



3 1293 01019 7881

This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled
FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF THE
PRIORITIES AND IMPORTANCE OF
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL GOALS:
THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL ARKANSAS, A CASE STUDY
presented by

Brian Victor Bolter

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Doctorate degree in Philosophy


Major professor

Date May 30, 1991

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
APR 12 2006	_____	_____
APR 12 2006 013000	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

MSU is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

c:\pkr\date\due.pm3-p.1

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF THE
PRIORITIES AND IMPORTANCE OF
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL GOALS:
THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL ARKANSAS,
A CASE STUDY

By

Brian Victor Bolter

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Higher Education Administration

1991

ABSTRACT

FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRIORITIES AND IMPORTANCE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL GOALS: THE UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL ARKANSAS, A CASE STUDY

By

Brian V. Bolter

The importance and priority of international educational goals at the University of Central Arkansas were studied. All 435 full-time faculty members were surveyed, and 110 responded. The seven different international goals in terms of priority and importance included: International Student Services, Global Awareness, Recruitment and Enrollment, Faculty Exchange, International Training, Study Abroad, and English as a Second Language. The survey indicated that the responding faculty found International Exchange and English as a Second Language as the two most significant goals. The survey also showed that all goals had a moderate level of importance and priority among faculty. The findings were congruent with past literature in that the lack of understanding of the various components of international education leads to confusion among faculty. Because responding faculty gave support to all goals in terms of priority and importance, a further explanation of goals seems warranted.

Dedicated to
Anne
Thank you for your love and understanding
Kate and Meg
For understanding why Papa wasn't there
and why he wanted to be a "Thinking Doctor"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1	Introduction of Problem	Page 1
Chapter 2	Review of Literature	Page 16
Chapter 3	Design and Methodology	Page 50
Chapter 4	Statistical Findings	Page 58
Chapter 5	Conclusions	Page 65
Footnotes		Page 87
Appendix A	Survey	Page 92
Bibliography		Page 97

LISTING OF TABLES

Priority Ranking Summary	Page 59
Importance Ranking Summary	Page 60
Importance/Priority Association	Page 62
Importance/Priority Relationship Analysis	Page 63

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank all the members of my committee for their help and guidance, especially Dr. Ken Neff, who, as my committee chair, had the patience and understanding to answer every question, no matter how trivial.

Thank you all for your help.

CHAPTER I

Introduction to Problem

As we approach the 21st century, the world into which college and university students are graduating is becoming increasingly international. During the past three decades, the United States has been involved in world problems such as the unification of Europe, changing alliances within the political spectrum and militarization of developing countries that have previously appeared on the surface, irrelevant to American growth and prosperity. At the moment, the Persian Gulf is an excellent example of the need for today's college student to have an international perspective. If the United States is to meet the challenges outlined in the Presidential Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies, we must alter our thinking. World problems such as trade relations, the War in the Persian Gulf, the allocation and conservation of resources, overpopulation, hunger, environmental quality, energy, poverty, lack of communication, inflation, and the quest for peace all will require international solutions.

Education in the United States must have a strong international dimension. In today's increasingly interdependent world, every citizen, not just international specialists, must understand how our local and national concerns relate to the larger world, and how present-day realities dictate a harmonizing of our own aspirations with those of other nations and peoples.¹ The democratic

principles have always made it essential that Americans understand what they are voting for. Only if we have an informed citizenry can we influence our leaders to follow a wise course in their dealings with the rest of the globe. Today, when a military command can trigger the destruction of an entire civilization, and when both local and national dimensions have a strong impact on the world beyond our borders, it is imperative that the public better understand what values and what human necessities are at stake in our foreign relations and international conduct.²

The world has changed dramatically during the past three decades. For example, between 1987 and 1991, students witnessed radical cultural, political and economic changes during their collegiate years; if Americans are to cope with a changing environment, the higher education community should take the lead in developing international educational programs.³ Students, faculty members and staff, as well as the community, need the opportunity to understand and experience the interaction of our society with other societies. But the question arises as to how does an institution of higher education commit itself to the international education on the campus and use the resources of the community as well as its facilities to the best advantage.

Before World War II, the United States educational system demonstrated little commitment to the need for providing

students with an international perspective. Like most Americans, educators were more concerned with domestic growth and internal matters.⁴ Rather than acknowledge the changing circumstances brought on by the new immigrant population and increased foreign student enrollment, the educational system sought to Americanize their cultures and minimize any contributions they might make toward our world understanding.⁵

In the 1990's, the trend is to accept, understand, and utilize diversity to the university and society's advantage, and to allow students access and exposure to a variety of cultures to enhance their global perspective. The world that Americans find in the 1990's is much different than that of 1945. Today, few Americans are untouched by the events happening beyond the United States border. The capacity of Americans to comprehend global problems, to understand the significant world events, to work and interact with peoples from other cultures, and to obtain the requisite skills needed for new employment opportunities in foreign trade and finance depends largely on the response of higher education and training so essential to an interdependent world.⁶ Where will business, industry, and government, for instance, recruit the international managers and policy makers for its overseas operations?

Many educators believe all weapons in our arsenal will be inadequate if the United States fails to invest in its educational resources in this country. It serves to correct

inaccurate perceptions of both Americans and other peoples throughout the world. Without timely exchange of knowledge, information, resources and training, the United States will surely fail to have significant impact on international events. If these reasons were not enough for a university to develop an international program, other reasons could be easily enumerated. Rose Hayden, a leading international educator, asserted three reasons concerning the crucial need for an internationally-informed population. The first is survival. We must sustain informed connections in order to survive in a competitive global system. But survival alone is not enough. Thus the second and third reasons she enumerated are: humanitarian concerns, and the need for shared brain power. In regards to humanitarian concerns, the United States must illustrate to those developing nations among the world's population, that Americans care about their plight. The educational system should attempt to help Americans relate to other cultures and their people. The role of higher education in the process of internationalizing a population is abundantly clear. In fact, it has never been more important, the constraints never so real, and the rewards never so rich. Never have Americans so needed to reach for a new level of global consciousness.⁷ If we do not achieve global consciousness then the United States will become more isolated and lose its geo-political influence. And, so by helping developing countries now, the United States will reap a political and economic benefit in the future. Jordan, for

example, is being steered by United States development aid in keeping them neutral in the war against Iraq, and that neutrality results in the saving of American lives. The need to combine shared brain power and science, and all other aspects of research will allow world resources to be more efficiently used by eliminating duplication and scientific isolation. Also, by educating those from developing countries, we begin developing ties and alliances with future leaders and the citizenry of each nation.

There, of course, exist major obstacles in the development of international programs in any college campus. There are five areas on the college campus that need to be focused on in order to provide this success; these areas are institutional commitment, faculty opposition, cost, lack of long-term goals, and lack of centralization of International Programs.⁸ The first and second are particularly acute: lack of institutional commitment from top administrators, and faculty opposition. In other words, in order for a university to develop an international program, commitment is going to be needed from its faculty and its administration. Harari, author of Approaches to International Education, in 1981, argued rather convincingly that all faculty do not need to be committed to a serious international program. Only 25% or so are needed to move a college into the international arena.⁹

In many universities, those presidents, provosts, and vice-presidents of academic affairs who create obstacles must

be enlightened to show why an international perspective on campus is important. The strategies used to educate such administrators depend partly on the nature of the opposition, or, at least, the perceived opposition. Are members of the institutional leadership opposed to international programs because they do not recognize their value? Perhaps they fail to see the importance in international programming for the institutional mission. Maybe the cost of international programs is far higher than the perceived benefits. The administration may see foreign travel and study as junkets with no redeeming educational value. Other administrators may have the mistaken impression that faculty members are not interested. The list of reasons could go on, but the important point is that removing the obstacles or converting the skeptics depends on selecting the proper approaches. Fortunately, the university which has been chosen as a case study for this research is unique in its strong commitment by the upper administration towards developing an international program, and their commitment allows for a flexible approach towards developing an international program. Again, the problems in international programs that lack faculty support are extremely crippling. Most international program projects involve a great deal of faculty commitment. Areas such as study abroad, international training and faculty exchange are completely dependent upon the faculty commitment to these various projects. Faculty alienation is often caused by lack of input in the overall design of an international program.

Once key administrators are sold on the idea, faculty input is rarely sought. Several key areas in the design and implementation revolve around faculty and faculty governance. The limited resources that universities have become increasingly important in the development of international programs because development in any direction is expensive. Faculty members' input into short-term and long-term international goals is crucial in the development of vital and progressive international programs.

For many years, state-supported universities have been the driving force in international education at the post-secondary level. For example, Michigan State University, long recognized as one of the few American universities with an effective centralized international program, has for 25 years made a commitment to international education.¹⁰ Although international education in some other universities dates back to the early 1900's, the major push for international involvement at state universities began after World War II. The concern of higher education over international awareness and understanding developed after 1945, as did the public's concern for international affairs. After World War II, the United States could no longer consider itself geographically isolated, and was deeply involved in the rebuilding of economies of war-damaged countries. At the same time, however, state supported universities were ill-prepared to produce the needed experts in language, culture and politics

of other nations.¹¹ The role the United States played in the late 1940's was a positive factor in the development of international programs, particularly at state universities. Two other factors contributed significantly to the growth of international activities. The first was the expanding role of universities in development assistance. Several large institutions entered contracts in the early 1950's with the Federal Operations Administration, and, after the 1960's, with the Agency for International Development. Throughout the 60's and the 70's, certain universities played a key role in the U.S. Development Assistance Plan. Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1975, for example, was designed to encourage American agricultural universities to work collaboratively with less developed countries in solving problems of hunger and inadequate agricultural production. But many mid-level universities had no involvement with Federally-assisted international projects. These state-supported, medium-size universities, with enrollments of between 4,000 and 20,000 students, educate the majority of Americans.¹² But these schools historically lack the funding and opportunities to be involved in international activities, and as a result they were unable to gain footholds into the foreign markets for recruitment and funding purposes.

The role of international education within the university structure is rapidly changing and evolving. Schools such as Michigan State University, Southern Illinois University and

U.C.L.A. have had clearly established international programs for over forty years.¹³ Now, a large number of mid-size universities are gaining an understanding as to the importance and the need for international programs and education on their campuses. Private liberal arts schools have been involved in international programs for the past 30 years by developing strong study abroad components to their curriculum. These schools have had important advantages over the mid-size state universities. These advantages included a comparatively-higher tuition cost and large endowments which allowed them the resources to expose their students to an international perspective.¹⁴ The field of international programs no longer finds itself at the receiving end of large public and private disbursement. Massive federal assistance, significant state resources, and benevolent private support will not, in the near future, be allocated to development of international programs at institutes of higher learning. Minimal funding, moral support and greater encouragement from institutional leaders may be the most that can be expected into the 1990's.

Many mid-size universities such as the University of Central Arkansas are just entering the international arena. Because of the ambiguity and the general lack of direction and standards from university to university,¹⁵ the University has a lot of work to do before it begins to establish itself as a model international program. The ambiguity surrounding international programs is based on the fact that it means so

many things to so many people. The model at one university will be completely different from another university. Some will have huge centralized international programs and others will have a series of decentralized international pockets placed haphazardly throughout the university with little or no interaction between the entities. This is the result of uncertain and unsteady periods of growth within the university as well as the dominance of grant money in developing programs.¹⁶ The reason why UCA has been chosen as a case study for this research is because it is attempting to enter the international arena. UCA is typical of many other mid-size universities in that there has been no centralized planning or forethought in the development of its international programs. Programs have grown in various areas on the campus with no administrative controls. UCA's attempt to centralize international activities is a step that many universities have begun taking or will begin in the near future. And, like many other mid-size universities, international students have shown up at the doors of this university without the University playing an active role in their recruitment.

Universities have historically lacked forethought in the conception of their international programs. Their development was based on the immediate need, whether it was study abroad, faculty exchange or service to existing international students. Little or no long-term projections were given. Oftentimes, these universities have a wide gap between

international education, administrators, and faculty.¹⁷ This gap is caused by the lack of planning and priorities that international programs have had in the past. Universities have reacted to the international opportunities in the world at a given time, and most university faculty would prefer a proactive approach to international priorities. This philosophic drift makes for an unhappy marriage. It is clear that a university's expertise lies within its faculty. The proliferation and the number and influence of faculty governance is a clear indication of the importance the faculty plans in the university community.

This study was to examine the attitudes and the priorities for international education by the faculty of the University of Central Arkansas. Surveys were sent to all faculty members within the university. It was hoped that an understanding would be gained as to what long-term goals and directions the faculty saw as important for the growth and development of an international program at their university.

