0-8
7

POINTS OF LEVERAGE

AN AGENDA FOR A NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

RICHARD D. LAMBERT

POINTS OF LEVERAGE

Declassified and Approved For Release 2013/03/13 :
CIA-RDP90-00530R000802120001-3

Copies of this report may be obtained from:

Publications Office
Social Science Research Council
605 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10158

Declassified and Approved For Release 2013/03/13 : CIA-RDP90-00530R000802120001-3

POINTS OF LEVERAGE

An Agenda for a National Foundation for International Studies

Richard D. Lambert

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

NEW YORK

1986

Printed in the United States of America

Preface

In late 1984, the Smithsonian Institution hosted a dinner in Washington, D.C. to discuss what might be done to stabilize long-term federal support for international studies and foreign language training. Subsequently, a smaller group of educators and foundation officers gathered to initiate specific activities based on the recommendations advanced during this dinner. For the persons involved, the issues were not new. Many had, in one forum or another, participated in similar discussions many times. Some had written on the issue at hand and others had been active in establishing study groups and committees and councils whose work bore on the adequacy of existing programs in foreign language training and in area and international studies. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that this discussion, like so many before it, led quickly to the conclusion that the international challenges facing the society are inadequately and in some instances ineptly serviced by the existing federal arrangements for support of foreign and international studies.

A general plan emerged. It was suggested that improvement in these matters might be served by presenting for public debate the case for a National Foundation for Foreign Languages and International Studies, modeled on such similar successful national agencies as the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Science Foundation. The group was emboldened in this direction by the frequency with which the idea of a National Foundation has been raised in congressional circles and among some federal agencies. A two-stage program was decided upon.

Declassified and Approved For Release 2013/03/13 : CIA-RDP90-00530R000802120001-3

First, to advance public discussion and legislative attention, the group agreed that it would be useful to prepare an outline of the actual legal form that a National Foundation might take. Through the good offices of the Association of American Universities the task was undertaken, resulting in the AAU report *To Strengthen the Nation's Investment in Foreign Languages and International Studies: A Legislative Proposal to Create a National Foundation for Foreign Languages and International Studies*, published in October 1986, and available from the AAU office.

Second, a legislative proposal, however valuable in its own terms, was not thought to discharge fully the responsibility of those who wished to present before the public the case for a new National Foundation. More extended analysis and justification was needed, not unlike that represented in *Science: The Endless Frontier*, the critical document published in 1945 by the U.S. Office of Scientific Research and Development that was so instrumental in explaining the national need for the National Science Foundation in the immediate postwar years.

The foundations represented at the meeting which launched the present effort felt it would be useful to commission a document self-consciously modeled on *Science: The Endless Frontier*, and turned for this task to Richard D. Lambert, a sociologist at the University of Pennsylvania who had recently led the team that prepared *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies* (Association of American Universities, 1984). Five foundations provided support: The Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Ford Foundation, the Exxon Education Foundation, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation. Consultants were asked to prepare background papers. Particularly helpful were those prepared by Elinor Barber, Warren (Jim) Haas, Rose Hayden, Harold Jacobson, Steve Kobrin, Ivo Lederer, Gene Lyons, and Cassie Pyle. The Social Science Research Council served as a secretariat and prepared the report for publication. The views expressed in the report are those of the author and not necessarily those of the funders, the consultants, or the Council.

The result of these efforts is before you. *Points of Leverage*, although the work and responsibility of its author, is an essay which reflects and represents a broad current of concern. The intent of Richard Lambert's essay is no more, but no less, than that of presenting for public discussion and debate the rationale for a National Foundation for Foreign Languages and International Studies. It is the belief of those who sponsored this report that Richard Lambert has done this task well.

The next step is self-evident—wide consultation, informed debate, and the representation of citizen views to members of Congress and the executive branch. To facilitate public discussion and education, the Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Language and International Studies (CAFLIS) has been formed, with offices in Suite 730, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. The task of the Coalition is to insure that interested organizations and individuals have full opportunity to voice their views. Those who have formed the Coalition take for granted that whether there should be a National Foundation, and, if so, what form it should take, are decisions to be made by the political process. *Points of Leverage*, and the larger effort of which it is a central part, is presented in the expectation that it will inform citizen views, the resulting public debate and discussion, and the eventual judgment to be made by the Congress of the United States.

