University's establishment of a Dean of International Programs may be a breakthrough bringing with it significant changes in universities and in the ways in which they take part in international relations. Harvard, the University of Texas, and the University of California (Berkeley), to mention a few, are currently watching the

---

[157] Cleveland has directed a Carnegie Corporation-sponsored study based at Syracuse University on training for overseas work, and Weidner has served as Director of the Institute of Research on Overseas Programs at Michigan State University. The work of both research groups has resulted in numerous publications and professional conference papers, many of which indicate that present sponsor-university relations may bode ill for future university independence.

Michigan State example and formulating plans of their own to reshape their universities with a view to engaging more effectively in international relations.

TABLE 17

GENERAL SUMMARY OF MAIN COMMENTS BY "KNOWLEDGEABLE" U.S. UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL RELATIVE TO HYPOTHESES Ia-Ii

Sub-Hypothesis	% of Personnel Expressing Agreement	% of Personnel Expressing Disagreement	% of Personnel Having No Comment	Total
1. Through internat'l programs, univs. train primarily foreign elites/leaders	70%	20%	10%	100.0
2. Through internat'l programs, univs. make significant contributions to U.S. international policies	35%	60%	5%	100.0
3. Through internat'l programs, univs. make significant contributions to the general welfare of mankind	90%	5%	5%	100.0
4. Internat'l programs make a positive contribution to the education and development of univ. personnel	85%	10%	5%	100.0
5. Internat'l programs stimulate and improve the general internat'l atmosphere at American universities	95%	0%	5%	100.0
6. Through participation in internat'l programs, univs. increase their prestige	95%	5%	0%	100.0
7. Participation in internat'l programs results in additions to univ. faculties and competence	40%	30%	30%	100.0
8. Participation in internat'l programs affords a great opportunity for creative enterprise by Am. Univs.	10%	55%	35%	100.0

CHAPTER VI

EXAMINATION OF THE GUIDING HYPOTHESES (PART II)

It was anticipated that the 110 non-university persons representing the two major sponsoring organizations of international programs, the U.S. Government and private foundations, would perceive the primary roles of American universities in international relations differently from university persons. Perceptions of the latter were explored in Chapter IV. The present chapter presents data on the responses of the 110 non-university interviewees as they apply to the second group of guiding hypotheses used in this study. The presentation will indicate some of the points at which the perceptions about international programs of the two groups of respondents tended to converge or diverge.

Hypothesis II(a):

> Since government responsibilities in international relations are urgent and tend to be viewed by U.S. Government personnel in a short-term or medium-term perspective, there exists among government personnel acquainted with government-sponsored international programs involving American universities a tendency to consider such institutions and their staffs primarily as instruments to be used by the government in support of relatively urgent and relatively specific foreign policy objectives.

All of the government personnel interviewed stated what appeared to be a conviction that the responsibilities of government in all fields of endeavor, and especially in the international field, are greater and more diverse than the responsibilities of institutions of higher education in the same fields. It was clear that the government respondents began with the important assumption that the government stands in a

superior power and responsibility relationship to universities. Given such an assumption, the same persons unanimously asserted that the government has responsibilities to all of U.S. society which involve the utilization of universities under government direction. As was indicated in Chapter V, over ninety per cent of the university respondents also stated that universities must act in a manner consistent with the broad foreign policy program of the U.S. Government. But any precise formulation of the boundaries of such action or attempts to apply the same idea to the domestic scene engendered resistance and disagreement among university respondents. It is important to mention that agreement on this general level existed between university respondents and government respondents, even though from this point on their statements tended to move in different directions, suggesting significant disagreements. Certainly one aspect of this divergence is that each party probably overemphasized his own importance to, and independence of, the other.

Given this perception of the government as almost singularly responsible for activities affecting the United States in the international field, it is not surprising that the government respondents working with universities through international programs tended to view universities as instruments to be manipulated in international relations. Once classified by government personnel in this manner, universities apparently joined the other instruments for the conduct of international affairs already in the government's "arsenal." This does not necessarily mean that universities are not identifiable as distinctive instruments in the eyes of the government respondents, but only that they are seen as one among many instruments available for implementing the international

policies of the United States. Thus, we find that all government respondents said that the government could expect to use universities in support of foreign policy goals, and that such use was "rightful" and appropriate. But a significant minority (thirty per cent) of the government respondents insisted at the same time that such use did not mean that important areas of university independence were transgressed or that university independence would be violated. Sixty per cent suggested that their own descriptions of existing university and government relationships in international relations fairly accurately described a long standing fact which universities have disguised or ignored on the assumption that such relationships were contrary to some concepts of "academic freedom."

Further discussion with the eighty-seven government interviewees indicated that those respondents who were anxious to show that government sponsorship did not endanger the primary values of universities, and those respondents who attempted to dismiss any sinister implications of the relationships of universities with government in international relations, were both sensitive to any indications that universities as institutions might be damaged by involvement in government-sponsored international programs. A minority of about thirty per cent of the government respondents generally adopted the point of view that universities could contribute to American foreign policy goals in non-political ways, and thereby avoid control through political policy. This is the attitude we found expressed in Chapter III by both university and government respondents as representing an important part of the original rationale for bringing universities into international relations under direct government sponsorship. At that time it was felt that

universities, with their unique skills and high prestige, could disguise the "raw" political edge of cultural and assistance programs financed and operated by the government, and thus contribute to the total, favorable impact of these programs abroad.

If the comments of the government respondents are representative of the thinking of government decision-makers, such beliefs about the use of universities to de-emphasize politics in international programs may be outmoded. The statements of the sixty per cent who said that there exists a real identification of universities with the government, and that statements to the contrary tend to mask an important facet of reality, challenge some of the fondest beliefs of certain university personnel. While a minority of government respondents spoke in more restrained terms about the identification of universities with the government, the majority made statements which suggested that they were playing the role of realists who have "quit kidding around about university-government relationships." Neither position has struck a truly responsive cord among university respondents, as shown in Chapter V, but some recent evidence about the difficulties of managing a university in modern American society, especially in view of present demands for national strength, most recently discussed at meetings like the Seventeenth American Assembly, suggest that some universities are prepared to reassess their relationships with the U.S. Government.

The government "realists" appear to have made considerable headway since government funds for international programs assumed large proportions in the early 1950's. That was the time when the government appeared to be "begging" for universities to assist in the foreign aid program and cultural programs. At the time of this study, the majority

of government respondents displayed an assurance in their comments that suggested that they believed universities had become thoroughly involved in international relations under government auspices, and that universities were no longer capable of freeing themselves from this involvement even if they chose to do so. Of those sixty per cent of government respondents who were confident of the government's ascendancy in the university-government relationship, only a minority of three said that universities in general really wanted to escape the relationship. In so doing the respondents partially acknowledged the indifference and hostility of some major universities to international programs sponsored by the government, but quickly balanced this hostility factor by citing an impressive roster of universities that were currently seeking programs and/or were receptive to invitations to participate in international programs. It is at this point that the responses of university and government personnel converge briefly, for both respondent groups tended to agree that international programs have increased the prestige of American universities generally.

It is beyond the scope of this study to set forth specific foreign policy objectives of the U.S. Government and to explain the relationships between the specific objectives and specific international programs. Such an examination has been a part of at least two published studies of the Institute of Research on Overseas Programs.[158] The point being made in the present study on the basis of the responses made by a group of government interviewees is that regardless of the specific

---

[158]See Bruce L. Smith, Indonesian-American Cooperation in Higher Education (East Lansing, Michigan: Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, 1959), and Richard N. Adams and Charles C. Cumberland, United States University Cooperation in Latin America (East Lansing, Michigan: Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, 1959).

nature or content of a foreign policy objective, the government probably tends to perceive the American universities primarily as instruments to be used to attain the objective and determines the universities' value in terms of their ability to contribute to this attainment. It must be emphasized that this perception applies to universities in international relations and does not necessarily indicate the perceptions of government personnel vis-á-vis other university roles in other areas.

Retaining this "instrument" image for a moment, we can see that the government respondents apparently characterized university contributions to international relations primarily in the following ways, among others:

1) The university as an "institution," including its material, human, and prestige resources, can be used in international relations to attain given foreign-policy-related objectives.
2) University personnel, while retaining their academic identification, can be used at home and abroad to represent the interests of the United States.
3) Universities and their faculties can be used as facilities for training non-nationals in the United States.
4) Universities train American personnel for use by the government in international relations.

Whereas a critical observer might conclude that government respondents were at least partially blind as to the roles universities perform in society, recognition of the fact that the government respondents apparently saw things in the foregoing light appears important. On the verbal level, at least, it seems that the government and university respondents were far apart insofar as their stated perceptions of

universities' roles in international relations are concerned, except that they both seemed to make frequent statements indicating that they agree that American universities are appropriate places to train foreigners. As we shall see when examining Hypothesis III, this perceptual difference has influenced events at the operational level in international programs.

It appears reasonable to suggest that part of this divergence in the stated perceptions of university and government respondents resulted from the differing institutional identifications of the respective groups of respondents. Since the focus of the questions in this study was on universities and their activities, one group of respondents, the university personnel, tended to formulate its comments almost exclusively within the framework of an identification with one institution, the university. That is, they were asked to give their perceptions of an institution, and of a pattern of activity on the part of an institution, of which they were a very significant component. The other group, government personnel, generally identified themselves with a variety of institutions and tended to view universities as only a part of a complex of institutions and activities of gigantic proportions for which they had some broad responsibilities. Undoubtedly, then, the respective vantage points of these two groups of respondents and the focus of the questions posed in this study may have influenced the responses in such a way as to emphasize differences instead of similarities in perceptions.

Hypothesis (IIai):

> The methods to be utilized and the goals to be pursued in international programs, tend to be formulated by U.S. Government elites with a primary emphasis on short-term or medium-term political objectives and only a moderate interest in the educational practices and aspirations of the American or foreign universities.

With respect to international programs financed primarily with government funds, all government respondents said the government has the responsibility to exercise the dominant power necessary to determine the major goals of such international programs and the most appropriate means to achieve those goals. This apparently meant to them that government elites had the right and responsibility to provide the basic framework in which universities should operate beyond the American national boundaries. The respondents generally elaborated on their beliefs in the primacy of the government's position in international relations. Fewer than twenty per cent of the government respondents identified themselves with the attitude, common among university personnel, that education, or at least certain subject-matter in education, is international or universal in character and can transcend national boundaries. The remainder of the government respondents either did not accept any part of such an assertion or accepted it only insofar as it was useful within a foreign policy framework. In other words, this latter group of respondents, comprising approximately sixty per cent of the government interviewees, acknowledged the universities' historic claims to some degree of universalism, but tended to reply that no major institution of American society can presently operate independently of the government in the international field. The consequences of all international activities, and especially those of major institutions, in the existing context of international relations were too important for those activities to be overlooked by the government, in the opinion of most government respondents.

It was noted in Chapters IV and V that most of the university respondents appeared aware that international programs have political

implications. This awareness probably led them to say, as they did, that in all government-financed international programs involving universities, the participating universities cannot legitimately and consciously act to the detriment of American foreign policy. In this regard, the university respondents appeared to recognize a sort of general "citizen responsibility" to avoid purposely damaging their nation's interests. Even within this very broad area of agreement the representatives of government disagreed with the university personnel as to how important this understanding was. Government respondents very frequently said that university personnel give superficial allegiance to working within the government's policy framework at the outset of a program and then proceed to act in ways the government respondents felt to be contrary to government policy.

In referring to those international programs sponsored by private agencies, including the universities themselves, the government respondents very seldom made statements suggesting that such programs were politically important. A small minority of the government respondents, about ten per cent, indicated that they believed private programs have little impact on the parties involved; moreover, such programs apparently did not figure prominently in those respondents' attitudes and beliefs about how international relations are conducted. Such persons tended to represent primarily those government agencies which either specialize in large-scale foreign aid programs or agencies which have little knowledge of the international activities of non-governmental groups. The existence of a group of government knowledgeables who were aware only of government-sponsored international programs and of the major foundation programs tends to undermine the validity of the previously stated

position of the majority of government respondents that no major American institution can operate independently in international relations. Further doubt is cast on this assertion by the fact that both the government and private agencies have during the past five years been trying to inventory the on-going and terminated international programs of all types of institutions and groups in the United States. It appears quite probable that universities have, historically, gone about their international business with very little government interest or intervention. As was indicated in Chapter III, and as current attempts by the government and universities to develop a satisfactory operating agreement between themselves suggest, the government's present relatively high level of interest in international educational programs may be closely tied to the new power position of the United States in international relations and the increased size of international programs themselves.

Notwithstanding such a possibility, it should also be recognized that sixty per cent of the respondents said that the privately sponsored international programs did have some, but generally minor as compared to government programs, international policy implications of interest to the government. Thirty per cent of the government respondents said they saw important international policy implications in the small, private programs, and they suggested frequently that the government should work closely with the universities involved in such programs. In this way, according to this latter group of respondents, the government could exercise some influence over the programs, and this influence might lead to greater coordination of international educational activities and promote the projection of a coherent image of American activities

and goals in this area. Such an image, it was apparently assumed by the respondents, would benefit American foreign policy generally.

The government respondents seldom expressed concern for or interest in the impact of international programs on American universities. About eighty per cent of the government respondents said that program goals tend to be formulated as part of a picture which is much larger and complex than that involving only universities. Elaborating on this outlook, this group of government respondents said essentially that those international acts which contribute to the execution of government policy will benefit all those who participate, whether the participants are individual citizens or institutions such as universities. This variation on the "trickle-down" theory seems to provide the basic rationalization for the relative lack of interest government respondents showed in the ways the government's international goals and methods affect the educational practices and aspirations of American universities. The majority of the government respondents apparently felt that the government has no direct responsibility for anticipating the adjustments universities might have to make to participate in international programs. The rigidity of the government's administrative practices with respect to universities involved in government-sponsored international programs during the first half of the 1950's provides an example of how poorly government personnel understood the basic nature of universities and their personnel. The government respondents as a group appeared to speak as though the universities alone were responsible for adjustments at all operating levels in those programs affecting them.

In one sense, universities may have invited the kind of government indifference seen among the respondents to the possible effects

international programs might have on universities. It has been frequently indicated in this study that university personnel can not precisely articulate, or have not clearly articulated, the goals they seek for themselves or for universities through international programs. Their comments suggest that they may be extremely ambivalent about what universities are doing in international programs. Further, the university respondents, among others, have frequently proclaimed their independence of government, whether such independence is real or fancied. The result has been, although the second half of the 1950's has produced important changes yet to be discussed, that the government may have adopted an attitude of "let the universities worry about the educational outcomes" of international programs. In the confused and somewhat antagonistic atmosphere which has resulted from such attitudes, many government respondents expressed the short-range view that the universities can be left to "stew." Three such respondents bluntly stated that universities will follow where the money is and that "educational aspirations are public relations gimmicks."