Research Design

The design of this research was to send surveys to each faculty member at the University. The use of surveys allowed faculty members to make comments in a confidential manner that will effect the long-term role of the international program. Priorities were chosen to gain understanding of the immediate needs on campus. By viewing the short-term needs of the

international program, the University can make plans to deal with immediate needs of the campus. The area of importance was chosen to look at the long-term ramifications of an international program and to assess faculty's long-term needs in the international area for the campus. Using this design, the overall long-term and short-term direction of the University faculty can be researched. Because the faculty will play an important and integral role in the success of an international program, it was crucial that their input be used in the development of the role and mission of International Programs. The data and design of this program may be beneficial to other small colleges and universities who undoubtedly will enter this important area within the coming years. Therefore, a need and potential impact of this research is clear.

Limitations of Design

This design will provide limitations in regards to the generalizationability of the data to other mid-size state schools. Because the International Programs Office at the University of Central Arkansas is the result of a presidential initiative, faculty members may be inclined to list each area as high in priority and importance because of the presidential influence in the start-up of the program. Also, because each school has different strengths and weaknesses, as well as faculty interests, there is no way to insure that the findings of the study would be consistent with the findings of another

mid-size state university. A single university was studied because it permitted an in-depth look at the priorities and importance of identified educational goals. This design allowed an intense analysis of all responding faculty members instead of a wide-ranging survey with a small sample from several universities. By using a case study approach, one gets the full depth and breadth of the research and allows input from each faculty member.

Assumptions

Research at any university entails encountering a variety of political ideologies that can be extraneous to the researcher and his methodology. This study assumes that faculty members are free of any bias toward international education and its goals prior to the questionnaire. It is also assumed that faculty members will have some concern toward international education and its goals by listing its input in the survey. These assumptions, although not vital to the research, allow for the data to be viewed in a non-biased manner.

Importance of the Study

This research may be useful to colleges and universities in situations similar to that of the University of Central Arkansas. The research may also be generalized and applied to

smaller private and community colleges. Because the research analyzes the faculty attitude toward international educational goals, it can benefit other institutions by outlining areas that can be expanded to accommodate international concerns. This is important because it enables universities to avoid wasting time and resources in areas that may or may not be supported by the faculty. In order to help ensure program success, the research provides a design through which faculty have immediate input into the origins of a program.

Because of the previously-stated importance of faculty input into the development of an international program, this research will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. What areas of international education do faculty members rank as the highest immediate priorities?
2. What areas do faculty rate as being the most important long-range goals?
3. Are there any long-range goals where the importance is dependent on priority?
4. What is the co-relationship between importance and priority for each of the goals?

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

The question of international educational goals and priorities being addressed in this study by the faculty of UCA have previously never been addressed by university faculty. This leads us to review the origins of international educational goals as opposed to the study of previous educational goals. These origins give us the definition of various components of international education. These definitions play an important role in that they help form the faculty's perception of various international educational goals.

"International education" has become a common term in U.S. higher education. It has gained widespread acceptance, although the generic use of the term causes considerable confusion, because it is employed in a variety of ways that may be conflicting or at least inconsistent. The concept "international education" means a lot of different things to different people. In article after article, in report after report, and at conference after conference, the terms used to refer to the international dimension of education vary tremendously.

For example, Clifton Wharton, former President of Michigan State University and the SUNY system, introduced his talk at the 1983 meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities by saying:

I am not going to attempt here any lengthy or rigorous definition of what I will be calling 'international education' or, for occasional variety, 'global education'. There has been so much attention to the matter lately, ranging from state level debates like that conducted by New York's Board of Regents to national bodies like the Perkins Commission, that any practicing educator ought by now to have a pretty fair idea of what we are talking about.¹⁸

But do we have "a pretty fair idea of what we are talking about"? R. Freeman Butts, professor emeritus of Teachers College, Columbia University, believed that "international education" had an "imprecise meaning":

To be sure, it has often had an imprecise meaning, because so many different people have assigned different enterprises to it in the course of its usage . . . Much of the trouble in the past has been that the term has had multiple and often vague connotations for many different types of activities.¹⁹

Stephen King also concluded that, "In trying to pin down just what we mean by 'international education' we run into some semantic difficulties. The term is not a happy one."²⁰ And Gordon I. Swanson claimed, "it is not easy to define":

There are many facets of the broad subject known as international education. As many educators are interested in comparing national systems of education and each has his own opinion of what international education should be, international education is not easy to define.²¹

In 1967, John T. Caldwell, Chancellor of North Carolina State University at Raleigh, said, "'International education' is in

some respects an awkward phrase which connotes too many different activities, none of which is neatly described."²²

To make matters worse, professionals and non-professionals alike use some of the following terms interchangeably: international education, international affairs, international studies, international programs, global education, global studies, the international perspective, and the international dimension. However, they all probably agree with Stephen Bailey's point that, "Vague, ambiguous and multifaceted as it must remain, the phrase 'international education' warrants our concern and sustained attention."²³ Bailey's remark about the confusion over terminology in 1963 is even more relevant today.

Can people discuss such an important segment of education as "international education" without being able to define what it means within the university? How do we explain continuing to discuss such an important dimension of education without attempting to define? Is it not presumptuous to urge funding sources to support universities and to urge Congress and the States to support international educational programs throughout the country when that "something" has no clear, specific or agreed-upon meaning? Is it time to seek a common, accepted definition of the term "international education" within the university?

It is interesting to speculate why there has been so little concern for a more precise definition.²⁴ First, little

need has been felt for definitional clarity, because different constituencies see international education from different perspectives, and rarely have they had the need to see it as a whole or totality. Thus, what difference would it make what you called the totality? Such holistic or integrated vision in most academic matters is, unfortunately, more the exception than the rule. Second, this lack of definition has served its purpose, since no hue and cry has been heard to effect any consistency of terminology. The fuzziness seems to have served its purposes, allowing everyone to do his or her own thing. Third, the youthful period of the growth of international education has required so much energy to develop all the many aspects of international education that little time was available for the difficult task of definitional clarity.

For example, Herman B. Wells, former President of Indiana University, in analyzing the reasons for the non-funding of the International Education Act of 1966 concluded that:

One of the readier explanations involves terminology: 'international education' in the legislation was confusing to some members of Congress, who perceived the Act, not as a support of the U.S. educational community responsibilities, but as a direct contribution to the development of education in other nations. 'Another piece of aid legislation' was a complaint commonly heard on Capitol Hill, indication that funds for overseas development were considered to be already sufficient.²⁵

An examination of what or who the term "international education" describes in U.S. higher education reveals that there are some fairly consistent patterns emerging. Let us

examine several definitions of the term "international education."

* Actually, in the literature on international education, there are two types of definitions: one type discusses the ultimate purpose or rationale for all the people and programs involved in international activities of any kind and the other focuses on who is involved, the people and programs, how they are organized and structured on a U.S. university campus. An example of the first type of definition would be the following:

...the social experience and the learning process through which individuals acquire and change their images of the world perceived as a totality and their orientation toward particular components of the world system.²⁶

Another example would be those who believe that international educators should be striving to prevent a nuclear holocaust by teaching students the value of learning about global problems. In each case, the emphasis is on the goals people involved in international education hope to achieve.

Here are examples of the other, more organizational type of definition of international education. The first two definitions are fairly general in nature. Scanlon's definition is the most general:

'International education' is a term used to describe the various types of educational and cultural relations among nations. While originally it applied merely to formal education, the concept

has now broadened to include governmental cultural relations programs, the promotion of mutual understanding among nations, educational assistance to underdeveloped regions, cross-cultural education and international communication.²⁷

Fraser and Brickman defined it a bit more specifically:

International education connotes the various kinds of relationships - intellectual, cultural, and educational - among individuals and groups from two or more nations. It is a dynamic concept in that it involves a movement across frontiers, whether by a person, book or idea. International education refers to the various methods of international cooperation, understanding and exchange.²⁸

The first part of each definition talks about the general types of relations among nations, rather than international education as it appears on U.S. universities, which is the topic of this paper. However, the key components of the definition for international education appears in that each definition includes references to the tri-partite definition that will be developed in this dissertation. It is based on an earlier analysis by Arum. In that work, Arum divided international education on U.S. university campuses into three major components and analyzed each with its sub-components, who the participants were, how they were trained, what their professional organizations were, and what their funding sources were. Then he examined similar questions at the national level.²⁹

The tri-partite definition developed is relevant to these general definitions in several ways:

- I. INTERNATIONAL STUDIES - is equivalent to Scanlon's "educational assistance to underdeveloped regions" and Fraser and Brickman's "international cooperation."
- II. INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE - is equivalent to Fraser and Brickmans' "international exchange."
- III. TECHNICAL COOPERATION - is equivalent to Scanlon's "educational assistance to underdeveloped regions" and Fraser and Brickmans' "international cooperation."

Now several other more specific definitions will be examine to see how they fit the outline. In an issue of the Review of Educational Research, Spaulding, Singleton and Watson defined it in the following way:

The three major areas of interest associated with international education are international relations and cooperation in education; cross-national movements of educational materials, students, teachers, consultants, and aid; and education for international and cross-cultural understanding.³⁰

Butts defined it in another way:

If the scope of inquiry is thus limited to the somewhat more m23(%
 *^^ proportions of "organized education," international education may be thought of as embracing the programs of activity which identifiable educational organizations deliberately plan and carry out for their members (students, teachers, and closely related clientele) with one (or possibly both) of two major purposes in mind: a) the study of the thought, institutions, techniques, or ways of life of other peoples and their inter-relationships; and b) the transfer of educational institutions, ideas and materials from one society of another.³¹

Whereas Butts seemed to omit reference to international educational exchange, Deutsch defined our topic in a more complete way:

Even a brief review of the literature reveals that 'international education' has been used as a generic term to include: the study of non-Western cultures; education for world understanding; American studies abroad; programs of educational exchange of both students and teachers; and university programs such as educational technical assistance and institution building in developing nations.³²

Finally, the person who defines it most specifically and accurately is Maurice Harari:

International education is an all-inclusive term encompassing three major strands: a) international content of the curricula, b) international movement of scholars and students concerned with training and research, and c) arrangements engaging U.S. education abroad in technical assistance and educational cooperation programs.³³

In examining these definitions for the components of our tri-partite definition of international education, we find the following:

- I. INTERNATIONAL STUDIES - is equivalent to Singleton and Watsons' "education for international and cross-cultural understanding" and Butts' "the study of the thought, institutions, techniques, or ways of life of other peoples and of their inter-relationships," and Deutsch's "the study of non-Western cultures; education for world understanding," and Harari's "international content of the curricula."
- II. INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE - is equivalent to Singleton and Watson's "cross-national movements of . . . students, teachers;" or Deutsch's "programs of educational exchange, of both students and teachers," and Harari's "international movement of scholars and students concerned with training and research."
- III. TECHNICAL COOPERATION - is equivalent to Singleton and Watsons' "cross-national movements of educational materials . . . consultants, and aid;"

and Butts' "the transfer of educational institutions, ideas and materials from one society to another;" or Deutsch's "university programs such as educational technical assistance and educational cooperation programs."

Each of these major areas has numerous components, but the term "international education" usually refers to activities involving more than one major area, and often it encompasses all of them. A preliminary definition could simply state that international education consists of all educational activities of any kind involving people of two or more nations. It should be noted that "international education" as a comprehensive, umbrella-like term for all international activities has been in the process of evolving from before the 1963 lament of Stephen Bailey regarding the confusion over terminology.

One of the first times the term "international education" came to public attention in this century was with the establishment of the Institute of International Education (IIE) in 1919 in New York City. It is somewhat difficult to understand exactly what was meant by the term "international education" in the IIE title, except its first bulletin stated that it was thought to encompass all of "the major activities in international education:"

...the Institute should represent American education vis a vis the rest of the world, administering fellowships and visiting professorships, welcoming foreign scholars, arranging itineraries of foreign educational missions, holding conferences on problems of

international education, and conducting activities of a similar nature...In this way the major activities of international education have been concentrated in the Institute.³⁴

While this sounds primarily like what the field researchers have called international educational exchange, the Bulletin also describes in some detail the work IIE did regarding International Relations Clubs on college and university campuses. IIE not only sent U.S. and foreign speakers and books to campuses, but also held an annual conference on an international relations topic, sponsored jointly with the American Historical Association and the American Political Science Association. Thus, it appears that two of our three international education categories (international studies and international educational exchange) were present in this early use of the term.

Thus, throughout the past three decades, important publications in this field have employed the term "international education" as the over-arching term for all aspects of international activities and programs on U.S. campuses.