KENNETH PREWITT
The Rockefeller Foundation

Contents

Chapter 1

The Challenge of Internationalization and the Response

EXPANSION

Before World War II, the United States was an essentially insular country; international affairs were marginal to most of American life. Since that time, more and more sectors of our economy and our society have developed substantial—and growing—international dimensions. Whether we like it or not — and not all of the consequences are benign—our center of gravity has, in many aspects, moved to the global system. Foreign trade has become an increasingly important component of our economy. American companies export and import goods, manufacture them in plants abroad, enter into contracts to construct buildings, plants, roads, and the like, license technology, franchise everything from hamburgers to hotels, offer financial services and insurance, lend money to governments and private firms, sell services such as advertising and business consulting. They move huge sums of money hourly in the world capital market so as not to be whiplashed by international fluctuations in the value of the dollar. The inflow of foreign investment helps manage our deficit, and transnationally dispersed manufacturing systems muddy the distinction between domestic and foreign companies. Wage scales in Korea, Mexico, Taiwan, and Hong Kong depress those in the United States. We are engaged in complex alternative trade systems in which commodities flow in intricate multinational barter exchanges.

Few days go by without U.S. involvement in a political crisis in yet another country previously on the periphery of our national attention. With increasing frequency, the internal and international conflicts of other countries intrude into the domestic politics and media of the United States. The invasion of Grenada played on home television like an episode of *Dallas*. Hijackers in Beirut directed their drama to the American living room audience. A two-and-a-half-minute clip from a BBC film showed on NBC helped to generate a billion-dollar American government relief effort for Ethiopia and a $70 million show business blitz to raise money for the same purpose. Our educational institutions, our scientists, our churches, our cultural organizations—museums, orchestras, theater, film—now flow across national boundaries almost as easily and as frequently as they used to move across state boundaries.

RESPONSE

The American response to the internationalization of important aspects of our society has been characteristically profuse, multicentric, and immensely inventive. Municipalities and chambers of commerce vie with one another to become "international cities" or "favored nations," investing large sums of money, energy, and hype. Our churches serve their expanded foreign constituencies by satellite telecommunication and transnational personal ministries. Large companies have become multinationals or have developed extensive international divisions in their home offices. There are some 2 million Americans living abroad, and annually about four million trips abroad taken for business purposes. Last year some 12 million Americans traveled abroad for business or pleasure. There are 27,000 Americans studying abroad and 343,000 foreign students registered at American universities and colleges. Annually on the Fulbright program alone, approximately 400 to 450 American students travel abroad for study or research, and 1,000 foreign students come to the United States. So far the Fulbright program has made it possible for approximately 54,000 Americans to go abroad and 100,000 foreigners to come to the United States under its auspices. Natural science and medical research have become international and collaborative. Our physicists operate cyclotrons and telescopes that are jointly owned by a number of nations, and highly successful programs are sustained with respect to meteorological and other matters relating to the biosphere. Internationally coauthored engineering and technology-related articles as a percentage of institutionally coauthored articles have risen from 13% in 1976 to 16% in 1980. In 1980, more than 40% of all jointly authored articles in mathematics were international collaborative efforts.

In education, 39 states have organized programs to promote international education, and scattered throughout its various departments and agencies, the federal government has 196 separate programs in support of foreign language and international studies. The major professional association linking American business schools has included international business training in every degree requirement as part of its accreditation criteria. Foreign language requirements and enrollments, after an ominous sag, are climbing again. At our major universities there are 71 federally supported graduate-level programs producing advanced specialists who are expert on one or another of the world's regions. Many colleges have developed substantial study-abroad programs, and colleges and high schools have introduced global perspectives into their curricula. Some universities have engaged in long-term service to economic and technical development in the third world. And our federal government has erected an elaborate set of educational institutions of its own to train people for international missions and occupations unique to the government.