A minority (twenty per cent) of the government respondents stated that they were "concerned" with how government primacy, initiative, and dominance in structuring the operational characteristics of international programs might affect universities. Many of the respondents in this group were former university personnel. Their concern was mainly expressed in terms of giving university faculty overseas in government-sponsored international programs greater flexibility and freedom both in administrative and research areas. It was this group which spoke most frequently, and with obvious optimism, of the possible development of international university-to-university relations which

outlived the life of a particular government program. They said they saw in the programs an opportunity for growth among American universities which would be in accord with the traditional place of the university in American and world society. In effect, they were the government respondents who apparently tended to sympathize with the universities' claims to uniqueness as a functional institution in society. However, the same respondents never said that universities should be given a completely "free hand" to operate internationally, especially in government-sponsored programs, for they insisted that certain broad policy lines established by the government must be respected by the universities. For the universities to demand more freedom was in the eyes of this group of respondents a demand for irresponsibility.

Hypothesis II(b):

> Large foundations, the major private sponsors of the international programs of American universities, display a high degree of ambivalence with regard to their role expectations for American universities.

It was indicated in Chapter III that present trends in relations between foundations and universities tend to favor increased foundation support for university activities, especially in the international field. Moreover, data presented in Chapter IV as to what international acts are expected of universities, how they are to be performed, and why they are expected indicated that university and foundation respondents tended to express similar expectations about universities in international programs. The "depth" of these similarities was explored further with the twenty-three foundation personnel interviewed for this study along lines suggested by Hypothesis II(b) and related sub-hypotheses. While the foundation personnel interviewed represented the major foundations sponsoring international programs, the small number of interviews

conducted should suggest caution in formulating generalizations about how foundation personnel generally perceive university participation in international programs.

The responses of the twenty-three foundation personnel did not, on the whole, support Hypothesis II(b). In formulating the hypothesis it is probable that this writer was struck by the multiplicity and diversity of foundation-sponsored international programs and interpreted these particular characteristics as examples of ambivalence on the part of foundations. An examination of The International Programs of American Universities reveals the diversity of foundation-sponsored programs--multi-million dollar technical assistance programs, student exchanges, faculty exchanges, language programs, endowed lectures, provision of educational materials, etc.--but this diversity has a pattern which reflects relatively firm decisions by foundation leaders about what kinds of international university acts particular foundations will finance. Although the announced pattern of support is subject to exceptions (the international work of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, for example, represents an alteration of its founder's restrictions against international programs), there appears to exist steadfastness of purpose and sense of educational direction among foundation-sponsored programs which is not yet evident among government-sponsored programs. If these characteristics represent virtues, and the majority of university respondents said they do, it seems reasonable to attribute pursuit of these virtues in part to the fact that foundations have limited responsibilities as compared to those of the government. In their relatively favored positions, free from the pressure of immediate and dangerous policy decisions, foundations have enjoyed the comparative

luxury of developing long-range international programs involving universities.

The international record of the foundations, especially the Rockefeller Foundation, has been widely acclaimed. By contrast, the international record of the government has been under frequent attack by the public, Congress, and the participating persons, among others. Possession of a creditable record in the field of international programs seems to have provided the foundation personnel with a certain confidence in their own ability to formulate goals for these programs and to involve universities in the pursuit of such goals. Moreover, the general operating principles of foundations and universities appear to be much more in harmony than do the operating principles of the government and universities.[159] And finally, most foundations operate on the assumption that they are dispensing "venture capital." Given these attractive characteristics of foundations, their relations with the academic community were generally favorably perceived by all of the foundation respondents.

In this atmosphere of considerable mutual respect and interdependence among foundations and universities, the foundation respondents seldom said that they had difficulty formulating international program goals. The foundations' and universities' affinities for each other appear to have generated the kinds of expectations among the foundation respondents about the activities of universities in international programs which permit universities to interpret to a substantial degree

---

[159] See especially Joseph C. Kiger, Operating Principles of the Larger Foundations (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1954), Chapter III. Table 11 of the present study shows the strong faculty preference for foundation over government sponsorship.

their own international roles. Once these roles are interpreted by the universities and accepted by the foundations, universities appear, on the basis of the responses of the foundation respondents, free to play such roles with a minimum of direction and supervision by the sponsors. This is probably the ideal case, for an examination of Hypotheses (IIbi and IIbii) indicates that important exceptions to the ideal exist. But thus far, one finds foundation respondent expectations favoring considerable diversity of action by universities, which action, in turn, is unified by a belief among most university and foundation respondents that the general role of universities is to discover and proclaim truth, both at home and abroad.

Hypothesis (IIbi):

> The larger the program in terms of money and persons involved, the more closely the expectations of the foundations and relations between the foundations and the universities approximate those in the government-university situation.

and

Hypothesis (IIbii):

> The smaller the program, the greater the freedom the foundations accord the universities to formulate their own roles.

Almost concurrently with the growth of government financing for university-operated technical assistance programs, there has developed increased activity by foundations in the same area (see Chapter III for the history of this growth). Foundations have added international technical assistance programs to their repertoires of activities and/or they have expanded their previous commitments in this field. This expansion, combined with the foundations' generally favorable orientation toward universities and with the stimulus of the government's increased employment of universities in international relations, has contributed

to the creation of many new large-scale international programs under foundation auspices. The two most notable private sponsors with large international programs are the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. Their development of large-scale programs and the growth of others like them have had at least two important consequences of relevance to this study. First, the government and the foundations have begun to show some signs of creating means for coordinating many aspects of their international activities.[160] Second, foundations have found it necessary and/or convenient to involve increased numbers of university personnel and universities as whole institutions in the conduct of their international programs.

Foundation respondents all acknowledged that the present trend toward increased numbers of large-scale international programs requiring formal, institutional commitments from universities affects the total resources of universities and requires some coordination with government agencies. Aware that foundations had during the 1950's experienced two congressional investigations of their activities, and alert to the criticisms still current, the foundation respondents generally agreed that foundations had a responsibility to develop international programs which were in step with American foreign policy. These respondents made it clear that they did not perceive themselves or universities who accepted their international grants as tools of the government, but they

---

[160] Typical indicators of the trend toward coordination are the combined government-university-foundation conferences on problems of international programs, the cooperation of the foundations with government overseas missions, the foundations' development of complementary programs in countries receiving American technical assistance, and government and foundation interest in cataloging the overseas activities of each other. See WE-412 for an example of coordination of government and foundation programs.

stated that "realistically" one cannot expect to operate internationally on a significant scale for long if one's actions are considered detrimental by the home government. This attitude is in clear agreement with the attitudes of the government respondents on the same subject, and somewhat at variance with the position of the majority of the university respondents. On this subject, the foundation respondents apparently felt themselves caught somewhere between the demands of the government and those of the universities. They tended to perceive foundations as capable of lifting their sights a bit "higher" than universities in the field of international programs, yet at the same time capable of retaining their basic identification with non-government institutions.

To meet the demands of bigness, government coordination, and advanced business practices, foundation respondents occasionally said, in a manner suggesting a reluctant admission, the character of foundation relationships with universities may be undergoing some important modifications. It has been shown that universities have tended to believe and foundations have endeavored to insure that any university working in a foundation-sponsored international program will enjoy the maximum freedom to play the roles it considers appropriate for itself. But notwithstanding this belief, both university and foundation respondents gave evidence in their respective interviews which suggests that under certain conditions this ideal relationship cannot be maintained. For example, at six universities having both ICA programs and large foundation programs, the business representatives of the universities spoke of the growing complexity of administering large foundation programs. They did not, however, feel that the administrative demands of the foundations equalled those of the government; but they did say that the distinctions between the two were becoming less discernible to them.

As foundations increase their outlays to universities for international programs, it seems probable that the accountability requirements imposed on universities by foundations will increase. The increase in accountability may take at least two forms which were suggested by the respondents. First, foundations have begun and will continue to insist on greater financial responsibility on the part of universities handling their funds. This is still in the infant stage, but apparently will increase, according to foundation respondents. Second, the influence of overseas representatives of the foundations on the activities of universities operating in the representatives' assigned areas with their foundations' funds has increased, according to foundation respondents. These country or area representatives represent the "policy" of the foundations in the respective areas and their recommendations appear to carry considerable weight with the foundations. To maintain their positions with the foundations, universities may feel some pressure to conform to the broad lines of foundation policy for their operational areas abroad.[161]

The Rockefeller Foundation has a substantial history of pursuing specific, established type of policies in various parts of the world. But the recent experience of the Ford Foundation in efforts to coordinate its large university programs overseas with the government technical assistance programs has dramatized the "necessity" for all foundations with large-scale programs to acquire some of the operational-administrative characteristics usually attributed primarily to the

---

[161]The Ford Foundation personnel interviewed for this study placed considerable emphasis on the importance of their own field personnel in relation to the activities of universities receiving grants from Ford for operations in their areas. They also frequently spoke of their "policies" for particular areas.

government. Thus there were numerous suggestions from both foundation and university respondents that the increased magnitude of foundation activities overseas has stimulated attitudes and practices by foundations which tended to approximate those of the government.

No university or foundation respondent suggested, however, that the large foundations and the government were becoming indistinguishable in their international program practices. But the respondents appeared to be suggesting frequently that the "ideal" type of relationships between the universities and the foundations, so eloquently supported by university faculty members in this study, may represent inaccurate perceptions of a dynamic system of interaction among powerful institutions operating in a rapidly changing environment.

With respect to operating freedom for universities involved in small-scale international programs (see Hypothesis (IIbii)), an important distinction about size should be made before any generalizations are drawn from the data. On the one hand, small-scale programs financed by large foundations tend to have one set of special characteristics, while small-scale programs financed by small foundations have other characteristics. The number of interviews relating to other possible combinations of sponsors in terms of size and program scale was so small that these were not examined for the present study. Because of the relatively small number of interviews conducted among foundation personnel, the following descriptions of certain perceptions of universities' roles in programs having the aforementioned characteristics represent a composite of remarks by foundation and university respondents. University respondents especially familiar with small programs were questioned at length about how they thought foundations perceived the international roles of universities conducting such programs.

All foundation personnel commenting on the matter said, essentially, that the smaller the programs sponsored by large foundations the greater the operating freedom accorded to universities responsible for such programs. It should be recalled from Chapter III that recently the major foundations have begun to emphasize the development of large-scale international programs as compared to small-scale programs. The proportion of their income used to support large programs has increased steadily over the past decade. But at the same time, an examination of the annual reports of three of the larger foundations working in the international field for the past five years indicates that the number of small programs increased during that period. This numerical increase has not kept pace, however, with the over-all financial or numerical growth of large programs.

Interviews with university personnel directly involved in small-scale programs (approximately thirty-five per cent of the university respondents) produced responses which tended to support the views of the foundation respondents. The fact seemed to emerge from the interviews with university personnel that when these persons spoke of the comparative freedom of action accorded to universities in foundation-sponsored programs they were referring almost exclusively to small grants and to those kinds of programs which tend to have a minimal impact on the status of the universities receiving the grants and operating the programs. Seldom did the small grants exceed fifty thousand dollars. Under these circumstances, most of the university respondents said foundations generally expected universities to play what they called a "scholarly, professional role." This group of respondents said they saw no significant international policy issues at

stake in small programs, and they knew of no outside pressures being exerted to direct their operations. University respondents expressed greater individual enthusiasm for small-scale programs than for any other single type of international program.

Possibly aware that many university persons tend to favor the smaller programs, most of the foundation respondents appeared somewhat defensive when responding to questions about the changing pattern of foundation grants from small programs to larger programs and the impact of such a change on the development of programs identified with whole institutions instead of individuals. Foundation respondents generally said, and such statements agree with the literature on the subject, that it is easier to sponsor large-scale programs than small-scale programs. In so arguing they all mentioned a point which tends to support the foregoing hypotheses, and that is, that large-scale programs usually commit universities as whole institutions to responsible management of the program supported by a grant. This seems to suggest that a university's acceptance of a large grant, as opposed to acceptance of a small grant, tends to entail greater administrative control of university activities by the granting foundation.

According to those university respondents working under small-scale programs sponsored by small foundations, a different relationship may exist between the grantor and the grantee than has just been described. Evidence to prove this has not been systematically obtained, but the responses of twenty-seven university persons indicated that small foundations, since they are capable of sponsoring only fairly modest international ventures, tend to watch over such ventures with great care and interest. Since international programs sponsored by

small foundations may represent an investment of nearly all of their "venture capital," and in this respect be "large" programs to them, small foundations frequently expect their grantees to follow patterns of behavior clearly specified by them. In such instances, the grantees may have a minimum of operational freedom and frequently may perform roles precisely determined in advance by the grantors. It is hardly appropriate to pursue this subject further, since representatives of small foundations were not interviewed and thereby given an opportunity to explain their positions. But the effect of the relationship between the size of the grant to support an international program and the size of the granting foundation upon the freedom of universities to perform certain international roles appears to be worthy of further study.

Hypotheses II(c) and (IIc1) may offer a starting point for later research.

Hypothesis II(c):

> The minor private sponsors, small foundations, student organizations, individual grantors, religious groups, etc., of the international programs of American universities tend to have a wide variety of perceptions relative to the international roles of American universities.

and

Hypothesis (IIc1):

> Since the number and size of the international programs sponsored by these groups is small compared to those sponsored by the government and large foundations, there is a tendency for them to reflect special characteristics derived primarily from the immediate nature of the circumstances in which they were started.

In interviews with university knowledgeables about international programs sponsored by persons and/or groups other than the government or large foundations, it appeared that this group of respondents described international program experiences which did not conform to any clearly

discernible pattern. The number of such respondents was sixty-three. There were no relevant responses on this subject by non-university personnel, primarily because interviews were not conducted among persons representing small private sponsors. The university respondents, however, suggested frequently that those universities which accept grants from the comparatively minor sponsors agree, in most cases, to perform specific tasks in close cooperation with the sponsors, and only in a very few cases could the recipient universities use the grants as they saw fit. Twelve of these respondents, representing universities with ten international programs sponsored by six different types of groups, claimed that their universities used the financial support from small sponsors in ways determined wholly by the university. Twenty-three respondents representing universities with eighteen international programs sponsored by three different types of groups (four endowment funds, four individual sponsors, and ten religious groups) stated in ways suggesting dissatisfaction that the international activities of their universities in these types of programs were strictly prescribed by the sponsors.