In 1966, Congress passed The International Education Act (IEA), which confirmed the use of the term to define the various international components of education. As the House Committee Report accompanying the bill stated:

The Committee is particularly interested in seeing broad support under the Act given to a diversity of high quality programs. The Act is designed to make

it possible for the federal government to bring about a basic improvement in international education. Rather than simply buying a commodity defined in narrow terms, the federal government would instead make a conscious, systematic and long-term investment in this facet of U.S. education.³⁵

Although the IEA was never funded, the common use of the term "international education" was encouraged by the title of the bill and the widespread attention and support it received. At this point, the term started to appear more frequently in educational publications, especially among the small number of faculty involved in the development of comparative education in the U.S. The George Peabody College for Teachers published Research Monographs in International and Comparative Education beginning in 1964. These included a volume entitled "International Education: Understandings and Misunderstandings", published in 1969. It is clear from the content of these publications that the term "international education" was beginning to acquire use as a general term. In some cases, its use was more narrow in scope and closely related to comparative education. The evolution of the term to its present use appears to have happened slowly but surely through the 1970's with no one event or publication representing a significant turning point. For example, Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-329 - until 1980 called Title VI of the National Defense Education Act) contains several important international components. The legislation provided federal government support for

International and Foreign Language Studies (Part A) and Business and International Education Programs (Part B), but the name given to the entire section of the legislation was (and is) "Title VI-International Education Programs". Also, the name given to the office that administers this legislation is called the Division of International Education.

International education is now a general term used in the same manner as bio-chemistry and cultural anthropology, but it does not serve to define an area or sub-unit of an academic discipline. It is seldom used to refer to the international aspects of the curriculum, programs and services of a college of education. Its use is in a broader framework, referring to the international dimensions of the entire curriculum and diverse programs, services and activities that are international in focus. This distinction can create confusion and produce interesting problems, especially as colleges of education strengthen their international components and seek appropriate new terms to describe their international programs and services.

Whereas comparative educators have debated for years the methodological questions related to whether or not comparative education is a discipline or a multi-disciplinary field, international educators, on the other hand, have been concerned with policy issues, administrative structures, and the broad questions related to the international dimensions of all disciplines and all parts of an educational institution.

This is consistent with the definition of International Education.

The term "international education" is coming to have a common usage in the administrative vocabulary of colleges and universities. For example, a recent advertisement for a Director of International Affairs Center contains this language:

The Director of the International Affairs Center, reporting directly to the Present, has primary responsibility for developing and directing the university's newly formed International Affairs Center and for developing and promoting international education as a distinctive and prominent dimension of the university's academic program. A distinguished record of scholarship, teaching and/or administrative experience, ability to develop and direct a major new program at a large university and demonstrable commitment to international education required."

This advertisement is indicative of the common use of "international education" to refer to the numerous international activities, academic programs, and services often found on a single campus. In this case, the institution has chosen not to adopt the title "International Education Center," although it uses the term "international education" to describe the Center. The reason may be that frequently used titles on a campus are Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. The creation of an International Affairs Center is at least consistent in this regard.

A better example of the generic use of "international education" is contained in another advertisement, this time for a director of a Center for International Education:

The Director reports jointly to the Provost and to the Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs. Duties are shared with a professional staff, for which the Director has administrative responsibility. The Center serves approximately 1,000 international students, administers exchange programs, establishes academic linkages with universities abroad, and operates an International House that serves all segments of the campus. It interacts with community and state educational, civic and business organizations. Future directions include increased service to faculty, assistance with curriculum development, conduct of seminars and conferences, expansion of language training, aid in the establishment of language houses, and enhancement of efforts to develop an international dimension in all aspects of university life. The Director will work with the Council on International Education, which represents the major academic and administrative divisions of the University...

The example demonstrates the multi-dimensional definition of international education. It serves to illustrate the problem of arriving at a neat and clean usage that can be applied generally. The consistent element in the use of "international education" is the reference to multiple activities, programs and serves for which the primary focus is international.

The process of attempting a definition of international education is one that quickly becomes very complex. The Comparative and International Education Society has spent thirty years debating varying definitions of comparative

education and attempting to differentiate between international and comparative.³⁶ In 1969, the Comparative Education Society became the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES), thus recognizing implicitly two major constituencies in the field. Philip Altbach, the Editor of the Comparative Education Review wrote in a recent editorial as follows:

Traditionally, the comparative educators have been scholars working mainly in universities, training graduate students, and producing research and scholarly articles. ...Internationalists, on the other hand, are considered to be the users of research rather than the producers of scholarship.³⁷

This distinction is consistent with the fact that, at present, the term "international educator" is commonly used to refer to a person holding a primarily administrative position.

It is not difficult to conclude that international education is becoming a common term in the vocabulary of U.S. higher education. There is a recently organized Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA), consisting of university representatives with "multiple international responsibilities." New administrative offices and positions have been established that use "international education" to communicate the central location of and responsibility for a variety of international programs and services. At the national level, the American Council on Education has a Commission on International Education, and the federal

government continues to use the term to refer to legislation dealing with a variety of international programs and services.

The need for a common definition of international education within a university is more and more evident as the term is used to refer to and describe the important transition taking place in U.S. higher education. As more serious attention is given to this transition, the need for defining the terms by which we communicate becomes more relevant. To debate the importance of international education requires an accepted definition of what is being discussed. To propose funding for international education requires a common understanding of and for what the funds will be spent. To develop a sense of professionalism among international educators requires an understanding of how the profession is defined. To fail to develop a definition is to encourage misunderstanding, confusion, and a lack of clarity to the process of change involved in the transition to education for an interdependent world.

According to Harari, for a university to develop internationally, various issues must be addressed prior to beginning an international program. These issues include the following areas that relate to international studies, which is the first component of the tri-partite definition:

1. Preliminary Policy Planning: The first element in making policy is to have an agreed-upon one. Often policies emerge

after the fact, after an institution has agreed to do certain things internally or externally, that is, with another college in another part of the world. While it is vital to learn from mistakes, carefully thought out policies established in advance may serve to prevent some mistakes, or at least minimize the damage that they might do. In this early phase, the need for a clearly defined role and mission and a clearly defined statement of scope is vitally important. These outline the areas in which the Office of International Programs will work; it also defines the administrative structure of the International Programs.

2. Curriculum Considerations: Some decisions should be made in advance, as to what proportion of the curriculum should be devoted to international education. This is a difficult decision, since, in a real sense, every course worthy of its name should have a global aspect included in what is taught in the classroom. But specific courses, programs, and opportunities for global understandings should be provided on the campus. Some decisions should be made as to how much of an international flavor constitutes a reasonable or optimal proportion of a curriculum, and that should be especially defined as having an international thrust that is needed to internationalize that course.

3. Library Holdings: Similar policy decisions must also be made with regard to the number of books in the library that ought to relate to specifically global concerns. Each course

and major offered within the university that is advertised as having an international aspect, must also need the proper number of reference materials available, so that students are able to research and write papers, having the proper facilities available to them in the library. This is often a long-term project that requires several years to implement, but thought given at the beginning and establishment of international programs will lead to a dedication by the administrators, faculty, and library personnel towards moving in that direction.

4. Student Issues: Policy issues should be made with regard to the number of foreign students the campus can effectively educate at any one time, and how rapidly additional international students should be encouraged to attend. Issues such as who will evaluate international transcripts need to be decided. University foreign admissions policies, questions such as financial certification of foreign students, TOEFL (Test of English as a Second Language) score requirements, concerns about the ability to effectively house international students during break periods and how these students can be brought into the main stream of the campus life, and how they can best serve to enrich the international learning opportunities for all students can be looked into before the beginning or during the implementation stages of an international program.

The second component of the tri-partite definition of International Programs, which is international exchange, includes the areas of recruitment and enrollment, faculty exchange, and study abroad.

The University Administration needs to be proactive in assessing the future needs of faculty and students.

In this process, administration, faculty, students, even community, alumni, legislators, and board of trustees all need to be encouraged to participate, or at least they need to be kept informed. But, for specific changes to take place, that is, to truly internationalize the campus, to develop new programs and create new opportunities for faculty exchange with other countries to develop expertise in global affairs and to attract new foreign students to a campus and to make better provisions for them, some centralized administrative structure will be needed.

In regard to Faculty Exchange Policies, these policy decisions need to be made with regard to the number of professors who should be encouraged to go abroad during any one year. Decisions need to be made on sabbatical policies, how will university professors be compensated, who will teach their vacant classes, how many and what is the percentage of international faculty which should be encouraged to spend time on the campus. In some foreign universities, professors are expected to lecture to 1,000 or more students at a time.

While such large groups are not unknown to United States universities, classes of that size remain a rare phenomenon here. Does the U.S. professor realize that huge classes are common in certain countries? What are the minimum and maximum blocks of time that would seem appropriate and desirable for the faculty member to be abroad and still allow them to aid in the process of internationalizing their class? Policies with regards to credit towards tenure or seniority, and for promotion for a professor who serves abroad a year or more need to be clearly set forth, and must be explained to personnel committees of departments in colleges, so that recognition for service abroad can be clearly and fairly evaluated on an equitable basis. Policy decisions need to be raised with regards to increments of salary for U.S. professors teaching abroad, and levels of compensation need to be determined for foreign professors who are teaching here.

Another area of concern is the nature of exchange agreements. Much of what takes place under the umbrella of international programs is developed in an informal ad-hoc basis. One must decide how much informality is desirable? How much scope should be given to departments to internationalize by making informal agreements with sister departments in institutions abroad? What are the reporting mechanisms that should be required for how far departments may venture in designing their own international exchanges? Whom should these departments report to? And who should be

permitted to make commitments on behalf of the university? If agreements are only to be formal, that is, in the form of contracts and other documents, such as memorandums of understanding, what should these agreements contain, and who should sign them? If the institution is part of a state system, how much reporting to the central office is required, and what should those reports contain? A major policy decision needs to be made as to the countries with which student and faculty exchanges will take place, and in which language the professors will teach and students receive their instructions. There must be policy decisions made between cooperating institutions as to whether the students or the faculty to be exchanged are going to be taught in their native language, that is, English, in our case, or in the language indigenous to the university to which they are going. An aspect of the language question is whether or not English will be taught as a second language to help foreign students or professors who come to this country, and whether the U.S. institutions and professors will receive help in mastering the language of the countries in which they are studying. Policies on these questions needs to be formalized in advance, even if they are modified frequently, in light of experience. They serve to make sure many problems can be anticipated, and can be considered in advance, with a view towards deflecting their negative impact.

The third area of the tri-partite definition to be discussed is that of technical cooperation by providing educational assistance to underdeveloped regions. While this has components of both faculty exchange and recruitment and enrollment, as well as ESL, it falls mainly under the auspice of international training.

In developing International Training Capabilities, a university must rely heavily upon outside funding. Because of the technical nature of competing for grants, most U.S. universities rely upon programs such as the U.S.A.I.D.

The United States government has established the Agency for International Development to assist developing nations. Within U.S.A.I.D. lies the Participant Training Program. The Agency for International Development participant training program is a vital element of foreign assistance. Its primary goal is "the development of the human resources potential of citizens of developing nations."³⁸ The Congressional mandate is "to assist the people of less developed countries in their efforts to acquire the knowledge and the resources essential for development and to build the economic, political and social institutions which will meet their aspirations for a better life with freedom and in peace."³⁹

The Agency for International Development has given a strong emphasis to participant training, stressing the importance of higher level training to meet more effectively

the need for managers, scientists, technicians, teachers, and institutional leaders from all sectors. The Agency's four main development strategies are linked closely with training.

1. Improving policy environments for a stable and productive government structure;
2. Enhancing institutional capabilities to increase growth potential;
3. Generating, transferring, and apply technology; and
4. Stimulating private sector activities.⁴⁰

The Office of International Programs tries to provide programs to help developing countries build self-reliant and productive societies through the development of their human resources.

The program is largely decentralized. Almost two-thirds of all participants are programmed by and monitored by contract to AID missions. Agencies such as Partners in International Training, The Academy for Educational Development represent the largest of the contractors who provide training. These contractors in cooperation with the missions are responsible for:

- *initiating programs and projects which involve training,
- *determining the characteristics of that training together with host governments,
- *arranging for the selection of participants, and
- *determining the mode of program implementation.⁴¹

The Agency for International Development's Office of International Training is responsible for instituting policies and procedures for managing participant training activities. The Office of International Training provides assistance to missions and host countries concerning the development and management of participant training and maintains various services for all participants such as health and accident coverage and orientation.