CONTRADICTIONS, OVERLAPS, GAPS

Viewed from a national perspective, it is inevitable that the separate objectives and trajectories of American responses to internationalization would not produce a coherent, integrated, balanced, and fully effective national strategy. For instance, we are reducing the number of representatives of American business and of the American press stationed abroad just as our enmeshment in the world system is expanding exponentially. Large corporations are able to build international expertise in-house, but medium- and small-scale companies cannot afford to hire international specialists, and they have nowhere to go for the information needed to operate successfully abroad. Just as our need for direct knowledge of multiple levels of other societies increases, we become more dependent upon foreigners and compradors for that information. And a number of our key abstracting and scientific information storage organizations are being quietly bought up by foreign firms, speeding immensely the outflow of our advanced technology.

In foreign languages, we spend almost nothing on providing foreign language training for English-speaking adult Americans who may need to use another language in their work. Yet we spend millions to serve the language needs of immigrant populations whose foreign language skills we are busily trying to eradicate. We spend billions of dollars annually to train millions of American students in one or two years of French or German—languages of countries that are no longer our primary trading partners or cultural models—without having any way of knowing what level of competency those students have attained. We are fairly sure, however, that the skills they have attained would be barely enough for survival if they were called upon to use them. Moreover, we have no idea—indeed, no way to measure—what students retain of those competencies as adults, although our suspicion is that it is close to zero.

In education, we provide federal funds for the training of specialists on the non-Western world but subsidize the research only of those studying the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. We have no way of directing at least part of the research of language and area specialists into issues of importance to public policy. We put federal money into pilot projects in international education at the undergraduate level and for mixing business and international education, but we have no way of knowing which, if any, of the experiments work or establish permanent roots. After 30 years of federal support for campus-based international studies, we are still in the "pilot project" stage. We subsidize the creation of durable crossnational links for natural scientists, but not for social scientists and humanists. We have created, at taxpayers' expense, three parallel education systems for the training of international specialists—one on our campuses, one within the Department of State, one within the Department of

Defense—and they have almost nothing to do with each other. Indeed, in general we have insulated from each other the international aspects of our major institutions—government, business, academic, media—and as a consequence their strengths are not mutually supportive. The establishment of overseas centers for research and training of American scholars has roughly followed the availability in particular countries of so-called "excess currencies," with little thought given as to whether the resultant geographic distribution of such centers maximally serves the national interest. And money for the support of such centers has to be bootlegged under appropriation categories not specifically designated by Congress for that purpose.

We have no national policy on the accumulation and diffusion of scientific and scholarly information, and gaps and overlaps abound. We have funded the accumulation in 23 university libraries of everything published in India and Pakistan, yet we have put almost no national resources into library collections with respect to other countries, nor into preserving the materials we bought previously that are now disintegrating on library shelves. And aside from the major university research libraries whose collections are available primarily to those affiliated with those universities, only the Library of Congress has an equivalent international collection that serves the general public. Widely available collections specifically serving the needs of American business are almost nonexistent. Very substantial specialized collections within the federal mission-oriented agencies like the Department of Agriculture, the Agency for International Development, and the Department of Defense are not generally available for public use, although they are assembled with taxpayers' money.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

After 40 years of spasmodic and uncoordinated response to the demands of the increasing internationalization of our society, the time has come to put in place a National Foundation for International Studies to make that response more effective by (1) placing the various developments within some overall framework of national needs; (2) identifying redundancies, misdirections, and important gaps; (3) shifting existing resources and marshaling new ones from the various sectors of our society to better meet those needs; (4) assembling and disseminating data—both serial and ad hoc—essential for national planning; and (5) setting criteria and evaluating the effectiveness of programs drawing upon national resources. Participating in that Foundation, both in funding and in management, would be the segments of our society already investing heavily in our response to internationalization: various levels and agencies of government, business, the private foundations, and universities. The Foundation must serve not just as a granting agency responding to external requests for funding, but as an initiator and implementer of actions that are essential to the national interest. Moreover, it must serve as an active coordinator and facilitator, since many of the activities and programs with which it would be concerned would take place independently in various government agencies or private organizations.