The remaining twenty-four programs in the above category represented, according to this particular group of university respondents, attempts by the sponsors to find a vehicle which would permit them as sponsors to express their own values relative to international affairs. The respondents' statements suggest that frequently the sponsors were not strong enough to compel or induce the universities accepting their funds to conform exactly to the sponsors' role expectations. When this situation developed, apparently, the sponsors were satisfied to find a prestigeful device, the university-related international program

operating in a significant area of human endeavor, to which they could link their names. The respondents admitted in thirteen instances that the small-scale programs about which they had information were the result of a chance union of a sponsor casting about for a new idea and a university or one of its members out on a questing mission. This possibility suggests that perhaps at least some of the small programs were interesting accidents. It also offers a small bit of additional evidence that some foundations are recruiting universities to perform roles in international programs which universities have not formulated, but to which universities are willing to adapt their behavior to realize outcomes they believe to be valuable.[162]

Although the kinds of small programs, the ways in which they are operated, and the relationships between their sponsors and the participating universities may create classificatory difficulties, one attribute of the programs was mentioned with considerable regularity in the interviews. It was that most of the small-scale programs reflected special characteristics derived primarily from the nature of the circumstances in which they were started. For example, several endowments have been established at American universities for the purpose of bringing foreign faculty to those universities as distinguished teachers and lecturers. Generally, such endowments reflect the desire of the endower to bring to the campuses of the endowed universities certain kinds of persons, with particular competences, and from specified places

---

[162] This proposition was originally suggested and partially documented in Chapter I. No foundation respondent openly admitted that foundations seek out universities to conduct programs conceived at the foundation level, but eight of them suggested that foundations may circulate "hints" about areas of activity for which they will entertain proposals from selected universities.

in which the endower had or has a particular interest. To escape the restrictions upon such gifts, the universities have often either attempted to subvert the requirements of the endowment by covert devices or by direct legal attack. In some other cases, universities are following up religious missionary work overseas that started decades ago, and in so doing the universities feel constrained to observe the original mission goals. Although the university respondents displayed no uniformity in their attitudes as to the appropriateness of the restrictions inherent in many small programs, there tended to be general agreement among them that the weight of the programs' past history and the present interest of the smaller sponsors in "their" programs constituted significant factors which should be included in the formation of any role expectations for universities.

Summary of Findings on Second Group of Hypotheses

An examination of the second group of hypotheses in the light of statements made by personnel representing government and private sponsors indicates that the three major institutional actors identified in this study--universities, government, and foundations--perceived the universities' roles differently. As shown in Chapter V, the universities, as described by some of their representatives, frequently cast themselves in the roles of "searchers after truth" and "transmitters of truth." Universities tend to perceive their general status in society as being unique and virtually independent, according to most of the university respondents. The respondents most frequently said that universities believed it was their special privilege, responsibility, and competence to engage in a continuous search for knowledge important to the conditions of human existence and to disseminate such knowledge to all mankind.

The possession of such a broad status perception by universities appears to have led to claims by some universities for roles in international relations which have varied somewhat from the expectations held by most of the foundation and government respondents about universities' international roles.

A substantial group of the government respondents said that the most pervasive image of universities' roles in international programs held by them is one in which the universities are first divested of some of their claims to uniqueness and universalism and then integrated into the total pattern of national foreign policy. These respondents said further that American universities as a group represent an extremely valuable resource for the government to use in the conduct of international relations. But at the same time, these government respondents restated their belief that the government has a primary responsibility, if not a virtual monopoly of responsibility, for the formulation and execution of American foreign policy, including the activities of all major institutions operating beyond national boundaries. This appeared to mean to them, essentially, that universities are important instruments to be used both directly and indirectly in support of foreign policy objectives formulated primarily by government personnel. These respondents frequently claimed that American universities as a group have failed to realize that activities in the international sphere involve a variety of actors and demand different kinds of skills and attitudes from those the universities are accustomed to operating with in the United States.

Caught between these two points of view, both of which may possess some very unrealistic elements, are the foundations. The

foundations' sympathies and general policy orientation have tended in the direction of the universities, according to foundation respondents. A similarity of leadership types as well as some shared doubts about too close an involvement with the government appear to have favored the development of similarities of perceptions, as between university and foundation personnel, about what universities are and do. But the impact of program bigness and the rapid growth of those international educational activities which are felt to be linked to national interests appear to have influenced foundations to adopt some of the administrative practices of government. Also, foundations have promoted the growth of coordination and cooperation between themselves and the government. Very important differences between government and foundation perceptions of and expectations about universities remain, but the over-all pattern of relationships among these three major international actors has changed and probably will continue to change.

Impact of University-Sponsor Operating Relationships on Universities

Hypothesis III:

> Since many general administrative practices and attitudes of universities and their sponsors tend to differ, the actual operation of international programs may create significant areas of dissension between the two parties.

and

Hypothesis III(a):

> Dissension between the universities and their sponsors on administrative matters tends to affect adversely the operation of international programs.

Primary attention has been focused thus far on the perceptions certain groups of respondents have about universities' roles in international relations and the impacts of these roles on the universities.

Complex and important as these particular perceptions and impacts may be, they are only a part of the story of interaction between universities and other major institutions which has been at least in part a by-product of international programs. Another part of the story can be found in the actual operating relationships which characterize the co-operative efforts of the three major actors. The characteristics and dynamics of these relationships were frequently referred to by the various respondents, especially if the respondents were acquainted with large-scale programs. As has been shown in the examination of Hypothesis II(c), small-scale programs create fewer operating problems than do large programs; therefore, fewer comments on this from respondents involved in the smaller programs were expected, and this expectation proved to be correct.

Before examining Hypothesis III and its related hypotheses, it should be noted that observers such as the American Council on Education's Committee on Institutional Projects Abroad have recently indicated that operating and administrative differences between the universities and their sponsors may be diminishing.[163] It may be that all parties to international programs are moving toward an increased understanding of the others' peculiarities. However, the data for this study indicate that in 1958-1959 a significant sample of international program

---

[163] American Council on Education, Toward a Foreign Policy for Higher Education (Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, Addresses and Summary of Proceedings of the Conference on University Contracts Abroad, November 19-20, 1959), see especially pp. 45-48 and Appendix A. An earlier sign of growing accord between universities and the government as a sponsor appeared in May 1957, at a meeting of certain business managers of universities and ICA representatives in Denver, Colorado. An account of this meeting and its impact is available in BJ-32. This interview also suggests that the passing of John Hollister from the scene as head of ICA contributed greatly to improved relations between ICA and the universities.

knowledgeables did not discount the fact that administrative problems still existed between the universities and their sponsors. In order to obtain any definitive evidence on any changes in attitudes about such a problem area, the knowledgeables should be re-interviewed after a reasonable time interval has elapsed.

Table 18 shows that major differences about the administrative operation of international programs existed among universities and the program sponsors, and that the respondents generally seemed to agree that the bulk of the differences and the resultant dissension existed in those international programs sponsored by the government. Such findings are consistent with the findings reported earlier in this chapter and in Tables 10 and 11 in Chapter IV.

Hypothesis (IIIai):

> Fiscal control practices of many sponsoring organizations foster antagonisms on university campuses, while some sponsors view the fiscal practices of some universities with suspicion.

and

Hypothesis (IIIaii):

> Disagreement on the allocation and performance of certain service responsibilities generates tensions which interfere with personnel performance.

and

Hypothesis (IIIaiii):

> Partial withdrawal of the government from the process of personnel selection for international programs has tended to reduce conflict between the universities and the government.

and

Hypothesis (IIIaiv):

> Most universities tend to favor a minimum of identification with their sponsors while operating abroad; sponsors' reactions vary.

TABLE 18

EXTENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN UNIVERSITIES AND SPONSORS, AS PERCEIVED BY VARIOUS TYPES OF RESPONDENTS

Types of Respondents	Perceptions of Administrative Differences									
	Perceived Major Differences Generally		Perceived Major Differences Primarily Between Univs. and Government		Perceived Major Differences Primarily Between Univs. and Foundations		Perceived No Major Differences Generally		No Answer	
	# of Persons	% of Persons in Population	# of Persons	% of Persons in Population	# of Persons	% of Persons in Population	# of Persons	% of Persons in Population	# of Persons	% of Persons in Population
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
1. Total Population of Interviewees (N=413)	27	7.0	283	68.5	0	0.0	52	12.5	51	12.0
2. University Personnel (N=303)	13	4.2	170	56.1	6	3.1	81	26.7	33	10.9
3. Government Personnel (N=87)	14	16.0	70	80.3	0	0.0	2	2.4	1	1.3
4. Foundation Personnel (N=23)	0	0.0	9	39.1	1	4.3	8	34.8	5	21.8

Having said with considerable frequency that the administrative and operational practices of universities and their non-university sponsors tend to differ, the respondents proceeded to indicate the most important areas of difference between the major actors. From the 323 recorded responses of 323 respondents out of a possible 413, the following list of differences was derived. The differences are listed in order of frequency. The respondents were not limited as to the number of differences they might suggest, although all differences were recorded as a single response; consequently, some mentioned a large number of differences and some a few or only one. The number mentioned, of course, was influenced by many variables, such as type of program the respondents knew, the respondents' personal success or failure feelings, and the newness of the program. As a result, the listing is a somewhat gross representation of the respondents' beliefs at a particular time. It should be noted, however, that there was no significant variance in the relative frequencies of the various kinds of differences mentioned by university, government, or foundation respondents. The level of agreement in this respect was extremely high; therefore, the following list of areas of difference is presented as a composite of all respondent views.[164]

1) Fiscal practices. The control, allocation, and disbursement of funds was considered a persistent problem area in international programs. (Hypothesis (IIIa1)).

2) Service responsibilities. The distribution of service responsibilities, e.g., shipment of household goods in

---

[164] See American Council on Education, op. cit., Appendix A, pp. 97-103, for complementary data gathered by Mr. Orville Lindstrom, Business Manager, University of Oregon, in 1959.

support of international programs and the performance of these services created numerous irritations (Hypothesis (IIIaii)).

3) Personnel selection. The process of clearance and delays in personnel selection were frequently cited as disruptive factors in the university-sponsor relationships (Hypothesis (IIIaiii)).

4) Policy support. Attempts to bring university-conducted international programs into closer harmony with sponsors' policies promoted instances of chaos and bitterness (Hypothesis (IIIaiv)).

Several other kinds of differences, such as those stemming from personality clashes, were mentioned occasionally by the respondents, but none often enough to merit attention as representative. Once the differences were stated, the respondents were asked to indicate what they felt to be the general effect of these differences on the operation of international programs. As can be easily anticipated, nearly all of the respondents said they felt that the differences lead to dissension which in turn has deleterious effects on international programs. The reader may recall that Table 18 indicated that most of the feelings about differences and dissension tended to be focused on government-sponsored programs, although the comments of the respondents were not restricted to programs of that type.

When Hypotheses III and III(a) were constructed, disagreement among the major actors was anticipated in three areas affecting program operations: fiscal control, service responsibilities, and personnel selection. Differences of opinion and perception in the area identified

as "policy support" were not anticipated. The reasons for disagreements in the policy support area were explored earlier as part of the examination of other sets of hypotheses developed for this study. To repeat briefly, these differences appeared to arise, on the one hand, out of the sponsors' beliefs, especially the government's, that they had broader and greater responsibilities nationally and internationally than did universities;[165] and, on the other, out of the universities' beliefs in their peculiar independence as institutions and their possession of unique competencies.

Concerning Hypothesis (IIIai), it appears almost axiomatic that universities desire to obtain money for their operations with a minimum number of restrictions on how such money is to be used. This certainly is not surprising, given the traditional insistence of universities on independence. But it does appear to be "out of step" with some prominent, current developments in the area of university finance. For example, recent literature such as Moos and Rourke's The Campus and the State and the American Assembly's The Federal Government and Higher Education contain pleas for the defense and/or continuation of universities' financial independence. But such writings also contain admissions that the trends of the times are moving in the opposite direction. Harlan Cleveland's proposal for financing of international programs through an organization similar to the National Science Foundation[166] is

---

[165] For a recent public statement of this point of view, made directly to universities at the November 1959, Conference on Institutional Contracts Abroad, see the remarks of Robert H. Thayer, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for the Coordination of International Education and Cultural Relations, in American Council on Education, op. cit., pp. 3-8.

[166] American Council on Education, op. cit., pp. 55-61.

manifestation of the belief that the present relationships of the universities and the government in international relations imply future developments adversely affecting universities' independence. Thus, universities appear to be searching for a way out of a financial situation which they tend to believe may be some kind of trap, but to which they are drawn because that situation offers them new sources of income.

It was found in this study that approximately ninety per cent of the university respondents said universities should be given wider discretionary powers to spend funds alloted to them for international programs. The major exceptions were respondents representing church-supported universities involved in international programs closely related to their over-all religious goals. Respondents at such universities generally said they believe universities supported by religious organizations have a responsibility to accept centralized direction from religious leaderships in the allocation of the resources of their institutions.

The government was singled out by almost all university respondents acquainted with government-sponsored programs for criticisms about government fiscal practices. Generally, the university respondents appeared to interpret the government's fiscal control policies as evidence of the government's distrust of universities. Very frequently the remark was made by university respondents that the government treated universities like children or thieves, and seldom like gentlemen and adults. Many government respondents, aware of the universities' criticisms of the government, often countered the university criticisms with statements indicating that they believed in the principle of accountability for public funds and that universities must be held accountable

for using public funds in the same way others are held accountable. In fact, a minority of the government respondents stated that the universities might improve their own business practices as a result of their experiences with the government.

Those university respondents acquainted with government-sponsored programs before 1958 frequently agreed that antagonisms derived from financial issues were very prominent up to that time. According to university respondents, the bitterness on both sides tended to subside noticeably as the result of a change during 1958 in government policy toward universities, but the issues have never been settled entirely. The change in policy consisted of the development of a new set of standard contracts defining university-government responsibilities in international programs, and of a general relaxation of government control over the ways universities used public funds. To the present, however, university business managers, according to a leader among them, maintain a "catalog" of complaints against the government. Notwithstanding this, there appears to be less evidence currently that mutual recriminations over the control of funds are the salient features of the relation between the government and the universities in international relations.[167] The most common suggestion by university respondents as a way to minimize differences in the fiscal area was that the contract idea be dropped in favor of grants by the government to universities. Approximately eighty per cent of the government respondents opposed this suggestion. They felt that a grant would result in an almost complete loss by the government of control over the universities'

---

[167] The softened tone of relationships is exemplified in the remarks of Leonard J. Saccio, Deputy Director, ICA, in American Council on Education, op. cit., pp. 18-23.

activities. Since the government respondents perceived the universities as a kind of foreign policy instrument, they apparently could not accept an arrangement which could decrease their ability to manipulate the instrument.