To meet the objectives outlined in A.I.D.'s main development strategies, two types of programs; technical and academic are offered in participant training.

The training for technical programs at an academic institution to observational programs which offer the opportunity to learn about (through on-the-job training), or to observe the operations of American counterparts. Technical training is often tailored to the specific talents of the individual participant.

Participants in academic programs earn a degree awarded by an institution of higher education in the United States:

- *Associate of Arts degree from a two-year community college,
- *Bachelor of Arts, or of Science, from a four-year institution,
- *Master of Arts or Science, one to two years and sometimes part of a doctorate program;
- *Ph.D., or Doctorate, a highly specialized degree, taking from three to four years to complete (plus a year or more if the Master's degree is included).

In providing training, AID also stresses the interaction between participant and the US culture. This component is known as "Experience America." Experience America is a direct result of research done in the early part of the 1980's.

Participants were given a pre and post test concerned with attitudes about the U.S. Both long- and short-term participants were tested from a variety of countries.

Research results showed a significant decrease in attitudes towards U.S., i.e., a pretest showed a high level of positive feelings toward U.S. and post test showed a high level of negative attitudes after spending time in the United States. Results also showed a correlation between length of stay and amount of negative response. The longer a participant stayed in the U.S., the more negative his feelings toward the U.S.

U.S.A.I.D. was concerned about this finding because of political ramifications of such results, both at home and abroad. The finding clearly has political motivations. Areas in danger, i.e., leftist, and political distress receive the largest amount. The \$500 million Central American Peace Scholarship Program (CAPS) is an excellent example. The backlash of finding participants who felt negative about the U.S. could endanger the entire AID program. The harm that could be done abroad was also substantial. A participant who spends four years in the U.S., receives a degree, returns and

speaks negatively of the experience and of the U.S. was clearly not acceptable to U.S.A.I.D.

Researchers began doing interviews with participants to better understand results. Participants told of the isolation they felt on U.S. campuses, often interacting only with other international students. Participants told of never being exposed to non-institutional aspects of U.S. culture. U.S.A.I.D. moved quickly in remedy of the problem. Georgetown University coined the phrase "Experience America" early in the C.A.P.S. program. It is now the generally accepted term for a coordinated effort to integrate U.S.A.I.D. scholars with the U.S. culture.

U.S.A.I.D. presently considers "Experience America" as equally important to technical expertise in awarding contracts. This has led to a wide range of experiences for AID scholars.

In reviewing the large number of activities AID scholars have been involved in, the Agency identified the single most important component as interaction with the American family. Researchers found this to be the most significant factor in determining the satisfaction with U.S. culture, according to Dan Terell, Director of Statistical Research for Office of International Training.⁴²

Today all C.A.P. participants must be involved in a minimum two-week host family stay while in the U.S. This

interaction has proven to be a highly valued experience for both participants and families.

The U.S. government spends billions of dollars each year on the training of participants from a variety of countries. These participants are trained to return and help develop these countries. The Agency for International Development has developed objectives for all U.S. sponsored training programs. These objectives are directed to improving the life of the people in that country.

Universities must develop International Training Programs in accordance with the USAID initiatives. The university can provide numerous training opportunities for faculty and students by pursuing AID-sponsored programs. These programs can have a significant effect on the international flavor of a campus.

Robert Black, Project Director for Education and the World View, stated:

"Whatever one's view of the world and his place in it, there can be little disagreement that the last decade or two have dramatically challenged virtually every traditional assumption about our global circumstances. The rapidity and pervasiveness with which global events now affect our national and private lives leave little doubt that we are in the midst of significant new transitions in our national future.

"Regardless of what the future holds in regard to these global uncertainties, there is a fundamental question of how such fresh national circumstances should reflect on our educational context. The issue cannot be overlooked by anyone who understands the necessity in a democratic society for wide public understanding of the country's national and international policies."⁴³

Educational institutions have the responsibility to adjust their programs to meet the needs of society which these fresh national circumstances have created, and to teach students the wisdom and value judgements which will enable the student to make the optimum contribution to himself, his community, his country, and the world at large. Cyrus Vance, former Secretary of State, stated:

"This leads me to the importance of our educational institutions and the role they play. The special obligations which the country's major institutions must now bear - particularly education and the public media - are abundantly clear. For it is in our schools and in our universities that each generation first learns of its world. The complexities of this uncertain age thus impose special responsibilities on them to help create a deeper comprehension of global issues that will make the years to follow more understandable to the body politic."⁴⁴

Unfortunately, past practices at most universities have not included an emphasis upon the global issues and perspectives to which Secretary of State Vance was referring. As a result, surveys concur with the premise that even though Americans live in an increasingly interdependent world, they remain relatively ignorant about international issues.

For example, Educational Testing Services and Carnegie Council Investigations have determined that a majority of the students tested through these programs have had a surprisingly limited understanding of other countries. More astonishing was the fact that tomorrow's teachers (those students in education who were tested) scored the lowest, answering

correctly only 39% of the questions which the committee felt were essential to international understanding.⁴⁵

If we feel that our mission as educators is to prepare the youth of our nation to function effectively in the whole world - not just a part of it - then higher education should follow the example of government and business and give more attention to global perspectives and languages in the development of the curriculum and give students more opportunities to have international exchanges.

The urgency for international education is immediate. Students currently attending colleges and universities are the decision makers of the future. There is no question that these individuals will need information and understanding about the whole world if they are to make intelligent decisions in performing their daily activities at the household, local, national and international levels.⁴⁶

When, about a hundred and fifty years ago, Americans were debating the desirability of common public schools in which children of rich and poor would be educated at the taxpayers' expense, one of the very difficult questions raised about the equity of such a proposal was, "What justification is there for taxing one person to pay for the education of another person's child?" In due course, this question was resolved in favor, not only of the common elementary school, but eventually in favor of the common American high school as well.⁴⁷

Today, the issue may be couched in global terms. Why should U.S. taxpayers pay for or otherwise subsidize the education of students from other countries? Obviously, the parallel is not exact, but there are differences in levels of financial support of foreign students among independent, church-related, and state-supported colleges, universities, and community colleges. Many institutions, moreover, in an attempt to bolster declining enrollments, specifically try to recruit foreign students. Among state colleges and universities, the addition of foreign students may improve the institutions FTE or otherwise enhance its budget, but the taxpayer is sharing some substantial burden to educate the offspring of parents who live outside the borders of the United States.

There are some graduate departments, as in engineering or computer science, that would have to be shut down if it were not for the foreign student population.⁴⁸ There are some who think of the education of foreign students as a means of helping the U.S. and its balance of payments, since, in effect, the country is providing or exporting educational services. In some instances, there is interest in foreign students as a means of enriching the opportunities on campus for all students. In other instances, there is a fear that some foreign students may steal America's technological secrets and know-how, and thereby give their countries a competitive edge. As the report "Absence of Decision" makes

clear, these issues have not been resolved. There are many substantial questions among boards of higher education and legislatures of several states, as to the necessity and the wisdom of subsidizing the education of students from abroad.⁴⁹ Bills, such as a recently-introduced and passed law in the State of Arkansas that requires a spoken English test for college faculty, are an excellent example of the xenophobia that many state legislatures feel toward international students. These prevailing attitudes make it more difficult to identify an approach for dealing with the still-growing foreign student population in the United States. The argument that we are preparing men and women who will occupy positions as prime ministers, cabinet officers, corporate heads, and who will, upon assuming power, look favorably upon the United States, makes little impression. These attitudes make it very difficult for colleges and universities to plan an educational program for foreign students. The foreign student, one must remember, is many things. He or she is a student in medical school on the verge of becoming a physician. The foreign student may be completing doctoral work in sciences or social science, business or engineering. The foreign student may be a freshman entering a four-year institution, or the foreign student may be one of the thousands who attend community colleges. Each of these categories of foreign students, and the shades in between, require sensitive treatment and careful decision making in regards to funding, educational programs, admissions policies and campus life. In general, there is

little recognition by legislators and state boards of higher education that the mixture of foreign students will provide a more enriching opportunity for the state's students, and provide them with interaction and cultural opportunities which will be invaluable later in life. But the evidence to support precisely what foreign students do by providing academic or cultural enrichment is not easy to gather in detail, with the results that some suspicion persists that there is no real value to having international students on a college campus. The state of Oregon, for example, approached the problem by proposing that universities give tuition waivers if there is concrete evidence that an international student will make a specific contribution to the citizens of the state. The legislature of Oregon went on to define precisely what the contributions might be, including working a certain number of hours in the state's public schools, or a certain number of hours working with Oregon's industries, or working in areas of continuing adult education or with the handicapped. John Reichard, Executive Vice-President of the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs, states, "The view that the Oregon approach might be a useful experiment that clearly will be closely watched. Most foreign students do like to contribute; in fact, many are frustrated that they seem to be able to give so little."⁵⁰

Like many other components of the University, international education is a complex idea. It touches every corner of the University in some manner. By trying to provide

a model and definition for this experience, the needs of our international educational community can be better met. The tri-partite definition developed in this chapter allows a university to focus and gain understanding of specific areas of international studies that need to be addressed on a university campus. By developing specific areas within this definition, a university can allow and plan for a consistent development of an international program within the university structure by providing resources and commitment for those areas identified by the definition.

CHAPTER III

rel

su

on

fo

st

an

st

sp

te

bo

re

h

t

w

t

i

f

c

c

s

u

Design and Methodology

This study was conducted with the 435 full-time faculty members of the University of Central Arkansas. Of the 435 surveyed, 110 responded. In this study, data were collected on immediate, priority, and long-term importance of the following international educational goals: International student services, global awareness, international recruitment and enrollment, faculty exchange, international training, study abroad and English as a Second Language.

The instrumentation to be used was a survey which was specifically designed to match long-term importance and short-term priorities. The instrumentation was previously tested on both senior and new faculty members to test the validity and reliability of the tool and several changes and modifications have been made. The faculty members who were previously tested agreed that the final survey was understandable and would provide a workable instrumentation for the survey.

This research was designed to give faculty an instrument to provide information to help in the formulation of an international program. By providing a survey of all of the faculty, a thorough understanding as to the international educational goals that faculty deem immediate and important is obtained. The areas of international programs that were surveyed in this data were designed and approved by the University Faculty Senate prior to the formation of the

research. These areas, although consistent with areas of international studies throughout the country, are difficult to implement at one time across the board. Therefore, this instrument allows the faculty a device to indicate which of the international areas adopted should be immediately addressed by an international program, and which areas are needed on a long-term basis. This is important for two reasons.

1. Faculty members will have an understanding as to immediate needs for both students and themselves in the international arena. They have daily contact with the existing international student population on campus and are the ones that have the most direct bearing on the internationalization of a campus through courses and exchanges. By allowing faculty to identify the needs that are immediate concerns, the administration then gains support for international programs by allowing faculty to choose the immediate areas into which limited financial resources are funneled.

2. Long-term needs may also be addressed by faculty by taking the identified educational goals and looking at what areas need to be developed over a long period. It is important to view the long-term commitments the University makes so that plans may be formulated to have a long-term effect in these areas. The initial foundational work can be begun by establishing faculty and administrative committees and to begin discussion on what would be the best way to

achieve these overall goals. Therefore, by using this design, the overall long-term and short-term direction of the University then can be researched and their input can be acted upon, which makes for a more unified international program.

Because faculty play an important and integral part in the success of an international program, it is crucial that their input is used in the development of international programs. If this does not happen, the university has a situation in which they are trying to internationalize from the top down; the curriculum and faculty are not affected and feel no input into this decision, which can have detrimental long-term effects. The kinds of programs will also benefit other similar universities who will be entering this important arena in the coming year. Many community colleges, and small- and medium-sized state universities are beginning to develop in this area. This information will provide them a way to view the general feelings of the faculty at a similar university. It also allows them to review which goals and priorities take on a long-term and priority basis, and can be moved upon quickly without the wasting of resources and moving in areas that would not be supported by the faculty. The survey allows for faculty to identify and give input into the established international educational goals. This is important in that it allows movement from ground zero or a starting point in a program to that of a fully-formulated and functioning international programs on a planned and logical

scale. The research allows the administration to plan over a long period of time with the support of faculty by giving them input on to what areas should be addressed immediately and over a long-term period. This growth can then be tracked over a period of time and faculty questions on the rationale for moving in a direction are easily answered, based on the input from this survey.

The research, based upon the review of the literature, broke the established international goals into one of the three sections of the definition. Goals were labeled either international studies goals, international educational exchange goals, or technical cooperation goals. By labeling each of these goals from the definition established in the review of the literature, we can make assumptions from our finding onto the exact area of the definition that should be addressed, therefore, again providing a rationale for decisions made based upon input from the faculty.