Indeed, it should be stressed at the outset that the proposed Foundation should not be viewed as the only organization, public or private, that would be supporting international studies. As will be noted throughout, the ample fruits of American pluralism so evident in so many aspects of our society—the rich growth of inventiveness and institution building; the remarkable expansion of internationally focused interests and competencies among talented scholars and educators in the humanities, the social sciences, and the applied disciplines, as well as in leaders in business and the professions; the proliferation of programs and funding sources—are evident in abundance in international studies as well. One measure of the success of the Foundation would be the continued vitality of this rich resource base built up over the past decades. Accordingly, we are not recommending a single national policy, but a major new national response. It should be clear that while some of the activities relevant to that response would fall within the domain of the proposed Foundation, some would not. At frequent intervals throughout this report, this distinction will be carefully drawn and its implications made quite specific.

The primary substantive focus of the Foundation would be the interface between government, business, and the scientific and educational community as they relate to international affairs. One of its first activities should be to determine a national agenda in meeting the increasing challenge of internationalization. As a contribution to that end, this report proposes a set of priority issues to indicate the domains that might lie within the Foundation's responsibilities, together with some specific programmatic suggestions about where reallocation of existing resources or the provision of new funding might maximally serve the national interest. Emphasis will be given to problems that have arisen in the course of 40 years' growth, including totally neglected or underdeveloped areas that require attention. The spirit of the Foundation should be parsimonious—saving money as well as allocating additional money; empirical—continuously measuring the results of programs against the common purpose; and pluralistic—coordinating a wide variety of highly dispersed activities and spreading the costs equitably among the various levels of government and relevant sectors of society.

The following pages will address a series of interrelated challenges posed by our society's increased internationalization, and will recommend steps the proposed Foundation might take to help meet them:

1. improving the foreign language competencies of important segments of our population;
2. enhancing the capacity of American business to be competitive in an increasingly internationalized economy;
3. shoring up and improving our cadres of foreign affairs specialists;
4. expanding international communication and the gathering, management, and analysis of information from abroad;
5. building durable linkages and opportunities for overseas sojourns for those engaged in international studies; and
6. internationalizing the education of substantial portions of the successor generation.

Chapter 2

Foreign Language Competency

There is nothing more damaging to the American capacity to cope in a global society than the abysmally low level of foreign language competency of most Americans. Most of us are devoutly monolingual. This is not for want of investing money and time in trying to get American school children to learn a foreign language. Our annual investment in teaching foreign language in our schools is more than $2 billion. Millions of students study French, Spanish, or German for at least two years, and often for four or six years, of their high school and college education. And the number of students enrolled in foreign language classes, after a period of decline, has begun to rise again. Many colleges and universities are reinstituting a foreign language requirement for admission or graduation, and several of our largest states are proposing to require foreign language instruction for all high school students.

The trouble is that while we invest an immense amount of student and teacher time and huge amounts of money in foreign language teaching, survey after survey documents how inadequate our current foreign language capacity is: the skills it imparts are too low and too scholastic; the languages taught were appropriate for the nineteenth century but not for the twenty-first; the ways of measuring skill acquisition are outmoded; the levels of instruction are totally unarticulated, so that the cumulative aspect of skill acquisition by a student is unattended and accidental; and no one knows or seems concerned about how much of early foreign language training survives to be available for adult use.

This is not to criticize the many hard-working teachers and students now involved in foreign language education. It is various aspects of the system as a whole that present the problem: too limited time given to language acquisition; too many students dragging their feet in learning a skill whose utility to them is, at best, unclear; the low average level of foreign language competency of too many teachers; the compartmentalization of instruction by semesters and between primary, secondary, and tertiary schools; the lack of a way to measure well just how much competency a student really has acquired. Thus, while we welcome the growing foreign language course enrollments and requirements as a recognition of the importance of foreign language competency, putting more and more students through, and pouring more and more resources into, the current foreign language teaching system will not solve the national problem.

A NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Hence, before we plunge into an expansion of a system that now gives millions of students a little foreign language training and relatively few a genuinely usable competency, a major shift in emphasis, organization, and teaching technology is needed. Otherwise, we will look back after another decade of spending increasing amounts of student time and scarce national resources on teaching foreign languages, and we will find ourselves just where we are now: all but a few of us able to communicate only in English in a polyglot world. We need a freshly thought-through national foreign language agenda and a redirection of national will and resources to improve the system.