Such government agencies as the Office of Education, the United States Information Service, and the Department of State have utilized grants and/or fairly broad contracts with universities. No significant signs of dissatisfaction with these methods were detected among the interviewees. But it should be noted that there are important differences between the operations of these kinds of agencies and the operations of ICA as they affect universities. ICA programs tend to be much larger and to have greater direct impact on the actors involved than do the other types of programs mentioned. The present reluctance of ICA to use the grant system might suggest to those universities that pride themselves on the non-political character of their roles in international relations that what they agree to do through international programs may have more political significance than they have admitted in the interviews.

The government was not alone as a target for the criticisms of the university respondents with regard to financial matters. As has been indicated, large foundation programs have acquired some of the attributes of government programs. One important attribute of this sort is the closer foundation supervision of the expenditure of foundation funds granted to universities. Although university respondents overwhelmingly said they preferred foundation financing to government financing of international programs, an important minority (approximately fifteen per cent) of the university respondents, all of whom worked with large foundation programs, stated that foundations are beginning to insist on

more stringent methods of accounting for the use of their funds. University business managers interviewed for this study expressed general sympathy for the foundations' positions. Occasionally, business representatives of universities said they welcome increased supervision by foundations of the expenditure of foundation funds, since such supervision improved the strength of their own positions in dealing with the demands of the faculties of their respective universities. The increasing number of "contract research officers" on university campuses may have a significant, and as yet unexplored, impact on the faculty. For example, the long-standing independence of the faculty in receiving outside funds to be used at their discretion as university persons may be undergoing some alterations.

A second area of dissension among the respondents was related to the distribution of service responsibilities (see Hypothesis (IIIa11)) in support of international programs among the three program actors. Over sixty per cent of the government respondents said universities expect the government to provide too many services for their overseas teams. This condition appeared very difficult for the government respondents to understand or accept since they were familiar with the universities' frequent demands for greater independence of action. To them, the two points were definitely related. One of the most pervasive impressions which appeared among the statements of the government respondents was that the universities wanted "the best of all possible worlds" in the area of services, and that the universities expected the government to provide such services at their demand. The government respondents seemed to feel that this was an unreasonable expectation on the part of universities. Generally, in analyzing all of the interviews

among government and university personnel, it appears to this writer that more feelings of anomosity between the government and the universities exist in the area of service responsibilities for international programs than any other single area of interaction.

University respondents for their part made frequent statements detailing an impressive array of alledged defects in the government's administrative support of international programs. Over eighty per cent of the university respondents working in ICA-sponsored programs complained about one form or another of government "red tape." One reason why many university respondents were so vocal in their criticisms may be that a significant percentage of them were on-campus program coordinators who spoke with a background of accumulated complaints from individual faculty members overseas in international programs.

Since more recent evidence than the interviews conducted for this study conveys the impression that the extent and intensity of administrative disagreement between the government and the universities may be subsiding, it is possible that the dissension reported herein has been largely created by a host of misunderstandings about and plain ignorance of the myriad problems involved in transplanting large numbers of American faculty members to foreign countries to perform tasks that do not have well-defined goals. The interviews seem to suggest that in the service area both government and university personnel have seized upon many incidents, minor in themselves, to fight a battle which may be grounded in more fundamental differences. That is, the interviews seem to indicate that the small battles so frequently mentioned by the respondents may be a manifestation of the basically different perceptions university and government personnel have of the roles of one another.

(See Chapter IV for supporting material). Notwithstanding the possibility that the differences surrounding service responsibilities may be minor in the total scheme of things, probably one must acknowledge that these "low level" kinds of differences can affect the "high level" performance of an international program.

Compared with the government, foundations emerged from most university interviews virtually unscathed insofar as their responsibilities for services and their performance of services were concerned. University respondents most frequently indicated that foundations generally perform relatively few direct service functions for universities involved in foundation-sponsored international programs. This was generally verified by the foundation respondents. Because this situation tends to be clearly understood by all parties from the beginning of a foundation-sponsored program, and because foundations have fewer overseas representatives than the government, fewer problems and disagreements in the service area apparently have emerged. Moreover, most university respondents did not perceive foundations as a possible threat to universities, but on the contrary perceived them as valued supporters. A similar position of trust was not enjoyed by the government when working with universities, according to most university respondents. Finally, foundations were not expected to provide the kinds of supporting services overseas for universities that was expected of the government. The belief that the government has a special set of responsibilities for Americans abroad tended to permeate the statements of university respondents and to affect their service expectations accordingly.

Concerning Hypothesis (IIIaiii), it appeared to a large number of interviewees that the process of selecting university personnel to

staff international programs created problems which affected adversely the operating relationships between the universities and the sponsors. Again, the government as a sponsor was singled out for strong criticism by most university respondents, and occasionally by some of its own representatives. Since foundations appeared to participate only indirectly, if at all, in the process of selecting university personnel for programs they sponsor, they received scant attention by the interviewees. A few foundation respondents claimed that the most they might do to influence the universities' personnel policies was to raise "tentative questions" about the suitability of retaining a particular individual on the overseas staff of a foundation-sponsored university program. The university respondents unanimously supported this claim and reiterated their general satisfaction with foundation policies in the personnel area.

With respect to personnel, four problem areas were mentioned by the respondents with sufficient frequency to merit special attention. They were competence of staff, security investigations, general clearance procedures, and percentage of personnel in a program from the university-contractee.

Eighty-five per cent of the university respondents said the government should not have a voice in judging the general competency of university staff members to serve in international programs. By "competency" it appears that most of the respondents meant professional and/or academic competency. Judgments of this nature were considered to be the exclusive province of the staff members' universities and/or professional associates. Any attempt by the government to become involved in the evaluation process was interpreted as an unwarranted intrusion

into university affairs.[168] However, a small minority (less than ten per cent) of the university respondents suggested, very cautiously, that since the government had an interest and a considerable investment in international programs, it should be heard with regard to the competencies required to perform the tasks involved in its large-scale programs. Even this partial acceptance of a small role for the government in personnel selection did not mean to the respondents that the government should pass judgments on individuals who might be involved in international programs, but only that the government should participate in the enumeration of sorts of individuals needed for the programs. The university respondents generally were so sensitive about government participation in the personnel selection process that they appeared unable to consider any alternative ways in which the government might be involved in selecting personnel for government-sponsored programs. Those university respondents mentioned earlier who conceived of international programs almost exclusively in terms of non-government sponsorship could see no role for the government in the personnel selection for any programs.

The government respondents as a group tended to display some interest in having a voice in determining the competency of university personnel who planned to work in programs supported by the government. However, since only twenty-one of the eighty-seven government respondents spoke directly to the issue, it seems quite likely that the government permits universities a relatively free hand in evaluating the professional competency of persons on the staff of those international

---

[168] This position is examined in The American Assembly, The Federal Government and Higher Education (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960), p. 163 and p. 173.

programs for which the universities assume responsibility. Even those government respondents who said they were dissatisfied with this state of affairs spoke at the same time like persons who had grown weary of the "personnel battle." There was considerable evidence from both government and university circles that prior to the time interviews were conducted for this study the government had made some attempts to assert a right of evaluation with regard to the professional competency of academic personnel working in government-sponsored international programs. But evidently, the universities have effectively denied this claim and have reaffirmed their virtual monopoly in the area of selecting and evaluating personnel.[169]

The demands of national security have had a special kind of impact on the personnel selection process for international programs according to government, foundation, and university respondents. Of course, the impact of security measures has been greatest on government-sponsored programs, but all international programs are affected to some extent by the security requirements imposed and enforced by the government with respect to all persons leaving or coming to this country. In government-sponsored programs, it appears that clear-cut security standards for personnel must be met. Other types of international programs are subject to varying amounts and kinds of scrutiny by the government, but no program escapes at least a minimum security check before personnel attached to them leave the United States.

---

[169] The evolution of this process in favor of the universities' positions is suggested in the reports of the meetings of the American Council on Education's Committee on Institutional Projects Abroad (CIPA) for the period 1955-1959. During the early part of this period, the involvement of the government in the personnel selection process is frequently mentioned. By 1959, it apparently has ceased to be an issue important enough to attract the attention of the major universities involved in international programs; for personnel was not a subject of the 1959 conference called by CIPA.

Those university respondents who had had considerable contact with government-sponsored programs indicated that in the early days of the programs, up to 1956, there existed considerable controversy between the government and the universities over the government's security requirements for university staff in international programs. These same respondents said much of the dissension could be attributed to the general "security" atmosphere of the first half of the 1950's during which time many university persons were waging a personal crusade against the excesses of "security cadres." As the air began to clear after 1955, most university respondents said both the government and the universities became less aggressive in their handling of and reactions to the security clearance process. The security clearance procedures stuck, but the procedures themselves were conducted in a less emotional atmosphere and with greater dispatch than had been the case previously. Thus, while the university respondents believed that the universities had essentially won their case for evaluating personnel competency themselves, they also seemed willing to concede to the government its case for the necessity of security clearances for persons involved in international programs.

The universities' "concession" in this area was not unanimously accepted by university personnel. Approximately sixty per cent of the university respondents granted that the government has a responsibility to determine the loyalty of persons representing it abroad directly or indirectly. This responsibility includes the security clearance process. Over twenty per cent of the university respondents objected strenuously to security clearances on "intellectual" grounds, and the remainder accepted them in what appeared to be a spirit of an "unfortunate but necessary evil."

Another aspect of the personnel selection process related to clearance procedures, but having a different impact on international programs than security clearances, is the task of having new personnel "cleared" by the university team abroad and/or the cooperating government and/or cooperating institution. Forty per cent of all university respondents who had been involved in programs requiring overseas clearance said they were not directly affected by this facet of the selection process. But of the remaining sixty per cent who had contact with the process, nearly all complained of the defects in this clearance system.

A little background information may help to make the problems involved a bit more meaningful. First, the hiring of academic personnel has a seasonal aspect given the nature of such things as the "academic year." This reduces the number of "prime" months available for hiring academics. Second, any person going overseas requires considerable "lead time" to permit him to accomplish certain health necessities, to arrange certain personal matters, to complete certain "household" responsibilities, etc. Third, some kind of orientation and study is a frequent requirement. Fourth, an academic person usually desires to leave at a time which will not disrupt the academic year and will permit him to return at a time convenient to start a new academic year.

Faced with the problems inherent in dealing with persons having these characteristics, the university respondents said that elaborate clearance procedures compounded the difficulties of hiring appropriate personnel for overseas service to the point that confusion was commonplace. Moreover, it is common folklore, or knowledge, that academics love most to disagree. In this regard, the university respondents said

frequently that factors such as geographic distance intensified this "innate" quality of university personnel to disagree to the point that agreement on the selection of personnel for programs between the university campuses and the overseas contingents came only after a considerable time lapse.

Fewer than fifteen per cent of all university respondents said that clearance by the cooperating governments and/or institutions presented a difficult problem. It was generally agreed among them that if one could get the university staff already overseas to approve a new staff selection, the approval of the host country or institution would generally follow quickly. This may indicate that part of the consensus-building process among university staff abroad with international programs involves obtaining informal agreement of the hosts. Thus the hosts' deliberative delays may be hidden in the time taken by the overseas university leaderships to clear a new appointee. If one looks at the total group of university interviewees for this study, instead of the smaller group of interviewees acquainted with government programs, it appears that delays encountered because of clearance procedures are most frequently perceived in those situations involving groups of American staff overseas. In those programs without American university staff based overseas, there were very few indications from the respondents that the personnel selection processes for such programs are significantly affected by clearance procedures.

The fourth aspect of the personnel selection process, viz., percentage of personnel from the university contractee, raises a variety of questions which cannot be answered here. That they cannot be answered here reflects some of the limits of this study. Nonetheless, raising

the questions alone suggest the number and complexity of the problems which universities have yet to face as they contemplate additional commitments to and involvements in international relations. Perhaps one part of the central problem is contained in the question: "What proportion of the staff of an international program should come directly from the staff of the university accepting responsibility for the program?" There is no doubt that this kind of question is focused primarily on group programs instead of individual programs. But since the 1950's have seen the development of a trend toward group programs involving whole universities, and since the growth of university-related programs has exceeded the growth of other kinds of programs in terms of expenditures and personnel involved, what happens in this particular area may set the pattern for significant changes in many areas of international education.

In the end, however, whether the program is large or small, it seems apparent that the universities which have accepted program responsibilities must make some decisions about personnel which may affect the university's basic character as an institution. That is, international programs with their various ramifications appear to be causing the universities to reassess their human resources and to wonder how the allocation of these resources affects their perception of themselves as "guardians of the truth." Of those respondents at universities with group programs, and especially ICA programs, eighty per cent said that one of the most important continuing problems facing universities is how international, national, and local commitments are to be met with the human resources available to universities. These respondents thought that perhaps the universities may have been trapped by cross-pressures.

For example, it has been shown in this study (see Chapter V) that universities most frequently participate in international programs because of certain responsibilities they believe to be theirs and because of certain advantages they hope to gain. Having admitted this much, the respondents, it seems, should face the issues of how and/or whether universities can meet these responsibilities and reap the advantages of international programs indefinitely.

Ideally, most of the respondents representing the three actors felt that any university undertaking an international program should do so only if it had the personnel to staff such a program competently. Implicit in this preference is the belief among the respondents that international programs should have a particular "university" identification as opposed to possibly a "higher education" identification. In this respect, one should recall that in Chapter V university respondents stated a strong preference for the university-to-university type of program relationship. The major unit of identification for them was their profession as it is embodied in universities. Given this identification, all of the respondents tended to suggest that the closer universities could come to staffing their international programs with their own personnel, the better the programs. Much of this kind of thinking appeared to be reinforced by such actions as ICA's inclusion in their contracts with universities certain stipulations about the proportion of staff that should come from the contracting university. Normally, ICA has tried to insist on a very high percentage.

Concerning the extent to which universities and their personnel operating overseas should be identified with their non-university sponsors (see Hypothesis (IIIaiv)), most university respondents said they favor

identification with an American university rather than with a non-university sponsor. No university person interviewed said that universities should describe themselves as instruments of the U.S. Government operating abroad in direct support of government policy objectives. The belief appeared almost universal among university respondents that usually the interests of all parties involved in international programs are best served if universities are not closely identified with non-university sponsors. However, when the sponsor is a university either in the United States or a host country, nearly all university respondents said overt identification of the university person or persons operating overseas with such a university sponsor contributes to the achievement of the program objectives.