Each faculty member was sent a survey and asked to return it in a timely fashion. The survey was tracked and follow-up applications for completion were sent to those faculty members not returning the survey. Data from the returned surveys were analyzed in terms of frequencies, means of individual goals, an analysis of mean scores and priorities based upon mean scores of the goal that has the highest priority, analysis to show faculty rank of immediate priorities. The following sections detail the procedures.

Subjects

The subjects were the 435 full-time faculty members of the University of Central Arkansas, of whom 110 responded. Only full-time faculty members were surveyed because a large number of part-time and adjutant faculty may lack a long-term commitment to the university. Also, many areas such as faculty exchange would be unavailable to them because of university guidelines concerning sabbatical leave. Therefore, having the survey of full-time faculty members gave a more accurate description of the attitudes and priorities of faculty members at the University of Central Arkansas.

Instrumentation

The instrument used was a survey that was designed specifically for the University of Central Arkansas faculty. The survey was reviewed by the Faculty Senate, as well as faculty members at large to insure clarity of design and understandability amongst the faculty members. Also, ten surveys were given to faculty members in a variety of colleges at the university, and faculty members were then interviewed as to their intended answers to insure reliability of the instrument. The survey, in its final form, was approved for distribution to the faculty at large by the administration and the Faculty Senate in the fall of 1990.

Procedures

Each faculty member was sent a survey with a pre-addressed return envelope. Follow-up letters to faculty members were sent after a two-week period to urge non-respondents to complete and return their surveys. The data were then correlated and analyzed.

Data Analysis

For each research question, a variety of tests were run, correlating and providing statistical analysis of the survey.

1. What areas of International Education do faculty members rank as the highest immediate priorities?

For this question, frequencies and mean scores of each of the individual goals were obtained, then mean scores and priorities based on mean scores of the goal that has the highest priority were analyzed.

2. What areas do faculty rate as being the most important long-range goals?

For this question, frequencies for the importance were run. Data was then analyzed based on the mean scores. Resulting mean scores were analyzed by the goal that had the highest mean and the highest priority.

3. Are there any long-range goals where importance is dependent on priority?

For this question, cross-tabulation and chi-square between importance and priority were run for each long-range goal. Based on a significance level of .05, for each test of the null hypothesis, H_0 : Priority and importance are independent. The priority and importance are independent variables. If the significance level was below .05, then the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis that priority is dependent on importance was accepted.

4. What is the co-relationship between importance and priority for each of the goals?

For this question, a Pearson correlation was also used to test the importance and priority correlations. H_0 : There is no relationship between priority and importance. The same .05 significance level was used to reject the null hypothesis. The decision rule is that the null hypothesis was rejected if the significance level fell below .05, and therefore there is relationship between priority and importance.

CHAPTER IV

Statistical Findings

To find out the goal that the faculty members ranked as the highest immediate priority, the frequencies of the responses were counted and the mean scores of priority of each of the seven goals were obtained. Below is a table summarizing the result. The possible score for priority is from 1 to 7, where 1 is the highest priority and 7 is the lowest priority. Below is a table summarizing the results:

Priority Ranking Summary

<u>Goals</u>	<u>Mean Scores of Priority</u>	<u>Rank of Priority</u>
International Student Services	3.462	2
Global Awareness	4.010	5
Recruitment and Enrollment	3.802	4
Faculty Exchange	3.787	3
International Training	4.481	6
Study Abroad	3.383	1
English as a Second Language	4.651	7

As can be observed from the table, the highest immediate priority is the opportunity for students to study abroad with a mean score of 3.383. For this goal, out of 110 total cases, 17.3 percent of the faculty members ranked it as the highest priority and 23.6 percent ranked it as the second highest priority. The second highest immediate priority is providing

services to international students with a mean score of 3.462. The lowest priority is providing English courses and tutorial services to non-English speakers in the Conway area with a mean score of 4.651.

On the other hand, the same procedure was utilized to find out which goal is perceived by the faculty members as the most important one. The scale for the measurement of importance is from 1 to 4, where 1 is the most important and 4 is the least important. Below is a table summarizing the results:

Importance Ranking Summary

<u>Goals</u>	<u>Mean Scores of Importance</u>	<u>Rank of Importance</u>
International Student Services	3.206	7
Global Awareness	3.165	6
Recruitment and Enrollment	3.067	3
Faculty Exchange	3.067	4
International Training	2.798	1
Study Abroad	3.087	5
English as a Second Language	2.817	2

As can be seen from the table, there was not any goal that is convincingly more important than the others. The most

important goal has a mean score of 2.798 and the least important goal has a mean score of 3.206. The most important goal is to provide and develop International Training Programs for faculty members. The least important goal is to provide service to international students. As mentioned earlier, none of the goals is conclusively more important, because even the most important goal has a mean score of 2.798 in a scale of 1 to 4. Only 10.9 percent of the faculty members rated it 1 (most important) 20.9 percent rated it 2 (important), 39.1 percent rated it 3 (less important), and 23.6 percent rated it 4 (not very important).

To gain more understanding between the priority and importance of the goals, the importance and priority of each of these goals are cross-tabulated. The null hypothesis (H_0) is that the priority and importance of the goals are not dependent. The objective is to reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_A) that the priority and importance of the goals are dependent. The decision rule is for the significance level to fall less than 0.05 to reject the null hypothesis. Below are the results of the cross-tabulation:

Importance/Priority Association

<u>Goals</u>	<u>Significance Level</u>	<u>Association Between Importance and Priority (<0.05)</u>
International Student Services	0.0022	Yes
Global Awareness	0.0003	Yes
Recruitment and Enrollment	0.0390	Yes
Faculty Exchange	0.0009	Yes
International Training	0.0042	Yes
Study Abroad	0.0165	Yes
English as a Second Language	0.0987	No
All the Goals Combined	0.0000	Yes

As shown in the table, the priority and importance of the proposed goals are associated with each other except for the goal of "English as a Second Language." When these goals are combined and cross-tabulated, it showed a significant association between their priority and importance. The interesting results led to another test of relationship between the priority and importance of these goals.

To test the relationship between importance and priority, Pearson's correlation was run to obtain the correlation coefficient for each of the individual goals. The coefficient ranges from +1 to -1 where a positive sign indicates a positive relationship and a negative sign indicates a negative

relationship and 0 indicates no relationship. The null hypothesis (H_0) is that there is no relationship between priority and importance and the alternative hypothesis is that there is relationship. The decision rule to reject the null hypothesis is for the coefficient to have a significance level of less than 0.05. The results of the test are shown below:

Importance/Priority Relationship Analysis

<u>Goals</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficient</u>	<u>Significant Level</u>	<u>Is the relationship significant (<0.05)</u>
International Student Services	+ 0.09904	0.1610	No
Global Awareness	- 0.10874	0.1408	No
Recruitment and Enrollment	- 0.07812	0.2187	No
Faculty Exchange	- 0.20726	0.0188	Yes
International Training	- 0.14769	0.0683	No
Study Abroad	- 0.05957	0.2790	No
English as a Second Language	- 0.26768	0.0260	Yes
All Goals Combined	- 0.21166	0.0002	Yes

Interestingly, for only two of the goals, the relationship between priority and importance is significant. These are "Faculty Exchange" and "English as a Second Language." Both of them are negatively correlated, which means that the higher its importance, the lower its priority. Moreover, when all the goals are combined to be tested, it

also showed a significant negative relationship. These findings imply that the goal that needs to be reached and implemented first is not necessarily the most important one in the view of responding faculty.

Based on the results above, the decision maker has to balance the priority of the goals, since the goal that needs to be implemented first is not necessarily important. The decision maker also needs to be aware that, according to the faculty members responding, all the seven goals are not very important, as well as their priority for implementation.

CHAPTER V

Conclusions

Most colleges and universities are already involved in some aspects of international education. That is, they probably have at least a few international students in attendance, and have some faculty members who were born or educated in another country or who have some ties to another country through past employment history. Undoubtedly, there are some courses in history and geography and the humanities that have an international flavor, and, in all likelihood, most universities and colleges will offer some classes in foreign language; perhaps French, Spanish and German.

While these conditions give an institution a flavor of international education, these bits and pieces of international activity do not, by themselves, mean that a college or university has internationalized the campus. Nor does it indicate that there is even a commitment toward the establishment of an international program. One may say that by virtue of having these activities, that there may be tendencies within the faculty to feel that no more needs to be done to achieve global awareness among its students. Such feelings, in light of the dwindling Federal budget and limited resources, and resistance to international matters by legislators and boards, may be tempting; even understandable. But to be content with the status quo is to ignore the pressing needs of the world citizenship and global literacy. As Rose Hayden, former Executive Director of the National

Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, pointed out,

"As a vital national education movement, international education is certainly coming of age. As many others have said, there has certainly been a shift toward international education. Those of us who have been in the field for some time have seen us move out of the realm of rhetoric and into the realm of innovation."⁵¹

It is no longer a question of whether or not to be international, instead, the question is how to build upon what an institution already has to develop the things necessary for a campus and curriculum to be considered international in perspective. The bare bones of internationalizing the campus, according to Alan H. Wheeler, Dean of the School of Education at Radford University, includes:

1. Curiosity with regard to the program.
2. Concern and care about the institution and its global responsibilities.
3. Collaboration among the constituency of the institution, as well as those abroad.
4. Commitment to enrich the lives of students and faculty by encouraging and providing the development of sensitivity toward global issues.⁵²

Institutions such as the University of Central Arkansas, or any institution, must get started from where they are. Since it is not feasible to wait for everyone to become similarly aware of the need for internationalization, it is enough for just a few faculty members to have expressed interest and be willing to make some plans involving other

faculty, students and administration. Of critical importance is support and interest from the administration and, in particular, the institution president. Providing inspiration and guidance, demonstrating the willingness to allocate resources in dollars or in kind are Presidential responses that, in many cases, determine a program's viability.

The purpose of the research was to identify and operationalize the definition of international education according to the faculty of the University of Central Arkansas based upon their perception of the priority and importance of international educational goals of that campus. The major findings of this study are that the responding faculty found a significant relationship between the levels of priority and importance within Faculty Exchange and English as a Second Language. These two areas represented the most important focus in terms of immediate and long-term responses. Another important finding was that responding faculty generally found a high level of priority and importance amongst all the goals. This could be interpreted in several ways, one being that the faculty members lack an understanding of the meanings and the ramifications of specific goals, therefore grouping them all equally. A second possibility could be that the faculty has a high level of understanding as to the sophistication and intricacy of each goal and is truly supportive of all areas of international education that could be developed on campus. A third possibility is that the faculty felt that each goal had

some merit, but the instrument did not allow them to separate goals with primary importance and priority and those with secondary areas of importance or priority. In reviewing the scores, it appears that faculty members wanted to give each goal a moderate degree of importance and priority. This is indicated by the clumping of scores in the middle range. The mean scores of importance all ranged between 2.7 and 3.2, and for priority all ranged between 3.5 and 4.5, therefore each goal has a statistical response which would indicate regardless of the goal that was supported, there is some degree of support on campus. Moreover, the instrument did not provide a sufficient range of responses to provide a clear cut direction or definition.

International education was broken into three components: international studies, international education exchange, and technical cooperation. The responding UCA faculty seem to provide support for each of these areas. They indicate a high range of both priority and importance for all international educational goals surveyed. This support would indicate a broad acceptance of international educational goals. The University faculty helps provide definitional validity by giving a broad-based response to the survey.

International studies, which includes components of international awareness, ESL and international students services, was generally given a high level of importance and priority. Each of these provide an opportunity for the influx

of international studies into the university curriculum. The responding faculty recognized these areas as providing an international component on the campus, which could then be utilized as a resource within the curriculum.

This study of the importance and priority of international educational goals at UCA provides the administration and faculty with a loose framework to initiate campus internationalization. It allows both direction and input from faculty. This input can be translated into action by the administration. It provides a rationale for the movement in a variety of directions. By providing for this opportunity, the university provides the first necessary step in the internationalization of the campus. This step toward global input of the faculty community gives the administration and faculty the opportunity to determine which goals have priority and which goals have importance. The direction toward internationalization that UCA takes can be traced to its beginning roots. These roots and the ability for all parties to be involved allows for the success of these goals to be shared amongst the campus community.

Once a university has established an area or a definition of its international goals, the university must address some internal questions as to the function, administration, and purpose of internationalizing its campus. The university must assess the institutional expectations.

By exploring the long-term implications of this data, and correlating them with the various stages of the definition of international educational goals, other universities may profit from this information by studying the individual components and making assumptions concerning the reaction of their faculty to the development of an international program. This approach benefits other universities by allowing them to view data necessary to begin working with their faculty in response to the needs and goals of the development of their own international program.

Regarding the area of international studies, the responding faculty at UCA indicated that this area had a high level of priority because no existing support services were in place. The faculty saw an obvious need that needed to be met. They also responded that the international student services did not have long-term priority, leading the researcher to believe that once the needs were addressed, the area of international education and international programs should move on into other areas and develop those. So when the existing structure is in place for servicing these students, resources can then be shifted to other areas of international education. Therefore, based on the UCA model, when a university is developing an international program, it must first establish support services for its international students in order to satisfy the most immediate needs which would be those of the international students already on campus.

Enrollment and recruitment was seen as an integral part of international educational goals having little long-term importance or priority. Responding faculty rated it as having a medium degree of importance and priority. This, of course, indicates that they understand it's necessary to recruit and enroll international students and that the process of diversification in the internationalization of the campus takes place by having students from other countries attend the university. Because the UCA model indicates such a low importance or priority for enrollment and recruitment, other colleges or universities could use this information by not investing heavily in recruiting and marketing their university abroad, but by using a more unstructured approach to how students are attracted to their university: by word of mouth, by Peterson Guides, and other publications. The budget should not be spent in putting valuable resources into the travel for recruitment of international students, but for allowing faculty to do work overseas. A more cost effective approach to attracting students should be implemented.

In regard to the area of global awareness, this goal was assessed by reporting faculty as having low priority and low importance. It could be surmised that the faculty felt that this could be addressed internally; that each individual faculty member had control over the course content, therefore the global awareness section of the goals could be maintained without administrative control, but internally from each

classroom. This may suggest a lack of awareness that the resources of the University must address global awareness in terms of expenditures, library holdings, and general curriculum content. As explained in the review of the literature, once these areas were initially addressed, the long-term need would lessen considerably because it would become an integral part of the courses taught by the University.

English as a Second Language had the highest rate of priority for the reporting faculty. It also was rated high in terms of its importance to faculty, indicating the faculty felt that English as a Second Language should be an important component in international education. By indicating that ESL should be developed, the faculty showed an understanding of the need for inter-campus diversity. Many universities unintentionally draw a large portion of their international community from one or two countries. ESL Programs often will bring students in from a wide range of countries because the attraction is the language, not a specific major or program. Bringing students with little or no English skills into campus and dormitory situations provides American students with an excellent opportunity to interact with people from a variety of religious, political and ideological backgrounds.

In the area of international exchange programs, which included faculty exchanges and study abroad, not surprisingly, reporting faculty felt that it was important to travel. Many

felt Paris in the spring would be a good trip for faculty. The fact that the University's faculty understood the importance of arranging faculty exchanges, faculty study, and student opportunities is not unusual. This tends to be the area that appears to be the most sought after in international education. Traveling and doing consulting work in order for faculty and students to tour historic and cultural sites around the globe has much base appeal to faculty members. The scores indicate that the responding faculty rated these two activities with both high levels of importance and lower levels of priority. This would suggest that the faculty understands the need to build foundations before the university develops more overseas travel-related programs, even though these activities would most certainly effect the faculty and students in a more direct manner, as opposed to the more indirect effects of developing global awareness and of internationalizing the student body on campus. Other universities can use the information gained from the UCA Model to assure faculty these opportunities will be provided, but only after other more rudimentary areas are addressed.

The area of technical cooperation, which can include faculty exchange, but more directly includes international training, was ranked as a high level of priority. Indirectly, the responding faculty indicated that this is an area that produces revenue and opportunities for exchange. The opportunity for faculty to have research opportunities and

share in development work overseas is a natural outgrowth of any university's role and mission. The service component of a university is not limited to the borders of its city, state, or country, but is world-wide. Many disciplines see the need for their expertise overseas and the ability to secure outside funding to proceed in this manner is indeed attractive. Again, responding faculty noted that, although this is an area that they would like to begin immediately in, they also indicated that the need to fund other activities, such as the exchanges, are often fueled by this component, which explains the high level of priority and low level of importance. Using the information gained from the research at UCA, other colleges and universities can encourage faculty to support the seeking of funds through United States Agency for International Development and United States Information Agency to help build the foundation of an international program and to develop programs for international training, which in turn supports the other components of the definition.

After examining the overall tone of the faculty scoring, it was found that the faculty's overall ranking, both of importance and priority, showed general approval in all areas. This is important in two ways:

1. Other universities can look at their international studies programs, and note that faculty generally want this area addressed and addressed immediately, hence the service aspect of international programs becomes a foundational

function of an English Language studies program. Bringing in students, training them in language and providing a global awareness for our students becomes a foundation upon which other portions of the international programs can be built.

2. Resources should be spent to develop a sound foundation of international studies upon which international areas can be built.

Implications

Campus internationalization may require some course reorganization or a change in degree requirements. Further, new administrative structures may have to be created. Teaching methods may need to be re-designed. Domestic and foreign students may need to meet one another in more varied settings. All of these activities may be said to be in the process of which the internationalization of a campus may go forward. If global awareness is to be internalized among students, then more of an attempt to climb aboard the bandwagon of international education is a means of snaring a grant or gaining professional visibility, it must be more than grafting international programs into a probably overworked faculty and curriculum.

It is well for institutions getting started to recognize that courses and programs can change. International studies can be added. Foreign students can be attracted to the campus. And international exchanges can flourish without in

any way altering the ethnocentric character of the campus. Something must take place in the faculty and eventually in the students that will make them more receptive to the world beyond the border of the United States.

It should be part of the institution's policy to clearly set forth its expectations of an international program, and how it hopes to achieve those expectations. The institution should provide written answers to questions such as: Why send students overseas? Why send faculty overseas? Why have faculty and students from institutions come into our colleges and universities? What hope is there of achieving our expectations, and how will we know if we have succeeded? By looking at both short- and long-term goals, a university can assess where it began and where it is going on a frequent basis, and to shift resources and allocations as needed.

What needs to be developed is an Office of International Programs which is properly staffed, located conveniently to the campus, and can serve as a locus of information, coordination, leadership and incentive. The establishment of such an office will require either additional resources or the diversion of funds from existing programs by re-ordering institutional priorities. As institutional commitment to internationalization is developed, there also needs to be a willingness to establish a centralized office.

Decisions must be made in regard to the internal organization of an institution responsible for international programs: its funding, the kind of planning that will take place, and who shall do the planning. If there is a need for faculty and student involvement and such involvement is essential, how are faculty and students chosen? For what period of time? And what authority should such a planning group have? If a faculty group is responsible for the planning, that faculty committee should report to some academic administrator, so there is a direct line of responsibility within the group. International programs offices are found all over campuses. At the University of Central Arkansas, the Director of International Programs reports directly to the President. At Arkansas Tech University, the International Program Officer reports to the Registrar. At the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville, the Director of International Programs reports to the Dean of Student Services. There is no set line of stance for the Director of International Programs, but it does need to be clearly established wherever that position is put in the administrative unit.

During the initial development of a university's international programs, resources are often made on an in-kind basis. Policies need to be set down regarding such matters as the use of office space, laboratory and computer facilities and research equipment, and housing, for visiting professors

from other countries. Care must be exercised that foreign faculty are not humiliated by makeshift accommodations or by campus and community discrimination and hostilities.

Foreign students come to the U.S. colleges and universities having enormous expectations that, over a period of time, are generally realized. Nevertheless, international students must exercise a great deal of patience, and often experience a great deal of frustration and disappointment. Some of this may be inevitable, since no student can altogether be shielded from such difficulties. The implementation of an Office of International Programs can often add to the sense of well-being international students have when they attend campus. They can help with the orientation and counseling of students when they go through the difficult times that they face when they arrive at the doors of a university campus.

The Office of International Programs can also be an integral point in the launching of faculty exchange programs. As indicated from the data collected, faculty are generally very supportive of programs which deal with faculty exchanges, sending U.S. instructors abroad and bring in international instructors to the campus. Faculty exchanges are complex matters that may take several forms. The first and most common, and perhaps the most clear-cut of all, is the reciprocal exchange. In this form of faculty exchange, a faculty member from a U.S. college or university exchanges

places with a faculty member in the same discipline at a college or university abroad. This type of Exchange often involves not only reciprocity at the departmental level, but in housing and other amenities as well. While no faculty exchange is altogether trouble-free, the reciprocal exchange is probably the most cost effective. The U.S. faculty member going abroad for a minimum of 339 days out of a 365-day year, in fact, achieves some income tax advantages that may be enough to serve as an incentive to participate in the exchange.

Other ways of developing interest in study, research, and teaching abroad may be one-way exchanges in which a faculty member designs his own program. This requires substantial flexibility on the part of both institutions and a willingness for faculty members to make sure that their responsibilities at their home campus can be accommodated for the period of their absence. Several such ad-hoc arrangements have been made, and, in some cases are encouraged, since they not only help to provide an international experience for a U.S. faculty member, but also become an important element in the overall program for faculty development. Other exchanges, such as Fulbright and USIA exchanges, can provide an excellent opportunity for a U.S. faculty member to go abroad, sponsored by the U.S. government. These programs are encouraged because they do not involve a loss in income. Participants in the

Fulbright program also receive a substantial amount of status on their host campus by being a Fulbright Scholar.

Earl Kline, Director of International Studies at the College of Charleston, South Carolina, points out that "Faculty exchange experiences, living abroad in a alien culture, in a daily interactive process, with not only the academic community, but with the country community as well, is a much deepening and enriching experience."⁵³ Yet, while there is general agreement on this statement, there are also a variety of problems that arise from faculty exchanges. Faculty exchange represents one of the most complex dimensions of an international program. They require patience, careful planning, and tangible supports. At best, they represent a long-term investment with very few short-term payoffs, but the investment is worthwhile if we are content to wait for the dividends of the future.

Maurice Harari states, "I would say as much as 90% of what is needed to start a basic foundation for an international program can be done without a single nickel from the outside. It is internal commitment, rearrangement of resources and renewal of faculty dedication that are the keys to beginning an international program."⁵⁴ With this view, there is not, of course, universal agreement. It is well known that starting an office of international programs costs money, subsidizing faculty to go abroad costs money, recruiting international students to a campus costs money,

establishing new programs and engaging in activities with distinct international flavor costs money. You need to spend money in program development, and yet, those who feel that an international component can be mounted without a nickel, and those who feel that new money is essential, are both correct. In part, it is a matter of semantics. In part, it is a matter of accounting. Many funds on college campuses are fungible in nature, that is, they often cannot be separated out or factored out in any usable way. Thus, what does it cost to begin a course on an international issue instead of a course on urban sociology? Clearly, a cost can be determined if necessary, since equal dollars were shifted from one area to another. Does such accountability perform any useful function? What does it cost to teach American literature to two foreign students who are in a class of twenty-seven taking the same course? Can a cost be determined? But, then again, no new money has been allocated, and if the two international students were not there, would anybody be saving anything? If the costs are to be made up partly by tuition paid by the students and partly subsidized by taxes, how much of each was used to provide for the two international students? If tax money was used, and it likely will be, how much? Again, the accountants can probably determine such data, but it is difficult to assess its usefulness.

However, once qualitative improvements have begun and the momentum builds to increase the international programs and

funds must be sought. Harari recognized that requiring additional funding is essential to providing the margin of excellence, quantitative as well as qualitative, which allows an institution to cultivate their international dimension among its campus community. Having developed 90% of its activities without a nickel, the university must seek additional funds through grants, contracts, and, to a lesser extent, state funds, having established a track record of self help, and demonstrating an abiding commitment to establishing an international program on campus. It is important when seeking funds for a particular project that the project be consistent with the character and mission of the institution. To seek funds and develop internationally merely because an opportunity exists is inconsistent if it does not fit with the role and mission of the institution.

An analysis of the research data supports the finding that foundations of financial resources and an institutional commitment to all areas of international studies need to be built. Building this foundation gives the University the opportunity to successfully meet its international educational goals. However, the University cannot be called upon to fund all these activities without taking resources away from other areas of the campus; therefore the international training and technical cooperation areas must be addressed. These areas will bring in outside contracts, outside money from United States Agency for International Development and United States

Information Agency, as well as other funding organizations. By 1) building the foundation, and 2) helping the University pay for activities, the third area of exchange programs can be funded in a successful manner. Faculty want to have exchange opportunities for both faculty members and students, and by building and working within this model, universities have a logical, step-by-step plan to follow.