The rejection of close identification overseas between university personnel and non-university sponsors appears to be another manifestation of the already reported belief among university personnel that their offerings are both unique and intrinsically more valuable than those of other institutions, especially political institutions. Robin Williams in American Society, as well as other sociological commentators, refer to such beliefs as both the partial cause and result of the development of a "separate culture" in the United States encompassing education. Examination of the validity of these kinds of beliefs is beyond the scope of the present study, but the reader is referred to the previously mentioned IROP studies which examine the performance of many international programs involving American universities at the host country level, including some aspects of university-sponsor identification as they relate to program performance.

Although most of the findings of the present study thus far reported have indicated that government respondents generally tended to favor closer relationships between universities and the government in international programs, and that such relationships quite clearly imply political control by the government, the government respondents displayed considerable ambivalence concerning the identification of university personnel with the U.S. Government overseas. They divided almost equally on the question of whether or not international program objectives were best served by this kind of identification. Such a division of opinion among the government respondents and its apparent inconsistency with previously reported attitudes of the same group of respondents might be partially explained as follows. First, many of the government respondents apparently remembered the origin of university involvement in large-scale technical assistance programs. This memory included the fact that the government in the beginning emphasized the value of a minimum of identification between the government and the universities overseas. Those respondents whose international program work experience dated back to the early 1950's constituted the overwhelming majority of those government respondents who agreed with the university respondents. Both groups of respondents favored the development of an image of independence from government policy for university personnel overseas.

Second, as international programs grew in number, size, and scope, and as some universities began to bargain for government contracts (see Chapter III), and as the government's political policy orientation began to change, the government showed signs of attempting to increase its control over the overseas activities of universities under its contracts. It was during this period, 1955-1957, that Congress was

examining international activities in earnest, especially foreign aid.[170] Furthermore, Stassen, who had a record as FOA director of favoring university independence overseas, had departed the technical assistance field and was replaced by persons who apparently did not share his perception of the overseas work of universities. Government personnel from this period represent a majority of the government respondents used in the present study. Their responses fall primarily into that group of responses favoring close identification of universities and the government overseas. Thus, the differing periods of time in which the government respondents had work experiences related to international programs may have contributed to some ambivalence among government respondents on this facet of university-government identification.

All of the foundation respondents said that they neither required nor desired that universities regularly and publicly identify foundations as their international program sponsors. Nearly twenty per cent of the foundation respondents said, however, that they believed some universities found it advantageous to identify closely with foundation sponsors in their overseas activities. It was the opinion of this portion of the foundation respondents, that some universities and their personnel felt that some foundations were internationally very prestigeful and that such universities could improve their overseas operating conditions by emphasizing university-foundation relationships. In these cases, foundation respondents did not object to being identified with universities operating overseas. They said that if such identification contributed to the achievement of program goals it was appropriate.

---

[170] During the period 1955-57, at least twenty-one separate examinations of the foreign aid program were conducted under Congressional auspices.

Lest the foundations appear totally indifferent to the things universities are doing with their funds, it should be recalled that two of the major private sponsors of international programs, the Ford and Rockefeller foundations, maintain overseas staffs which cooperate with universities in the execution of various programs. As was indicated in Chapter III, the impact of the overseas representatives of foundations on universities operating abroad with foundation funds should not be dismissed as insignificant. Thus, while some foundation personnel de-emphasized the foundation-university identification overseas, many examples of this kind of identification exist.

It was further hypothesized that the following attitudes related to the operational experiences of the major actors in international programs are characteristic of university and sponsoring organization personnel:

Hypothesis (IIIav):

> Most universities tend to favor private sponsorship of international programs to government sponsorship.

and

Hypothesis (IIIavi):

> Cognizant of its broad public responsibilities, the U.S. Government as a sponsor tends to try to impose its administrative beliefs and practices on universities.

and

Hypothesis (IIIavii):

> The administrative relationships of universities and non-government sponsors are more acceptable to the affected parties than are government-university relationships.

Concerning Hypothesis (IIIav), all of the findings reported in this study indicate that the university respondents overwhelmingly preferred private sponsorship to government sponsorship of international

programs. Thus, if this group of respondents is representative of the attitudes of the leadership groups which formulate policies for American universities, it seems reasonable to conclude that universities as whole institutions are at least "philosophically" oriented toward private funds for international programs. This orientation persists despite considerable evidence suggesting that government spending for international programs is larger than that of private organizations, and that government spending is increasing at a faster rate than private spending. Also, the preference by universities for private funds continues despite steadily increasing participation in international programs by public universities. The tenacity with which the universities are apparently holding on to a "way of life" related to international educational activities may be an indication of their attachment to a past condition and/or their uncertainty about the possible future ramifications of government sponsorship on university independence.

As has been shown in some detail (see Hypotheses (IIIai)-(IIIaiv)), antagonism between the universities and the government and the preference of universities for non-government sponsors tend to stem from a group of operational-administrative factors. Hypothesis (IIIavi) states that the government tends to impose its administrative beliefs and practices on universities through the operation of international programs. The crucial aspect of such a relationship is the belief by most university respondents that the government has, is trying to, or does <u>impose</u> its administrative will on the universities. Nearly eighty per cent of those university respondents familiar with government-sponsored international programs said they believe the government expects universities to accept government concepts about how international

programs should be administered. This same group of respondents reacted negatively to such an expectation on the part of the government. Thus, it is not surprising to find among university personnel a preference for non-government support for international programs.

Because university and foundation respondents did not perceive or "feel" coercion in the administrative relations between universities, foundations, and other non-government sponsors, they found these relations to be acceptable and satisfactory. Thus, when all of the non-government respondents for the present study were asked a summary question (see Hypotheses (IIIavii)) about their attitudes related to acceptable administrative conditions under which international programs might operate, they evaluated those created by the university-non-government relationships more favorably than those resulting from university-government relationships.

Summary and Problems Raised

In all the interviews with the 303 university personnel and the 110 sponsoring organization personnel, there were no suggestions as to how universities were going to increase their participation in international relations yearly, as they have since at least 1945, and still pursue their other highly valued educational goals with limited resources. Perhaps the question they really didn't want to face at this time was how can the American "system" of higher education be re-organized to make a maximum contribution to a world in the process of losing some of its traditional boundaries. They found as Harlan Cleveland and the American Assembly did that suggestions for re-organizing the agencies granting funds to universities were easy to make. How easy it is to implement such suggestions is another question. But none of the

respondents directly suggested that given the conditions of current history, the old boundaries of higher education might be losing their significance just as are many of the old international boundaries.

Faced with the difficult problem of allocating very scarce resources within the framework of the university as an institution for subsequent use in international relations, it seems to this writer that many university personnel would have developed some thoughts about inter-university relations in the United States. But the suggestion that perhaps the "university" as a unit of international action was obsolete was not made by the respondents. Therefore, having watched and participated in the discussions of many university persons who were attempting to incorporate an "international dimension" with all of its responsibilities and demands into the traditional framework of the university, I might suggest that a more appropriate place to incorporate such a complex concept would be within the framework of "higher education." Thus, while Harlan Cleveland in The Overseas Americans and the American Assembly in The Federal Government and Higher Education may be correct when they speak of the "internationalization" of the college or university, they may also be several steps behind actual developments in higher education.

The statements made by respondents for the present study and the current literature on international programs and international education are both replete with "lamentations" about the impact of these activities on universities. They exhort the universities to "gear up" for the "great adventure," or they worry about how universities can participate internationally and still retain their traditional forms. The answer may be that they cannot, for such crucial questions

as those related to finding personnel for the new and the old ways suggest that, in the long run, universities may have to admit that they, as nearly 2,000 separate units, cannot meet the new demands. If the demands are to be met, the task of meeting them may become the responsibility of higher education as a whole.

Thus, as one observes the problems which were raised by the interviewees relative to some of the administrative and operational aspects of international programs, one comes full circle. The introduction to this study suggested that on the broadest level of consideration, universities have altered their roles in international relations. Now on the more mundane level of administration and day-to-day operation, one finds evidence both to support this contention and to suggest further that such role changes may be a prelude to some more basic changes in the character of American universities. If Linton's joining of the concepts of "status" and "role" is significant, then such changes should have been anticipated.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Extensive recapitulation of the assumptions and findings of this study does not seem especially appropriate or useful, since each chapter has, in part, been a recapitulation of the preceding materials. What will be attempted by way of conclusion is a brief summary of the findings concerning two aspects of the roles some universities are performing in international relations through international programs (see especially Chapters IV and V): (1) perceptions held by the various actors, and (2) impacts of the programs on the American university as an institution.

Actors' Perceptions

I. University personnel tended to believe that universities could extend their general "service" roles in the national society to the international level. Such an extension would involve an expansion of the kinds of acts already performed by American universities, but most university respondents did not envisage any fundamental changes in universities as a result of such expansion. They did not deny that universities are constantly in a process of change, but, at the same time, they did not attribute special significance to international programs as forces of change. International programs might have accelerated and/or contributed to changes in universities, but their contributions were only one part of a pattern of ongoing change.

University respondents appeared generally convinced that universities, in performing international acts, have unique qualities to offer; that universities should be accorded an operational independence comparable to or exceeding that enjoyed by them at home; and that universities are developing foreign elite-members who will become leaders in their own societies. Insofar as the possession of unique qualities was concerned, university respondents stressed the universities' training skills and the application of these skills to the discovery of new information, and to the ordering, testing, distribution, and utilization of this information. The majority of university respondents said that the possession of these skills equipped an institution and its associated personnel to make significant contributions to other societies and to international affairs.

The single most important contribution, from the respondents' points of view, appeared to be the training of non-nationals, both in the United States and in their home societies, in skills valued in American society. The training methods to be used were those generally accepted in American institutions. Such training was widely supported by university respondents despite the fact that the same persons expressed serious doubts about the lasting qualities of the impacts of these procedures on the recipients and their societies. The data provided by the respondents indicate quite strongly that university respondents perceived themselves and their universities primarily as channels for the exportation of American developments related to education. Such a perception is in basic agreement with conclusions reached in The International Programs of American Universities and The Overseas Americans. The things to be imported, by comparison, are comparatively few, seldom specified, and essentially unevaluated.

Most American university respondents said that universities, in pursuing the foregoing procedures, are training elite-members from foreign societies or, if direct institutional training in the United States is not involved in the international programs, they are working cooperatively with foreign elites. There was scant indication that the respondents felt such kinds of efforts may contribute to counter-elite structures in foreign societies which might challenge the positions of existing leadership groups and alter the relationships of their nations with the United States. American university personnel tended to speak of themselves as contributors to orderly, developmental kinds of "revolutions," and never as implicated in violent and dramatic revolutions. Thus, the evidence suggests that American university personnel see themselves and their universities as capable of contributing to revolutionary intellectual developments, but seldom see themselves and universities as possible contributors to revolutions which threaten to destroy the historic fabrics of foreign societies.

American university respondents emphasized the importance of operational independence for universities involved in the conduct of international programs. They felt that the greatest independence and freedom of action within the limits imposed by financial resources is possible in smaller programs supported by universities' own funds or by foundation funds. Independence declines when programs are sponsored by religious groups or by the government, and also as the size of the programs increases, they said. The university respondents expressed negative reactions most frequently to the control the government exercises over international programs it sponsors. Ideally, the university respondents said, they prefer to see international programs developed

on a university-to-university basis, excluding non-educational institutions from the programs to the maximum extent possible without losing such institutions as sponsors.

Despite the foregoing preferences for programs sponsored by non-governmental agencies, university respondents acknowledged that current trends in international programs indicate that the U.S. Government will probably increase its influence in this area. Further, such an increase will probably result in a general expansion of the number and sizes of university activities in international relations, they said. Thus, university respondents appeared to perceive themselves and universities as being on the threshold of an increased involvement with the government and possibly with its political policies. They seemed to feel that the exact nature and consequences of such involvement are not yet discernible. It appears likely that the outcome of this newly developing relationship may alter the images of the university and its roles currently held by university personnel.

II. Government personnel tended to perceive American universities as subordinate to the national and international policies formulated by government elites. They tended to characterize universities as appropriate instruments for government elites to use in pursuit of international policy goals. Therefore, they said, the participation of universities and their staffs in international relations through international programs should be directly supervised by government personnel to insure unity of action. Quite obviously, most government respondents were not sympathetic to the claims of universities for "complete" independence of action at the international level.

Government respondents frequently said that universities possess a convenient reservoir of skills which the government values in conducting international relations. They said that if anything is unique about universities, it is the universities' comparative wealth of valuable, skilled personnel. The government readily acknowledges that it has been plagued by shortages of competent overseas personnel since the inception of its technical assistance and international education programs. The personnel problem appears to have evolved to such a stage that the government as an institution of superior social power must bargain with universities as subordinate institutions for the use of a "prized" resource. The struggle between the government and universities implied in the personnel problem has been prominent in government-sponsored programs at least since the early 1950's.

Unlike university personnel, the government respondents frequently said universities can be expected to perform political and economic acts through international programs. This expectation has been reflected in most of the dealings between the government and universities during the processes involved in carrying out international programs, especially those programs financed by public funds. Notwithstanding the fact that this expectation on the part of government personnel has apparently contributed to many of the discordant aspects of the operation of international programs, the government respondents maintained their point of view that the government can and should manipulate universities in such a way that universities contribute to the pursuit of governmentally-defined foreign policy goals.

Government respondents expressed no special concern about, or interest in, the impacts of international programs on American universities. There appeared to be an underlying assumption among government

respondents that universities are receiving adequate financial and prestige rewards from international programs. Such rewards tended to be viewed by these respondents as appropriate and as non-threatening to universities' independence. The government respondents apparently did not share or understand the anxieties of university personnel as to the possible ramifications and implications for universities of extensive international commitments supported by non-educational institutions. This basic inability, or failure, on the part of two major actors, the government and universities, to find a common perspective from which to view the international programs of American universities as they affect international relations appears to be a crucial consideration in any assessment of the international roles of universities.

III. Foundation personnel tended to perceive the roles of American universities in international relations in much the same ways as university personnel. This similarity of perceptions is probably related to similarities in the backgrounds of university and foundation personnel, and to recent trends in foundation spending which favor universities.