Other universities examining this data could benefit from the knowledge that:

1. With increased faculty understanding of the need to build and move quickly in areas that are going to help in the long term (including the need to provide exposure on campus to international developments, and the need to provide an association of international students) comes a greater understanding of and tolerance for the outlay of resources necessary to accomplish international educational goals.

2. What many consider to be the highlights of international educational goals are often the ones that need to be developed more slowly and paid for in a more disciplined manner.

In reviewing this data, several improvements in the methodology could be designed. One would be allowing the researcher to more fully and clearly develop the definitions and educational goals instead of using existing international educational goals. Other improvements would be within the instrument itself. Faculty members may feel that any movement

in the international community is worthwhile and the instrument did not allow for this measurable factor.

Improvements to the methodology and to improve this research could include several items. The international educational goals which were developed by the faculty may have been ambiguous and somewhat self serving. Using the research to develop goals may be a more logical sequence, rather than developing the goals and then running the study. Another area which could improve is the design of the survey itself. By using certain goals which were stated in a generalized or ambiguous manner, the faculty may have avoided voting or indicating that something would be unimportant or have no priority. Another area which could have been designed better is the designation within the survey of the areas of importance and priority. There may have been other types of axis, other terminology, or points of measurability which would better indicate the long-term and short-term needs and priorities of the University faculty.

Need for Future Research

In looking at the future use of this data, the research could take either of two directions. The first direction would be a longitudinal study to examine the areas that have been developed in order to determine whether or not the faculty supports the areas that they had indicated as important long-term goals. Included in this study would be

other faculty surveys, conducted over a period of time, designed to determine if those goals remain consistent. A second area would be to conduct an identical survey at a different campus in order to obtain a direct comparison of results on the international component of a campus. This study would be based upon the faculty and the programs offered at the campus. It would measure whether each campus has individual strengths and/or weaknesses in its international studies that could not be attributed to attributed to controlling factors such as facilities and financial resources. By moving in either of these directions, we could answer additional questions which this research does not answer.

Footnotes

1. Tonkin, J., Edwards, R., International Education: A Primer. New York, McMillan, 1981, p. 17.
2. Brademas, John. "Who Needs International Education?" Educational Record, Spring 1987, p. 3.
3. "Exchange 2000: International Leadership for the Next Century." Washington, D.C.: The Liaison Group for International Educational Exchange, 1990, p. 5.
4. Backman, Earl L. (ed.), Approaches to International Education, New York, MacMillan, 1984, p. 36.
5. Ibid, p. 50.
6. American Association of State Colleges and Universities, International Funding Guide-Resources and Funds for International Activities at Colleges and Universities, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., 1985, p. 19.
7. Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange. Educating for Global Competence: The Report of the Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange. New York: Council on International Educational Exchange, August 1988, p. 8.
8. Harari, Maurice, Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus. American Association of States Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., 1981, revised 1983, p. 18.
9. Ibid, p. 33.
10. Ibid, p. 19.
11. Backman, p. 17.
12. Chronicle of Higher Education, "Who Educates America?," June 19, 1989, p. 11.
13. Backman, p. 12.

14. Chronicle of Higher Education, "Who Educates America?," June 19, 1989, p. 11.
15. Brademas, p. 4.
16. Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange, p. 10.
17. Advisory Council on International Education. Cornerstone of Competition: The Report of the Southern Governor's Association Advisory Council on International Education. Washington, D.C.: Southern Governor's Association, November 1986, p. 17.
18. Clifton Wharton, in the Proceedings of the AASCU's 23rd Annual Meeting, "Our Roots, Our Future," San Diego, California, November 20-23, 1983, p. 21.
19. R. Freeman Butts, "America's Role in International Education: A Perspective on Thirty Years," in Harold G. Shane, editor, The United States and International Education, 68th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1969, pp. 7 & 10.
20. David C. King, International Education for Spaceship Earth, New York, Foreign Policy Association, 1971, p. 14.
21. Gordon I. Swanson, "International Education: Portents for the Future," in F. Robert Paulsen, editor, Changing Dimensions of International Education, Tucson, Arizona, The University of Arizona Press, 1969, p. 1.
22. John T. Caldwell, in Allen Michie, Higher Education and World Affairs, (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1968), p. 11.
23. Stephen K. Bailey, "Higher Education and World Affairs," in U.S. Congress, House Committee on Education and Labor, Task Force on International Education, International Education: Past, Present, Problems and Prospects, Selected Readings to Supplement H.R. 14646, H. Doc. 527, 89th Congress, 2d session, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 2.

24. Stephen Arum, "International Education: What Is It? A Taxonomy of International Education of U.S. Universities," CIEE Occasional Papers No. 23, New York, CIEE, November 1987.
25. Herman B. Wells, "International Education: The Present Decade," in VIDYA, Journal of the Regional Council for International Education, Spring 1970, p. 15.
26. King, p. 15.
27. David G. Scanlon, International Education: A Documentary History, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1960, p. 1.
28. Stewart E. Fraser and William W. Brickman, A History of International and Comparative Education: Nineteenth-Century Documents, Atlanta, Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968, p. 1.
29. Arum, p. 8.
30. Seth Spaulding and John Singleton, editors, "International Development Education," Review of Educational Research, June 1968, p. 204.
31. Butts, pp. 12-13.
32. Steven E. Deutsch, International Education and Exchange: A Sociological Analysis, Cleveland, The Press of Case Western Reserve University, 1970, p. 1.
33. Maurice Harari, Global Dimensions in U.S. Education, New York, Center for War /Peace Studies, 1972, p. 3.
34. Institute of International Education, Inc., It's Origin, Organization and Activities, Bulletin No. 1, New York, 1 March 1920, p. 4.
35. U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, report to accompany H.R. 14643, Report No. 1539, 89th Congress, 2d session, p. 13.
36. See, for example, Robert Koehl's article, "The Comparative Study of Education" Prescription and Practice" in the Comparative Education Review, Vol 21, nos. 2 & 3, June and October, 1977, pp. 178-179, for a discussion of different approaches to definitions.
37. Philip G. Altbach, "The Review at Thirty," Comparative Education Review, Vol. 30, No. 1, February, 1986, p. 6.

38. Ibid, p. 15.
39. Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange. Educating for Global Competence: The Report of the Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange. New York: Council on International Educational Exchange, August 1988, p. 6.
40. Ibid, p. 7.
41. Council of Chief State School Officers. International Dimensions of Education. Position paper and recommendations for action. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, November 1985, p. 11.
42. Rose L. Hayden, National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies. Address to the First Annual International Education Leadership Conference, Boca Raton, Fla., November 5-6, 1987.
43. Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange, p. 77.
44. Advisory Council on International Education, p. 34.
45. Ibid, p. 26.
46. American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Guidelines: Incorporating an International Dimension in Colleges and Universities, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., 1985, p. 9.
47. American Association of State Colleges and Universities, International Funding Guide-Resources and Funds for International Activities at Colleges and Universities, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., 1985, p. 48.
48. Educating for Global Competence: The Report of the Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange. New York: Council on International Educational Exchange, 1988, p. 11.
49. Maurice Harari, "Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus: Guidelines for AASCU Institutions." AASCU Studies 1981/3/February, 1983, revised, p. 12.

50. Advisory Council on International Education. International Education: Cornerstone of Competition: Innovative Programs from the States. Supplement to the report of the Southern Governor's Association Advisory Council on Education. Washington, D.C., Southern Governor's Association, February 1987, p. 14.
51. Craufurd D. Goodwin and Michael Nacht, Absence of Decision, New York: Institute of International Education, 1983, p. 44.
52. National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, A Statement to the New Administration on International Education Priorities for the 1990's, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1988.
53. Don Sikkink, Internationalizing the Curriculum, St. Cloud State University, May 28, 1982, p. 2.
54. Maurice Harari, Global Dimensions in U.S. Education, New York, Center for War/Peace Studies, 1972, p. 10.

APPENDIX

SURVEY

University of Central Arkansas
Office of International Programs

Dear Faculty Member,

The Office of International Programs seeks to function as a catalyst to improve the quality and depth of information that is available to UCA students about global issues while, at the same time, giving members of the international community the opportunity to have effective international living and learning experiences. Our goal is to help improve the quality of life of these people and, hopefully, leave them touched in some way by our programs. By doing this, we hope to make the world a better place.

Your insight into the quality, content and scope of the curriculum is invaluable to our program. As educators, you are the most immediate and direct link between the University and its students. Moreover, because of cultural and language difficulties, your role is especially critical in regard to examining the specific needs of the University's international student body.

The Office of International Programs asks your co-operation in completing a survey examining specific areas of need our office intends to address. These areas have been carefully reviewed by President Thompson and he supports our efforts to utilize input from the entire campus community.

The survey is comprised of a summary of seven goals and areas of emphasis. To assist us in determining which areas reflect the majority of faculty interests, we ask that you take a few moments to read and rank these items according to the following scales. You indicate your voluntary agreement to participate by completing and returning this questionnaire.

Priority Level

Using each number only once, rank each item from one to seven. Use "one" to designate what you believe should be the top priority for this office.

Overall Importance of Long-term Goals

Use each number as many times as you believe necessary.

- | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 - no importance | 2 - little importance |
| 3 - important | 4 - very important |

Again, thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Above all else, we want to be responsive to the needs, desires, and professional opinions of UCA faculty, staff, and students.

If you would like a summary of the results of this survey, please indicate this in the "comments" section and include your address. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Brian V. Bolter, Director
Office of International Programs

INTERNATIONAL STUDENT SERVICES

Priority	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Importance	1	2	3	4			

The Office of International Programs understands the critical role that support services play in ensuring that every students' stay at UCA is both successful and meaningful. With this in mind, we are committed to developing a program of student services that will cater to the specific needs of international students as they strive to overcome the cultural and logistical problems encountered while studying in foreign countries.

GLOBAL AWARENESS

Priority	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Importance	1	2	3	4			

The Office of International Programs seeks to serve as a resource center to provide students and faculty with the opportunity to develop a sense of global awareness and to assist those departments are already advancing international interests. We will provide information dealing with a wide range of areas, countries and topics such as the dynamics of contemporary geopolitics, environmental issues that cross national borders, and the resurgence of regionalism and nationalism.

RECRUITMENT AND ENROLLMENT

Priority	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Importance	1	2	3	4			

Establishment of Admissions and Recruitment procedures that will attract and maintain a highly diversified student body, aid in the internationalization of the campus community and provide for all UCA students a global experience in education.

The design and distribution of printed materials promoting the University and its programs that will be suitable for the international community. Specifically, these materials will include international applications and brochures printed in a variety of foreign languages.

To regulate and govern the acceptance of university-level credit from foreign institutions, Procedural guidelines will be developed.

FACULTY EXCHANGE

Priority	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Importance	1	2	3	4			

The importance of giving UCA faculty members the opportunity to instruct and lecture in a foreign country cannot be discounted. The experience and perspective these instructors bring back to the classroom will touch and enrich the lives of each student they come in contact with. Therefore, the Office of International Programs seeks to implement Faculty Exchange Programs and procedures through which information concerning exchange and Fulbright opportunities for faculty may be made available.

INTERNATIONAL TRAINING

Priority 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Importance 1 2 3 4

The faculty of the University of Central Arkansas includes members with a variety of academic specializations that can impact on the lives of the citizens of third world countries. This knowledge is a resource that can and should be exported for the benefit of all concerned. With this goal in mind, we seek to develop International Training Programs that will bring groups from a variety of foreign countries to the Conway area for short-term technical, cultural, and language training. These Programs will provide participating faculty members with extensive opportunities for both personal and professional growth.

STUDY ABROAD

Priority 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Importance 1 2 3 4

The opportunity for students to explore a culture that is different than their own is invaluable. The Office of International Programs seeks to expand the opportunities for foreign travel and study for students of UCA. Toward this end, we seek the establishment of procedural guidelines between the Business Office, the Office of International Programs and faculty members for the design and implementation of Study Abroad opportunities.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Priority 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Importance 1 2 3 4

The Office of International Programs strives to be responsive to the needs of the international community. To meet this goal, we will provide special English courses and tutoring services to non-English speakers in the Conway area. Additionally, we will provide English language training and educational support for UCA students with deficient language skills.

* * *

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

Please return via campus mail to
The Office of International Programs

Name_____ **Department**_____

I. Have you ever participated in a Study Abroad or Faculty exchange program with this or any other institution? If so please give a brief description of your experience.

[illegible][illegible]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

Abrams, Irwin and Arnold, David B., The American College and International Education, mimeo., New York, Education and World Affairs, 1966.