Although the foundation and university respondents more frequently agreed than disagreed, some differences in the responses of the two groups did exist. Foundation respondents placed greater emphasis on the responsibilities of American universities to make direct contributions to the economic and social development of foreign countries through international programs. Since foundations frequently sponsor the international activities of many American universities rather than perform extensive university-type functions themselves, foundation respondents apparently tended to be concerned as much with the impacts of

"their" programs on the host countries and/or institutions as with the programs' impacts on American universities. This is not to say, by contrast, that American university respondents were indifferent to universities' overseas impacts; but, as might be expected, university respondents apparently attached greater significance to effects of international programs on American universities than did such non-university respondents as foundation executives.

While foundation respondents did not express support for direct government control of international programs, whether the programs are privately or publicly sponsored, they did indicate that the claims of many university respondents for complete operational freedom for universities in international relations are unwarranted. Foundations, like universities, have had some "unfortunate" experiences with the government, which might be a basis for finding a "common cause" with universities against the government; yet, foundation respondents frequently said that universities are operating under a "cloud of inordinate fear" concerning government intervention in their affairs. Further, foundation respondents said that such fears have led to actions by universities and responses by the government which have detracted from achievement of the purposes of international programs.

Other examples of differing university-foundation perceptions appeared in the findings. What seems significant about such differences is not their number or that they might represent warning signs of a possible schism between universities and foundations (these differences are not nearly as important as the large reservoir of similarities between the two institutions); but that they suggest possible avenues for future cooperation among the three major actors. The foundation

respondents said that although foundations generally support the universities' positions with respect to carrying out international programs, foundations are beginning to favor increased coordination of international programs among the programs' actors. This may suggest that foundations might cast themselves in the role of "moderators" among the participants in future international programs.

Impacts of International Programs on Participating American Universities

Both the historical materials in Chapter III and the findings reported in Chapters IV-VI of the present study indicate that international programs have discernible impacts on participating American universities. The exact nature and dimensions of the impacts are not clear. The impacts are most evident in the following areas:

1) Characteristics of university personnel (including their professional attitudes, outlooks, and actions), and university policies toward them.
2) Subject-matters taught and researched by universities.
3) Internal organization of universities.
4) International roles of universities.
5) Some characteristics traditionally associated with the university as an institution.

I. Impacts with Respect to the Characteristics of University Personnel, and to Universities' Policies toward their Personnel

The university respondents (especially if the respondent had traveled abroad) frequently mentioned that participation in international educational activities results in a "broadening" of the participants' perspectives. This means that the participants in international

programs, at home and abroad, increase their knowledge and appreciation of "things foreign." Furthermore, as the content of the participant's knowledge changes, his attitudes about the involvement of universities in international relations tend to become more favorable. Intellectual changes of this nature tend, in turn, to lead to a heightened propensity on the part of university personnel to participate in international programs, and to be increasingly active in precipitating further involvement of universities in international relations.

Not all participants are favorably impressed by their international program experiences, nor are all those persons who evaluate their own experiences favorably conscious supporters of more university involvement in international relations. Those participants who have negative reactions appear to be small in number and relatively ineffectual in their attempts to reverse the current growth of international programs. Some participants who are favorably impressed by international programs may not consciously and actively support more programs; yet, they tend to constitute a "reservoir of good will" which can serve as a buffer between the proponents and opponents of more international programs, as well as a "respectability factor" the "program-expansionists" can use in their attempts to influence university leaderships.

A second impact of international programs on university personnel has been to alter the loyalty patterns of many university personnel. Many of those persons favorably impressed with international programs, as well as a few opportunists among the "disaffected" group of university personnel, have changed and/or added professional and institutional reference groups as a consequence of their contacts with international programs. The result has been the creation of several new professional

and semi-professional groups which cut across the traditional, discipline-oriented reference groups of university personnel. Such changes tend to weaken the traditional groups, or in some cases influence the traditional groups to expand their activities to include the interests of the growing internationally-oriented groups. Consequently, one can see several times a year the formation of new professional groups which take as their intellectual focus international activities, and the expansion of existing professional organizations, such as the American Political Science Association, to include the international interests of their memberships.

Frequently university personnel choose among alternative universities not on the basis of which one has the best department for their particular disciplines, but which one offers the best opportunities for "international experience." This does not mean that university personnel are foresaking entirely their traditional loyalties, but only that in an increasing number of cases university personnel are attaching special importance to being associated with universities having international programs. A small minority of university personnel appear to have made their individual choices among universities exclusively on the basis of the universities' attitudes toward and participation in international relations. What has happened insofar as traditional loyalties and reference groups are concerned may not represent anything approaching a "destruction" of the old order, but it may suggest future changes in the preferences and value-priorities of many university personnel, in the direction of greater emphasis on international activities.

A third impact of international programs has been to alter material and prestige statuses of many university personnel. The

material and prestige statuses include financial rewards, prestige among colleagues, employment opportunities, etc. Those university personnel who had participated in large-scale international programs sponsored by the government or by large foundations frequently reported that their material and prestige statuses were noticeably improved. This was reported more frequently by younger participants than by older participants. But nearly all participants in the large programs said that they had reaped financial rewards through participation in international programs greater than those they could conceivably have acquired under "regular" academic circumstances in the same period of time. Participants in the small programs did not generally point to any significant changes in their financial positions as a direct result of their participation in international programs.

One positive impact of international programs on the material-prestige condition of all university personnel affected was the increased opportunity for them to travel. From a personal point of view, the university personnel frequently rated overseas travel as a valuable experience which they could not have acquired under other circumstances.

One outcome of the alteration in the material-prestige conditions of university personnel has been the development of a widespread feeling among those who have participated in the programs that their "general level of professional competence" has increased. By this, university personnel frequently mean the kinds of "broadening" influences previously referred to. But in addition to those influences, some university personnel reported that they developed new professional competences and/or added to old competences as a result of international programs. This belief was prevalent primarily among small-program participants;

however, it was not completely absent among participants in large-scale programs. The large-scale program participant was more likely to report that he reverted to lower levels of professional competence because he was most frequently involved in technical assistance programs which, by their nature, tend to be attempts to build structures from the ground up, rather than to add to already existing, highly-developed structures.

As the university personnel recounted the ways in which international programs had an impact on them, they tended to conclude that their over-all personal statuses had improved. A few told stories of personal deprivation related to international programs, but these respondents represented exceptions to the general pattern.

From what has been reported, it would appear that the impact of international programs on participant university personnel was, on balance, favorably perceived by the respondents. But this is only partially correct, for a significant number of both university respondents and sponsoring organization respondents reported that although the individual university person makes a favorable assessment of his personal improvement, that same person tends to feel that his university and profession do not make a similar assessment of his international program experiences. This frequently results in conflict with those on the home campus who evaluate the participants from an institutional/professional point of veiw. This kind of conflict is not new, but it tends to be extremely visible because of the striking, dramatic qualities associated with a person's working professionally in an international milieu during a time when international relations have increased importance from an American perspective.

The conflict generally centers around the value that should be attached to international program experience in selecting persons for rewards within the universities and professions. Of course, the participant tends to place a high value on such experiences, especially if he is young or is a newcomer who hopes to be upwardly mobile. In small universities with small programs, problems related to the distribution of rewards for this kind of service are relatively few. But in universities involved in large-scale programs, the question of how to incorporate international program experience into those universities' various reward structures remains one of considerable importance. The way this question is answered may produce significant impacts on future participation of university personnel in international programs. For the answer will induce either more or less participation, and this, in turn, may determine the over-all effects of American universities in international relations.

II. Impacts with Respect to the Subject-Matters Taught and Researched by Universities

Those respondents who generally supported the involvement of American universities in international relations through well-defined programs tended to believe that the content of what is taught and the ways in which it is taught by American universities are being or will be significantly altered as a result of program participation. Yet the respondents pointed to very few subject-matter changes which could be directly attributed to international programs. They said, however, that in many instances the universities' participation in international programs has contributed to the universities' acceptance of new courses and materials having an "international emphasis." Since most of the

programs are relatively new, and since the establishment of any direct causal relationships between international programs and the development of new subject-matters at universities is difficult, the respondents most frequently took two avenues to describe the impacts of the programs on subject-matters: (1) international programs develop university personnel who generate a favorable environment for the inclusion of an "international dimension" in the universities' handling of subject matters, and (2) the growth of international programs will develop attitudes among university personnel which will result in expansion of the "international dimension" in existing subject-matters and in the creation of new courses and new research emphases.

There is very little empirical evidence to support the first approach. There is, however, considerable evidence in the form of general statements by nearly all the university respondents who teach that they, as individuals, teach their own courses differently as a result of their international program experiences. Very few respondents from this group said they drastically re-structured their courses to include cross-cultural materials, or created new courses. But most of these respondents said they brought cross-cultural materials into the existing frameworks of their courses. This means that far more cross-cultural materials may be included in the subject-matter offerings of many universities than such formal statements of university offerings as catalogs generally indicate. The reasons for the possible differences between formal statements and what may actually be taught and researched are undoubtedly numerous and complex. For example, inertia probably accounts for many of the differences. Whatever the causes, there apparently remains among many universities the general impression that

their subject-matter offerings have hardly been affected by international programs.

While the lack of "formal evidence" that changes in subject-matters have occurred as a result of the impacts of international programs may produce some smugness among critics of international programs at universities, it has also led many university persons who are generally favorably disposed toward the programs to assume that the impacts of the programs on subject-matters will occur in the future. This latter group of university personnel were supported in their approach by nearly all foundation respondents and most of the government respondents who made statements with respect to this aspect of international programs.

Those respondents with the "future-orientation" tended to agree with program critics that there exists very little evidence which would "prove" that university participation in international programs has produced important innovations or revisions in subject-matters or in the ways in which these subject-matters are taught. These respondents did, however, move beyond the position of those respondents who said that participation in international programs produces a "favorable environment" for changes in subject matters (see numeral (1) above). That is, they started with the assumption that a favorable environment for an "international dimension" in some subject-matters is developing on many university campuses. This developing environment they attributed partially to international programs. The respondents then said that, as the environment becomes increasingly favorable, there will exist opportunities for important re-structuring of the subject-matters handled by universities. International program participants will provide the

initiative and leadership to alter subject-matters and teaching approaches. As a result, cross-cultural materials will be featured prominently in the universities' curricula and research activities. Such recent events as the Ford Foundation grant to Michigan State University to assist that institution in finding ways to relate the international program experiences of its personnel to the university's academic program support the optimism of the second approach.

Presently, evaluation of the impacts of international programs on the kinds of things universities teach and research tends to be primarily a matter of guesswork. However, as the following materials concerning the impacts of international programs on the internal organization of universities will show, some universities are beginning to change their organizational forms so that an analysis of the relationships between subject-matters and international activities of universities is becoming more feasible.

III. Impacts with Respect to the Internal Organization of Universities

The majority of respondents reported that participation by universities in international programs produces changes in the internal organization of many universities. Their observations are supported by the literature describing the development of international programs (see Chapter III). Changes in administrative and organizational structures are, of course, easier for most people to detect than are changes in such areas as subject-matter. Moreover, since some international programs require substantial administrative support units for their proper functioning, the connection between international programs and the establishment of such units within the universities' structures

appears obvious to most observers. But this does not show that the international programs result in significant changes in the formal, internal organization of all participating universities, or that such changes are the only important organizational changes which occur.

First, most universities participate in small-scale international programs which seldom produce important organizational changes according to the respondents representing universities with small-scale programs. It is among the relatively few universities having large-scale international programs that respondents reported important organizational changes that were made to accommodate the programs. Notwithstanding the fact that only a small number of universities participate in large-scale programs, a large number of American universities have expressed interest in the organizational changes such participant universities have made as a result of international programs. For example, the Committee on Institutional Projects Abroad of the American Council on Education maintains a continuing interest in the organizational methods universities have developed to facilitate their participation in international programs. The Committee disseminates information on such developments to ACE's membership of nearly 1,000 universities. One result of this cooperative pooling of universities' organizational experiences may be an increase in the operating efficiency of some international programs.

Second, although changes in the formal organization of universities are relatively easy to detect, changes in universities' informal organizational patterns are almost impossible to analyze without considerable study in depth at each university. Obviously, the kinds of "depth" studies which might reveal those changes in universities'

informal organizations which can be attributed to international programs are far beyond the scope of the present study. Incidental information provided by numerous respondents suggests, in a general way, that changes in some universities' informal power structures can be linked to those universities' participation in international programs. It seems reasonable to expect these kinds of changes in view of the fact that the respondents had already reported changes in universities' formal organization patterns. Furthermore, it is generally accepted that informal structures in most organizations tend to develop in response to certain characteristics of the formal structures. Beyond this point, the present study can not go.

Within the limitations suggested by the two preceding precautionary statements, the impacts of international programs on the internal organization of universities can be summarized by describing the universities' attempts to change or develop machinery to meet the demands of international programs with respect to the following:

1) Providing administrative support for international programs.
2) Providing staff for international programs.
3) Providing replacements for staff involved in international programs.
4) Developing and carrying out policies designed to achieve the goals of international programs.
5) Cooperating with organizations that sponsor international programs.
6) Involving the non-participating, "at home" staff in international programs.
7) Developing structures which will enable universities to maximize the benefits to themselves of participation in international programs.

1. Providing administrative support for international programs

Respondents at eighteen of the thirty universities in the sample said the universities they represented have developed new machinery to provide administrative support for their international programs. All eighteen of these universities have large programs sponsored by either the government or large foundations or both. The universities are all in the "very large" or "large" (minimum enrollment of 8,000) categories as defined by the U.S. Office of Education. Respondents at six of the remaining twelve universities said their universities have provided administrative machinery for the support of their international programs by adding responsibilities to existing structures and/or by re-arranging some administrative units. These respondents did not consider such machinery "new," although they did report that the organizational changes made were in response to the administrative demands of their universities' international programs. Thus, respondents at twenty-four of a possible thirty universities indicated that one impact of international programs has been the creation of new and/or different administrative patterns and structures within the traditional frameworks of the universities.

One testimonial to the growth of distinctive administrative devices at universities designed to support participation in international programs is that half of the universities involved in this study have on-campus "coordinators" for international activities. At all but two of these universities, the coordinators' positions were created during the 1950's. Perhaps it should be granted that many coordinators may have very little to coordinate; yet, the fact that they are recognized as distinctive "administrative entities" attests to the

increased significance universities apparently are attaching to problems of providing administrative support for international programs.

2. Providing staff for international programs

As the findings of the present study (see Chapters IV-VI) frequently indicate, the task of providing staff for international programs is a persistent problem for universities participating in international programs. Respondents at all those universities with multi-person overseas groups said that providing staff for international programs on a continuing basis is the most difficult demand to meet. Initially, it was relatively easy for universities to staff international programs. Many university persons were anxious to travel, and the early personnel demands of the programs were relatively small. But as many programs now involve universities on a long-term basis; as universities and host countries become more exacting with respect to qualifications of personnel for overseas work; and as the demands on American universities increase at home, the problems of staffing international programs adequately are compounded.

Most respondents said universities are in a state of confusion over how to allocate their very scarce personnel to meet the variety of demands which are placed upon them. Nothing approaching a priority system for personnel allocation has been established at any significant number of universities. Moreover, the relative independence of the most desirable university persons and their related ability to command a variety of attractive opportunities make it extremely difficult for any university to systematize their behavior. Thus, until questions concerning the priority of demands and the regularization of expectations

surrounding the job behavior of university persons can be at least partially resolved, the outlook for the development of rational procedures for staffing international programs seems dim.

Responses of university personnel concerning the impacts of international programs on the staffing practices of their universities have varied. Some universities maintain special recruiting staffs that scour the country for persons to send overseas as part of the "university's team." Others "pressure" some of their less active staff into participating. Still others create sort of "foreign service" staff that spends most of its time moving from one program to another. No one appeared satisfied with the results of these measures, except a few persons who apparently used the international programs for personal financial gains. Yet no one seemed able to offer any well-developed alternative plans for meeting the staffing problems raised by international programs. Consequently, the impacts of the programs on staffing procedures have created a degree of confusion among university personnel greater than any other single aspect of the administration of international programs. As a result, "errors" in program staffing have become an important springboard for critics of international programs.[171]

3. Providing replacements for staff involved in international programs

Just as attempts to find ways of staffing international programs have failed to produce consistent, acceptable machinery, so have efforts to replace participant personnel resulted in a patchwork of stop-gap

---

[171]For examples of these kinds of criticisms see Walter Adams and John Garraty, Is the World Our Campus? (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1960), and William Lederer and Eugene Burdick, The Ugly American (New York: Norton, 1958).

measures. University decision-makers appeared to approach the problem from at least two perspectives.

First, one group of university decision-makers responsible for staff selection viewed the matter of finding replacements as a very difficult and onerous task. They felt that it is usually impossible to attract personnel of the same caliber as those who have gone abroad. The temporary nature of the employment offered to replacements discourages the most qualified senior-level personnel from accepting any offers, they claimed. Further, these same university personnel asserted, the temporary nature of replacements tends to disrupt the regular program of the university. Finally, the process of finding replacements consumes time and energy. This view appeared to be characteristic of more than half of those university respondents who were working with programs involving two or more persons. The general orientation among these respondents emphasized academic research and de-emphasized administrative responsibilities to the university community.

A second group of university decision-makers seemed to view with a minimum of enthusiasm the task of finding staff replacements as did the group just described, but the persons in the second group were optimistic about the <u>results</u> the process produces. As several university department heads described the situation, the process of replacing staff serving with international programs produces opportunities for departments to find new staff through avenues which might otherwise be closed. By this the department heads apparently meant that they could use the usual two-year replacement period as a period in which to evaluate potential staff members, at no additional cost to the department. Such devices increase the operating flexibility of the universities and their

parts and, importantly in the minds of this second group of respondents, they permit a modest expansion of staff. In effect, the process of replacing temporarily absent staff has developed into a process of permanently expanding the staffs of many universities. One department head said, "They somehow manage to remain far beyond the terms of their initial appointment."

These two "approaches" to the problem of finding staff replacements can hardly be called well-developed machinery for meeting the long-range staffing demands of international programs on universities. Of course, in one sense, the existing procedures meet the immediate demands. But they generally represent hurried responses to urgent stimuli, rather than rational attempts to resolve the significant questions raised by the attempts of American universities to allocate their human resources in such a way that they fulfill both their domestic and international roles.

4. Developing and carrying out policies designed to achieve the goals of international programs

As recent conferences involving international program "knowledgeables," such as the Michigan Conference on International Development,[172] have pointed out, the definition of international program goals remains a difficult problem facing both universities and their sponsors. Occasionally, these actors discover after a period of participation in international programs that universities and sponsors have developed

---

[172]This conference involved representatives of Michigan State University, University of Michigan, and Wayne State University in a discussion of the general subject of international development through such devices as international programs. The conference was held in Ann Arbor, Michigan, during the period May 15-17, 1960.

different ideas and are pursuing different goals. For universities with small programs these problems appear minor. But challenges are acutely felt at those universities with large, complex programs, especially if such programs are of the technical assistance variety. These kinds of programs raise new and sometimes overpowering questions about the international goals and roles of American universities. Responses have varied. Some universities, especially those with small programs, handle the policy and goal questions raised by their participation in international programs within traditional policy structures. In this way, existing policy machinery bears the additional weight of policy decisions for international programs. When this kind of arrangement is made at universities with large-scale programs, dissatisfaction with policy-making procedures appeared high among personnel familiar with the arrangement.

Other universities have responded to the policy-making challenges by constructing new decision-making structures which have as their primary concern the formulation of policies related to international programs. These new structures are then related in some way to the over-all policy-making structures of the universities concerned. Frequently, the relationships are not happy, for entrenched interests seldom welcome a newcomer who might turn into a challenger. Whether the internal policy-making relationships which have emerged as a result of international programs are cordial or not appears to be of only temporary significance. The increases in numbers and sizes of international programs and a rising level of interest among university personnel in developing new policy-making structures to deal with them may sweep aside traditional interests. Given the signs of ferment among university

respondents with respect to the present confusion about policy direction for international programs, it seems reasonable to assume that new machinery for developing universities' international program policies and goals is in the near future.

Of the various attempts by universities to alter their internal organization to accommodate international programs, Michigan State University's new office of "Dean of International Programs" aroused the most interest among respondents. Many other large universities were in the process of developing policy-making and administrative structures at the time interviewing for the present study was conducted. As these universities worked toward their own solutions, they expressed interest in the ways other universities were trying to solve similar problems. Since Michigan State University made an early break with tradition when it developed the Office of the Dean of International Programs, it became a focus of discussion. But no other universities have produced "copies" of Michigan State's solution. Instead, many variations have evolved and continue to evolve. The University of California at Berkeley has developed a complicated system of interlocking committees, deans, and vice-presidents who have the collective responsibility for determining what goals that university is pursuing through international programs and what policies will lead to the attainment of these goals. Even administratively fragmented Harvard is grappling with a plan at the "vice-presidential level" which its leadership hopes will lead to coordination of the university's various international activities. Thus, the responses are of many kinds. International programs apparently are producing more new structures than most university respondents knew about or would acknowledge.

5. Cooperating with organizations that sponsor international programs

One trend at large universities that appeared to be strongly influenced by international programs was creation of some kind of "office" bearing responsibilities for bringing universities, their personnel, and sponsors together. Frequently such an office is known as "The Office for Institutional Research," "The Office of Special Projects," "Research Coordinating Office," or "The Office of Contract Research," etc. These offices are not the exclusive result of universities' participation in international programs, but the programs have contributed to their growth.

The primary function of such university offices appears to be to regularize the avenues of communications between universities and outside organizations which desire to sponsor university activities in such fields as international education. In this way, the universities can coordinate the requests of their individual faculty members, supervise the expenditure of sponsor's funds, pursue more rational procedures for attracting money, etc. By and large, both foundation and government respondents spoke favorably of the development of these offices. Only a few university respondents disliked this "new bureaucratic device designed to reduce the independence of the individual professor," as one stated the case. On balance, it appears that international programs, however, have stimulated the establishment of university offices which have a primary responsibility for contacting and cooperating with sponsoring organizations.

6. Involving non-participant, "at home" staff in international programs

Many university respondents expressed a realization that the success of international programs depends to a large extent on increasing the involvement of the total university population in international programs. In the first instance, staffing requirements of the programs seem to suggest that participation by a larger number of university persons will be necessary very soon if the current rate of growth is to be sustained or even if present levels of university participation in international relations are to be maintained. Second, since part of the philosophical underpinning for the involvement of universities in international programs is that "the best programs are those which involve universities as whole institutions," the success of the programs appears to be related to the involvement of a large proportion of the universities' staffs.

Involvement of the staff in international programs does not necessarily mean that such persons must be direct participants in the programs. What was desired by most of the respondents is that more university personnel become "intellectually" involved in the programs. To accomplish this, the respondents claimed, one must seek to identify international programs with universities as whole institutions so that those persons with loyalties to their universities also have loyalties to its programs. In this way, the experiences of that proportion of the various university staffs that participate directly in international programs will have more meaning for more university personnel, and the individual participants will have an increased opportunity to affect the content of what American universities are attempting to teach.

Very little overt machinery has been developed at universities to create the foregoing types of impacts. Primarily, involvement of additional university persons in international program experiences is attempted through such unsystematic devices as occasional lectures and/or stories concerning personal experiences, committee meetings of like-minded people who talk about involving more people, and individual persuasion. On only two campuses was information obtained which indicated that sustained, specialized, university-wide steps were being taken to make international programs, in effect, "everybody's interest." The over-all picture still tends to be one in which a small "elite" group dominates international programs. An atmosphere of mixed apathy and hostility toward the "elite" group may prevail on the part of their colleagues.

7. Developing structures which will enable universities to maximize the benefits to themselves of participation in international programs

Several general "themes" appear with some consistency in the respondents' descriptions of the impacts of international programs on the internal organization of universities. First, the kinds of machinery which have emerged to meet the demands of international programs of universities are perceived as very rudimentary. They are at best, perhaps, first attempts by some universities to re-arrange their internal mechanics to meet the demands of international programs and to derive some recognizable benefits from participation in the programs. Second, most of the machinery developed has yet to produce the results which were envisaged for it. This may be a function of the machinery's newness and the widespread state of confusion surrounding all aspects of

international programs at many universities. Whatever the cause, or causes, internal organizational changes have not yet provided the means for universities to maximize the potential benefits of international programs.

Third, one reason that international programs seem to lack results which are highly valued by universities appears to be the universities' and the sponsors' inability to formulate program goals. Very simply stated, seldom do universities or sponsors know what their goals are; and when they think they do, they tend to disagree. Because universities have not yet answered the basic questions about the relationships of international programs to universities' policies, most universities have not yet begun to create structures which will increase the possibility that they will derive some agreed-upon benefits from participation in international programs.

The disorganization which the large-scale international programs, in particular, have produced at many universities, and the necessity for new organizational forms that these programs have imposed on universities apparently have not dulled the motivation of universities to participate in such programs. There remains among most university personnel, if the university respondents are at all representative of them, a feeling that international programs have a general value worth pursuing.

IV. Impacts with Respect to the International Roles of Universities

The major impact of international programs on universities' international roles appears to be a general expansion of these roles. Since the findings are based exclusively on statements made by

international program knowledgeables, this outcome could probably have been anticipated. Significant in any discussion of the expansion of universities' international roles is the fact that these roles have traditionally been very limited. Consequently, any growth in the international activities of universities would probably appear striking to most observers.

As many of the roles of universities have expanded under the impacts of international programs and of other developments in American society (these would include such things as increased demand for skilled personnel, increased complexity of social organization, increased international responsibility, etc.), universities' involvement in many aspects of public policy formulation and execution has also increased. Although most of the respondents denied that universities are becoming more directly involved in public policy questions and decisions, the actual behavior of universities in such activities as international programs tends to refute their denial. One aspect of the universities' expanded roles seems to be their increased involvement in those kinds of policy considerations which are not customarily recognized as academic. Quite plainly, universities are becoming increasingly a direct, overt part of public policy apparatuses. To some respondents this trend suggested an increased politicization of universities. To most of the respondents such a development appeared undesirable. But the trend of various changes in universities' behavior patterns, which have been outlined in the preceding materials, suggests that many universities may have to accept the possibility that they cannot simply expand their roles without also expanding their over-all policy responsibilities.

For the immediate future, it seems likely that universities will respond to such stimuli as technical assistance programs and international education programs by allocating an increasing proportion of their resources to roles geared to meet the demands imposed on them by these stimuli. Thus, more university resources will tend to go "off-campus" for extended periods.

V. Impacts with Respect to some Characteristics Traditionally Associated with the University as an Institution

As reported in Chapters VI and VII, the demands for participation in international relations currently imposed on universities appear to create strains on universities which, in turn, evoke from them searches for different and/or new ways to accommodate the demands. For the moment, few crucial changes in the traditional structures of universities apparently have occurred. But as the demands for university resources increase, and as universities intensify their own efforts to attract sponsors for their international activities, it seems probable that some far-reaching departures from their traditions will result.

Suggestions by observers of international programs like Edward W. Weidner and Harlan Cleveland that an organization similar to the National Science Foundation be created to handle the allocation of government funds for international programs have been cited as evidence that the value of some existing structures is being questioned. The many complaints by university personnel that international programs commit too many scarce university resources, and the suggestions that a permanent pool of university personnel drawn from all universities be created to staff international programs are additional examples of

existing doubts about the adequacy of universities in international relations. The voices of the critics and doubters were few as compared to those of the many respondents who expressed "some concern" over the impacts of international programs on universities, but who, at the same time, foresaw few fundamental changes in the university as an institution. Yet, many trends in American higher education as well as some undercurrents of unrest among university personnel with respect to the possible ways universities might be related to public policies, suggest that the voices of the "few" may represent a prelude to important changes in universities, and especially in their roles in international relations.

So great have become the aggregate demands and requirements of the United States with respect to universities that it seems unlikely that universities will be able to retain their traditional structures or the "indirectness" of their involvement in public policy. One outcome of present demands and trends might be a more integrated system of American higher education with respect to universities' participation in international relations instead of the present system of separate American universities participating separately in international relations. Given the possible nature of present and future demands for international service by universities and their personnel, this might represent a more rational allocation of universities' resources than currently exists.

Recommendations

One of the purposes of the present study is to make recommendations concerning the growing involvement of American universities in international relations. Such recommendations might constitute a "starting point" for further considerations by policy-makers. If the historical perspective, assumptions, and findings of this study are accepted, the following recommendations seem to be in order:

I. Recommendations With Respect to American Universities

A. American universities should establish a systematic means for the exchange of information concerning all aspects of their involvement in international relations. In this way, universities can try to accumulate an organized body of information which will be useful for them in planning. As a starting point, universities currently recognized as leaders with respect to the participation of universities in international relations should take the initiative in bringing together information on the separate activities related to international relations of such organizations as the American Council on Education, the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities, and the Institute of International Education. Existing organizational forms for communications among university leaderships provide an adequate base from which more advanced forms for cooperative behavior among universities can be developed. The numberous conferences and committees which have been called to discuss universities in international relations express the need for joint efforts by universities, but they provide minimal forms for actual cooperation. The old ways and the old forms may not be adequate for the new demands of a changing world. Now universities should draw together the experiences of universities and other groups concerned with the relationships of education and international relations. Then universities should incorporate these experiences into a more inclusive and more realistic policy-making framework.