Advisory Council on International Education. Cornerstone of Competition: The Report of the Southern Governor's Association Advisory Council on International Education. Washington, D.C.: Southern Governor's Association, November 1986.

Advisory Council on International Education. International Education: Cornerstone of Competition: Innovative Programs from the States. Supplement to the report of the Southern Governor's Association Advisory Council on Education. Washington, D.C.: Southern Governor's Association, February 1987.

Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange. Educating for Global Competence: The Report of the Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange. New York: Council on International Educational Exchange, August 1988.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Guidelines: Incorporating an International Dimension in Colleges and Universities, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., 1985.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities, International Funding Guide-Resources and Funds for International Activities at Colleges and Universities, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., 1985.

Andersen, Charles J., International Studies for Undergraduates, 1987; Operations and Opinions, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1988.

Anderson, Charles J., International Studies for Undergraduates, 1987: Operations and Opinions. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, October 1985.

- Arpan, Geer, McCracken, Wind, Hallmarks of Successful International Business Programs, council on International Educational Exchange, Occasional Papers 25, New York, 1988.
- Backman, Earl L. (ed.), Approaches to International Education, New York, MacMillan, 1984.
- Barker, H. Kenneth (ed.), AACTE Handbook of International Education Programs, Washington, D.C., AACTE, 1963.
- Becker, James, "Education for a Changing World". America's Education for a World Perspective: Draft Papers and Recommendations. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, October 1985.
- Berger, Joseph. "Where Students are Living Language." The New York Times, September 5, 1988, national section, p. 5.
- Biederman, Patricia Ward. "Geography More Than Just Maps." Los Angeles Times, June 30, 1987, section I, pp. 1, 18.
- Brademas, John. "Who Needs International Education?" Educational Record, Spring 1987.
- Brandemas, John. The importance of learning about the rest of the world. Chronicle of Higher Education, April 21, 1982.
- Bruner, Karen; Weeks, Kent; and Kern, Pat. International Education Resources: A Summary of OE-Funded Research Projects and Reports Available Through the Educational Research Information Center, 1956-71, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.
- Burn, B.B. Expanding the international dimension of higher education. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980.
- Burn, Barbara. Expanding the International Dimension of Higher Education (1980). Prepared for the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies Higher Education. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, 1980.
- Carlson, Jerry S.; Burn, Barbara B.; Useem, John; and Yachimowicz, David. Study Abroad: The Experience of American Undergraduates. Greenwood Press, 1990.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. Geography Education and the States: A Report on a 1988 Geography Education Survey of State Education Agencies. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, October 1988.

Council on International Educational Exchange, Educating for Global Competence: The Report of the Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange, Council on International Educational Exchange, New York, 1988.

Council on Learning. National task force statement on education and the world view. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Change Magazine Press, 1981.

Didsbury, Howard F., Jr., (ed.), Creating a Global Agenda: Assessments, Solutions, and Action Plans, World Future Society, Bethesda, MD, 1984.

Dinniman, Andrew and Holzner, Burkart (eds.), Education for International Competence in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania Department of Education and University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh, August 1988.

Draper, Jamie B., "State Activities Update: Focus on Exchange." Washington, D.C., Joint National Committee for Languages, November 1987.

Draper, Jamie B., "State Initiatives and Activities in Foreign Languages and International Studies". Washington, D.C., Joint National Committee for Languages, October 1986.

Educating for Global Competence: The Report of the Advisory Council for International Educational Exchange. New York: Council on International Educational Exchange, 1988.

Edwards, J. David, Executive Director, Joint National Committee for Languages. Testimony before the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, U.S. Senate, March 23, 1987.

Edwards, J. David, "Foreign Language Education for International Economic Competitiveness: Recent Initiatives." ERIC/Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics News Bulletin, vol. 10, no. 2, March 1987.

"Exchange 2000: International Leadership for the Next Century." Washington, D.C.: The Liaison Group for International Educational Exchange, 1990.

Fersh, S. International developments in postsecondary short-cycle education: Report of a Wingspread conference convened by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges in cooperation with the Johnson Foundation at Wingspread, October 25-27, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 176 832).

Fersh, S. and Fitchen, E.E. (Eds.) The community college and international education: A report of progress. Cocoa, Florida: Brevard Community College, 1981.

Financial Aid for Study Abroad: A Manual for Advisers and Administrators. Edited by Stephen Cooper, William Cressey, and Nancy Stubbs. Washington, D.C." National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1989.

Fraser, Stewart (ed.), Government Policy and International Education, New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1965.

Fraser, Stewart and Brickman, William W., A History of International and Comparative Education: 19th Century Documents, Glenview, Illinois; Scott, Foresman, 1968.

Freeman, Robert E. (ed.), Promising Papers in Global Education: A Handbook with Case Studies, National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, New York, 1986.

Global Perspectives in Education, The United States Prepares for Its Future: Report of the Study Commission on Global Education, Global Perspectives in Education, New York, 1987.

Goodwin, Craufurd D. and Nacht, Michael, Abroad & Beyond: Patterns in American Overseas Education. Institute of International Education Research Report. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Goodwin, Craufurd D. and Nacht, Michael, Decline and Renewal: Causes and Cures of Decay Among Foreign-Trained Intellectuals and Professionals in the Third World. Institute of International Education, New York, 1986.

Government Programs in International Education (A Survey and Handbook), Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, 85th Congress, 2nd session, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1959.

Groennings, Sven, "The Changing Need for an International Perspective: The Global Economy and Undergraduate Education", International Studies Association, Volume 13, Number 3, Oklahoma, 1987.

Hamilton, John Maxwell. Main Street America and the Third World. Cabin John, Md." Seven Locks Press, 1986.

Harcleroad, Fred F. and Kilmartin, Alfred D., International Education in the Developing State Colleges and Universities: A Report of a Study Conducted for the AASCU, Washington, D.C., The Association, 1966.

Harari, Maurice, Internationalizing the Curriculum and the Campus. American Association of States Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., 1981, revised 1983.

Harari, Maurice, Internationalizing Undergraduate Education: Highlights of the Systemwide Invitational Conference. Office of the Chancellor, The California State University, Long Beach, 1987.

Harrington, Fred H., International Linkages in Higher Education: A Feasibility Study. National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1978.

Hayden, R. Exchange of persons program, 1980. In J. Lurie (Ed.), America . . . Globally blind, deaf, and dumb. Garden City, New York: Adelphi University, 1981.

Hayden, Rose L. National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies. Address to the First Annual International Education Leadership Conference, Boca Raton, Fla., November 5-6, 1987.

"Improving U.S. Competitiveness: Swapping Debt for Education." A Report to the Secretary of Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce, International Trade Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1989.

"International Competence: A Key to America's Future." A Plan of Action of the Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Studies, Washington, D.C.: CAFLIS, 1989.

"International Cooperation in Business Education." A Wingspread Conference Report. Edited by Stephen J. Kobin, New York: Council on International Education Exchange, 1989.

International Council on Education for Teaching, Cultural Diversity and Global Interdependence: Imperatives for Teacher Education, International Council on Education for Teaching, Washington, D.C., 1986.

International Education: Past, Present, Problems and Prospects, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 2nd session, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1966.

International Education Act: Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, (Eighty-Ninth Congress, Second Session on S. 2474), U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1966.

- International Service Agencies. Expanding the States' Export Opportunities Through International Development Education. Working Paper. Washington, D.C., International Service Agencies, 1987.
- Joy, Carrol and Kniep, Willard M., (eds.), The International Development Crisis and American Education: Challenges, Opportunities and Instructional Strategies, Global Perspectives in Education, New York, 1987.
- King, David C., International Education for Spaceship Earth, New York, Foreign Policy Association, 1971.
- Kniep, William M., A Critical Review of the Short History of Global Education: Preparing for New Opportunities, Global Perspectives in Education, New York, 1985.
- Lambert, Richard D., International Studies and the Undergraduate, American Council on Education Special Report, Washington, D.C., 1989.
- Lambert, Richard D., (ed.), "New Directions in International Education," The Annals, American Academy of Political and Social Science, The University of Chicago Press, vol. 449, Philadelphia, 1980.
- Lambert, Richard D., Points of Leverage: An Agenda for a National Foundation for International Studies. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1986.
- Lamy, Steven L., "Defining Global Education", University of Southern California, Educational Research Quarterly, Vol. 8, No. 1, Special Issue, 1983.
- Lamy, Steven L., The Definition of a Discipline: The Objects and Methods of Analysis in Global Education, Global Perspectives in Education, (Occasional Paper), New York, 1987.
- Leestma, Robert. "Education for a Global Age: What is Involved?" Vital Issues, vol. 28, no. 7, March 1979.
- Leinwand, Gerald, Without a Nickel: The Challenge of Internationalizing the Curriculum and Campus. American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., 1983.
- McDonnell, L.M., Berryman, S.E., and Scott, D. Federal support for international studies: The role of NDEA Title VI. Santa Monica: Rand Publication Series, 1981.

McKinney, Kitzie. "Toward an International Partnership: Business Activities and the Foreign Language Curriculum." ADFL Bulletin, vol. 18, no. 2, January 1987, pp. 34-36.

Michigan State University, International Role of the University in the Eighties, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1982.

Nation at Risk. Washington, D.C.: National Committee on Excellence in Education, 1983.

National Assembly on Foreign Language and International Studies. Toward Education with a Global Perspective. Washington, D.C." Association of American Colleges, 1980.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, A Statement to the New Administration on International Education Priorities for the 1990's, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1988.

National Advisory Board on International Education Programs, Critical Needs in International Education: Recommendations for Action. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1983.

National Governors' Association, Educating Americans for Tomorrow's World: State Initiatives in International Education, National Governor's Association, Washington, D.C., 1987.

Nesmith, John, Mega-Trends, McGraw-Hill, New York, New York, 1980.

Nicholson, R. International education. Lake Buena Vista, Florida, January 14-16, 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 197 804).

Oliver, Patrick J., Vice President for Public Relations, Latin American and Caribbean Division, American Express Travel Related Services. Address to the First Annual International Education Leadership Conference, Boca Raton, FL, Nov.5-6, 1987.

Open Doors: 1988-89: Report on International Educational Exchange. Edited by M. Zikopoulos, New York: Institute of International Education, 1989.

O'Neil, John, "Global Education: Controversy Remains, But Support Growing." Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, ASCD Curriculum Update, January 1989, pp. 1-8.

Parnell, Dale, President, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Testimony before the Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities, Committee on Labor and Human Resources, U.S. Senate, March 23, 1987.

Paulsen, F. Robert (ed.), Changing Dimensions of International Education, Tucson, Arizona, The University of Arizona Press, 1969.

Perkins, James A., International Programs of U.S. Colleges and Universities: Priorities for the Seventies, International Council for Educational Development, Occasional Paper No. 1, New York, 1971.

Peterson, Normal. "State Initiatives to Increase International Exchanges," Working paper for the Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Studies (CAFLIS), November, 1988.

Rand Corporation, Federal Support for International Studies: The Rose of NDEA Title VI, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, 1981.

"Renewing the National Commitment to International Understanding through Educational and Cultural Diplomacy." Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1989.

Robinson, Olin C., "Toward a Definition of International Education", National Association for Foreign Student Affairs Newsletter, Volume 29, Number 9, Summer 1978.

Scanlon, David G., International Education, A Documentary History, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1960.

Shane, Harold G. (ed.), The United States and International Education, Chicago, National Society for the Study of Education, 68th Yearbook, 1969.

Simon, P. The tongue-tied American. New York: The Continuum Publishing Corporation, 1980.

Study Commission on Global Education. The United States Prepares for Its Future: Global Perspectives on Education. New York: The American Forum, 1988.

Sullivan, Candace J., "Foreign Language Study: A Call for State Board Action." The State Board Connection - Issues in Brief, vol. 7, no. 7, September 1988, pp. 1-2.

Tonkin, J., Edwards, R., International Education: A Primer, New York, MacMillan, 1981.

- Tysse, Agnes N., International Education: The American Experience, Metuchen, New Jersey, Scarecrow Press, 1977.
- Von Klemperer, Lily, International Education: A Directory of Resource Materials on Comparative Education and Study in Another Country, Garrett Park, Md., Garrett Park Press.
- Ward, Robert E., National Needs for International Education, Washington, D.C., Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, 1977.
- Whitman, Shepherd L., Inter-Institutional Cooperation and International Education, New York, Education and World Affairs, 1969.
- Wiprud, Helen R., International Education Program of the U.S. Government; An Inventory, Washington, D.C., USDOE Federal Interagency Committee on the International Education Task Force, 1981.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293010197881