1. The specific organizational form such a cooperative enterprise among universities might take is not crucial. Adequate accumulation and distribution of information and the development of minimum cooperative standards could be achieved through a permanent committee or

council structure, a permanent "clearing house," or a permanent, authoritative bureaucracy. The crucial point is, simply, that universities might devise their own means for clarifying their roles in international relations.

2. Once an organization is formed and has accumulated some operating experience, university leaderships should take steps to place the following responsibilities within the organization's field of action:

a) Formulation of a set of general, minimum goals to be sought by universities participating in international relations.

b) Distribution of information to sponsors about universities interested in international programs, and distribution of information to universities about the availability of international programs.

c) Development and maintenance of inventories of universities and university personnel interested in, and qualified for, educational work related to international relations.

d) Development and supervision of systematic procedures for financing the participation of universities and their personnel in international relations. Such responsibility should include the formulation of standardized fiscal procedures to be used by universities handling international program funds, as well as standardized procedures for the distribution of financial rewards to participating universities and their personnel.

e) Planning the participation of universities and their personnel in international relations on a long-term basis so that dependable plans can be made by all actors for the allocation of their resources.

f) Development of equitable, efficient, and uniform administrative procedures with respect to international programs. Any organization that seeks to coordinate universities' participation in international relations must face the problem of creating an administrative structure that meets the needs of such participants fairly and uniformly. Of special interest is the problem of finding a "formula" for relating international experiences of university personnel to the over-all reward structures of universities and the professions.

g) Conducting continuing research concerning ways in which the content of what universities teach can be related to what universities do in international relations. For example, consideration could be given to the possible development of procedures for imparting international program experiences to all universities through a publishing program and through devices similar to the American Universities Field Staff.

h) Orienting universities and their personnel for participation in international relations. Such orientation should serve at least two purposes. First, it should prepare committed personnel for their international experiences. Second, it should acquaint uncommitted personnel with the kinds of roles universities perform in international relations.

3. As an organization whose aim is to bring greater coherence to the various relationships of universities to international relations begins to function in earnest, it is likely that the organization will become not only a coordinator of university experiences with respect to international relations and a distributor of information about these

experiences to all universities; but also, the organization should become a primary point of contact between universities and their sponsors. The present study shows that many sponsors prefer to deal with "recognized institutions" rather than with individuals. Thus, as a coordinating body representing universities becomes established, it would probably become an important focus of sponsors' interests.

a) American universities should use this organization to involve themselves in policy considerations affecting international relations. Universities should assume the initiative in defining their relationships with the foreign policies of the United States. Universities are more likely to become "instruments of foreign policy manipulated by government elites" if they lack comprehension of the place of higher education in international relations and if they are preoccupied with the "independence" of the university, than if they take the initiative with respect to defining their involvement. This assumes, clearly, that universities have political roles and that they should quickly find the means to specify these roles and to perform them intelligently and effectively.

II. Recommendations with Respect to Sponsors

If the recommendations with respect to universities are observed, the following recommendations for sponsors seem appropriate:

A. Sponsors should encourage directly and vigorously the development of an organization encompassing higher education which will provide universities with a definite role and audible voice with respect

to their participation in international relations. Sponsors' encouragement should include funds to plan and build such an organization, and commitments to support the organization once it is formed. This would mean that sponsors would agree to channel their contacts, discussions, grants, contracts, etc., affecting the international activities of universities through a single organization representing universities.

1. As universities organize, (1) to maximize the benefits they derive from their participation in international relations, and (2) to maximize their impacts on international relations, sponsors should re-organize the channels through which they cooperate with universities in international relations.

a) The U.S. Government should experiment with new ways to coordinate its sponsorship of universities' international programs. The National Science Foundation might offer a prototype, but it should be emphasized that any organization developed for the foregoing purpose should not be construed as a device for insuring the complete independence of universities in international relations. Instead, any such organization should provide a framework for the intelligent comprehension by universities of U.S. foreign policy goals and the forceful contribution by universities of their ideas to the formulation and achievement of foreign policy goals.

b) Foundations should recognize that their emphasis on "separateness" is a luxury they can no longer afford if they expect foundation funds and programs to carry significant weight in international relations. The government is rapidly overshadowing foundations as a sponsor of universities' international

activities. If the foundations desire to maximize the impacts of their "venture capital," they should coordinate foundation activities in the international area. The recent establishment of the Foundation Library, a central repository for information about the major foundations, attests to how little foundations have known about each other. Having learned through Congressional investigations how vulnerable they are to attack, and seeing the growth of government spending in areas once the exclusive preserve of foundations, foundation leaderships should act to form an agency which would coordinate their respective activities and cooperate with a comparable agency representing universities.

c) Private sponsors whose international activities are small as compared to those of the government and the large foundations should use a central university organization to acquaint themselves with the possibilities of increasing their international impacts in cooperation with universities. In this way, small-scale sponsors would be able to participate in international programs and understand the extent to which their participation complemented the over-all goals of universities and the government in international relations.

III. General Recommendation

Universities and their sponsors should recognize that the statements of their own representatives as reported in the present study constitute at least a partial indictment of their attempts to make old forms meet the dynamics of a rapidly changing international milieu. If they recognize this difficult condition in which they now stand, then universities and their sponsors can turn to the significant and difficult

task of relating the resources of American higher education to the staggering needs and demands of international relations. The result will be a greatly expanded "general role" for American universities in international relations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Public Documents

U.S. Department of State. International Education Exchange Program: 1948-1958. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, November 1958.

_____. Point Four. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1950.

_____. Swords Into Plowshares. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, July 1956.

U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Government Operations, Forty-Second Report. Government Programs in International Education (A Survey and Handbook). Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959.

U.S. House of Representatives, 85th Congress. Government Programs in International Education. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959.

U.S. Senate, 84th Congress. Government Utilization of Private Agencies in Technical Assistance. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, January 9, 1956.

U.S. Senate, 85th Congress. Personnel for the Mutual Security Program. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, February 1957.

U.S. Senate, 85th Congress, Final Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Technical Assistance. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 12, 1957.

U.S. Senate, 85th Congress, Special Committee to Study the Foreign Aid Program. The Objectives of United States Economic Assistance Programs. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, January 1957.

Books

Adams, Richard N., and Cumberland, Charles C. United States University Cooperation in Latin America. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, Michigan State University, 1959.

Adams, Walter, and Garraty, John. Is the World Our Campus? East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1960.

American Assembly. Douglas Knight (ed.). The Federal Government and Higher Education. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

American Council on Education. Blueprint and Experience. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1958.

_____. Education Without Boundaries. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1959.

_____. Toward a Foreign Policy for Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1959.

_____. University Projects Abroad. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1956.

American Foundation Service. American Foundations and Their Fields. Seventh Edition. New York: American Foundation Service, 1955.

Andrews, F. Emerson. Philanthropic Foundations. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1956.

Baker, Vincent. World Affairs and the College Curriculum. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1959.

Barnett, Homer. Innovation: The Basis of Cultural Change. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953.

Bingham, Jonathan B. Shirt-Sleeve Diplomacy, Point 4 in Action. New York: John Day, 1954.

Bock, Edwin A. Fifty Years of Technical Assistance. Chicago: Public Administration Clearing House, 1954.

Bodenman, Paul S. American Cooperation with Higher Education Abroad. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin 1957, No. 8.

Butler, Nicholas Murray. The University and the International Mind. New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1931.

Cleveland, Harlan, et al. The Overseas Americans. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1960.

Coelho, George V. Changing Images of America: A Study of Indian Students' Perceptions. Glencoe: Free Press, 1958.

Cole, Fred, and Sterling, Richard W. World Affairs in Institutions of Higher Education in the South. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1958.

Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, Committee on International Exchange of Persons. Educational Exchanges: Aspects of the American Experience. Washington, D. C.: National Academy of Sciences--National Research Council, 1956.

Curti, Merle, and Burr, Dendall. Prelude to Point Four: American Technical Missions Overseas, 1838-1938. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1954.

DuBois, Cora. Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States. Washington: American Council on Education, 1956.

Flexner, Abraham. Funds and Foundations: Their Policies Past and Present. New York, Harper, 1952.

Fosdick, Raymond B. The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation. New York: Harper, 1952.

Fuller, C. Dale. Training of Specialists in International Relations. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1957.

Gange, John. University Research on World Affairs. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1957.

Garraty, John A., and Adams, Walter. From Main Street to the Left Bank. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1959.

Glick, Philip M. The Administration of Technical Assistance: Growth in the Americas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Gregg, Alice H. China and Educational Autonomy: The Changing Role of the Protestant Educational Missionary in China, 1807-1937. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1946.

Haskins, Charles H. The Rise of Universities. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1923.

Hirschman, Albert O. The Strategy of Economic Development. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.

Hoselitz, Bert F. (ed.). The Progress of Underdeveloped Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.

Houle, Cyril O., and Nelson, Charles A. The University, the Citizen and World Affairs. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1956.

Institute of International Education. Foreign Study for U.S. Undergraduates: A Survey of College Programs and Policies. New York: Institute of International Education, August 1958.

Institute of Research on Overseas Programs. The International Programs of American Universities: An Inventory and Analysis. East Lansing, Michigan: The Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, Michigan State University, 1958.

Jahoda, Marie, Deutsch, Morton, and Cook, Stuart. Research Methods in Social Relations, Part One: Basic Processes. New York: Dryden Press, 1951.

Key, V. O., Jr. A Primer of Statistics for Political Scientists. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1954.

Kiger, Joseph C. Operating Principles of the Larger Foundations. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1954.

Lambert, Richard D., and Bressler, Marvin. Indian Students on an American Campus. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.

Lasswell, Harold D., and Kaplan, Abraham. Power and Society. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

Lasswell, Harold D., Merriam, Charles E., and Smith, T. V. A Study of Power. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1950.

Lasswell, Harold D., et al. The Comparative Study of Elites. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1952.

Latourette, Kenneth Scott. The Christian World Mission in Our Day. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.

Laurie, S. S. The Rise and Early Constitution of Universities. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1891.

Lederer, William, and Burdick, Eugene. The Ugly Americans. New York: Norton, 1958.

Linton, Ralph. The Cultural Background of Personality. New York: Appleton-Century, 1945.

_____. The Study of Man. New York: Appleton-Century, 1936.

MacDonald, Dwight. The Ford Foundation: The Men and the Millions. New York: Reynal and Company, 1956.

Maddox, James G. Technical Assistance by Religious Agencies in Latin America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Métraux, Guy S. Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education. Pamphlet No. 9. New York: Social Science Research Council, June 1952.

Moos, Malcolm, and Rourke, Francis E. The Campus and the State. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1959.

Mott, John R. Strategic Points in the World's Conquest: The Universities and Colleges as Related to the Progress of Christianity. New York: Flemin H. Revell Company, 1898.

Myrdal, Gunnar. An International Economy: Problems and Prospects. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956.

_____. Rich Lands and Poor Lands. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

Ohlinger, Gustavus. The German Conspiracy in American Education. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1919.

Passin, Herbert, and McKnight, Robert K. In Search of Identity: The Japanese Overseas Scholar in America and Japan. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958.

Scott, Franklin. The American Experience of Swedish Students: Retrospect and Aftermath. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.

Sharp, Walter R. International Technical Assistance. Chicago: Public Administration Service, 1952.

Smith, Bruce L. Indonesian-American Cooperation in Higher Education. East Lansing, Michigan: Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, Michigan State University, 1959.

Snyder, Harold E. When Peoples Speak to Peoples. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1953.

The Student Missionary Appeal. New York: Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, various issues since 1895.

Useem, John, and Useem, Ruth H. The Western Educated Man in India. New York: Dryden Press, 1955.

Varg, Paul A. Missionaries, Chinese and Diplomats: The American Protestant Missionary Movement in China, 1890-1952. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Watson, Jeanne, and Lippitt, Ronald. Learning Across Cultures: A Study of Germans Visiting America. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1955.

Williams, Robin. American Society. New York: Alfred Knopf, Inc., 1951.

Wilson, Howard E. American College Life as Education in World Outlook. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1956.

_____. Universities and World Affairs. New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1951.

Articles and Periodicals

Carnegie Corporation of New York. "What Carnegie Corporation is," Quarterly, (April 1959).

Neiman, Lionel J., and Hughes, James W. "The Problem of the Concept of Role--A Re-Survey of the Literature," Social Forces, (October 1951), pp. 141-149.

Perkins, James A., et al. "Administration in the Halls of Ivy: A Symposium," Public Administration Review, (Winter 1960), pp. 1-27.

Whyte, William W. "What are the Foundations Up To?," Fortune, (October 1955).

_____. "Where the Foundations Fall Down," Fortune, (November 1955).

Reports

American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting, 1948-1958.

Association of American Colleges, Council on Student Travel, Experiment in International Living, and Institute of International Education. Academic Programs Abroad: An Exploration of Their Assets and Liabilities. Report of a special conference, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts, January 14-16, 1960.

Institute of International Education. College and University Programs of Academic Exchange. A Report Prepared by the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy. New York: Institute of International Education, March 1960.

_____. Expanding University Enrollments and the Foreign Student: A Case for Foreign Students at U.S. Colleges and Universities. A Report Prepared by the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy. New York: Institute of International Education, February 1957.

_____. Twenty Years of United States Government Programs in Cultural Relations. A Report Prepared by the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy. New York: Institute of International Education, January 1959.

Unpublished Material

Beaver, R. Pierce. "Educational Work of the Protestant Foreign Missionary Agencies of the U.S.A." New York: Missionary Research Library, 1954. (Typewritten.)

Donovan, George F. "A Preliminary Statement--Numerical Distribution of Catholic Colleges and Universities," National Catholic Education Association, 1956. (Typewritten.)

Mills, Plummer W. Protestant Colleges in Asia, the Near East, Africa, and Latin America. New York: Missionary Research Library, 1955. (Mimeographed.)

U.S. Department of State. "Scientific and Technical Cooperation in the American Republics under the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation, 1939-1949." (Mimeographed.)

U.S. Foreign Operations Administration, Education Committee. "Summary Minutes of January 24, 1955." (Mimeographed.)