A National Foundation for International Studies, or for that matter the federal government as a whole, can play only a marginal role in that process. The administration of foreign language teaching policy is the responsibility of the state or the local school district, and almost all of the billions of dollars spent in the United States on foreign language instruction appears on state budgets. There is, nevertheless, an important collective responsibility at the national level that can assist in making the marginal investment and providing the necessary intellectual catalyst that a major shift in national policy demands. The high degree of dispersion of foreign language instruction throughout our thousands of school districts makes it unlikely that such a transformation will well up spontaneously from the thousands of classrooms. There are some things, such as setting national standards, that must be done centrally or they will not be done at all. Thus there must be a national as well as a state effort to strengthen our foreign language teaching and learning system.

An attempt to create a coordinated national agenda comes at a propitious time; there are many, many separate initiatives afoot to work at pieces of that agenda. For instance, 32 of the major national language education associations have grouped together into a Joint National Committee for Languages to develop and work for a national agenda. The major private foundations have begun to invest in a transformation of the language teaching system. The Exxon Education Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Pew Memorial Trust are funding a National Foreign Language Resource Center to help create a national agenda and to try to make progress on pivotal items on that agenda. With the support of a number of private and public funders, plus monies contributed by school systems throughout the country, a system of academic alliances has been created to bring together language teachers and administrators from high schools, colleges and universities throughout the country to help improve foreign language instruction. The Rockefeller Foundation has provided $1.5 million in fellowship support to send high school teachers of foreign languages abroad to upgrade their own language competencies.

Meanwhile, the federal government has been funding work on the improvement of language teaching capacity in the less commonly taught languages through Title VI of the Higher Education Act (HEA), and in the reauthorized (1986) version of that act, Congress has authorized the creation of two to five centers to improve language pedagogy. The National Institute of Education included improvement of foreign language instruction in its recent grants to establish major centers for research on bilingual education. The National Security Agency has funded development efforts in foreign language pedagogy, particularly in the use of high technology in language teaching. The Department of Defense is considering how it may help in the development of our national capacity for instruction in the languages spoken in the Pacific Rim countries. The Education for Economic Security Act (P.L. 98-377) provides $5 million for the improvement of instruction in the critical languages. A number of bills aimed at this same general purpose have been or are about to be introduced in Congress: For example, Senator Simon's Foreign Language for National Security Act of 1984 and Congressman Panetta's Foreign Language and National Security Act of 1985.

These many initiatives in the improvement of the national capacity to teach foreign languages are most encouraging. However, right at the beginning of this upsurge of interest and investment, it is extremely important that a central planning, initiating, coordinating, and implementing organization be put in place to assure that the scattered efforts in the area of foreign language education are cumulative, that they address the central agenda issues, and, above all, that they are effective and represent the best use of our national resources. This is particularly true of the many federal funding programs, but it is equally true of those in the private sector.

Language instruction has become an area in which the American penchant for pluralism has become a vice. To effect the changes desperately needed in foreign language instruction, where the dispersion of control is already so great, a guiding intelligence at the core is needed. Assuming such a catalytic role in the development of a more effective system of foreign language instruction would be a natural first priority for the proposed National Foundation for International Studies.

Recommendation: *A primary function of the Foundation should be to provide central planning, coordination, and the necessary marginal resources to improve the nation's foreign language education system.*

THE AGENDA

Where are the points of leverage for change in our foreign language instructional system? How can an immense, highly dispersed foreign language education system begin to transform itself? What can a centralized effort accomplish? How can the various initiatives now under way be coordinated to make a major difference? How can the collective national interest be expressed as a determinant of priority areas of development? How can we measure the effectiveness of efforts to introduce change? In short, what should be the agenda for a national Foundation in the strengthening of our national capacity to teach foreign languages?

Needs and Use Surveys

The first agenda item is an action plan that starts with a point of view. Stated simply, the national interest is concerned not with the language instruction system per se, but with the production and maintenance of usable foreign language competencies among adults, particularly those occupational groups that need, or should need, them in their work. We add the phrase "should need" because it can be reasonably argued that, from the perspective of the national interest, some groups, such as internationally oriented business leaders, foreign service officers, staff members of key congressional foreign affairs committees, military attaches, or technical assistance workers, may need more foreign language competency than we currently demand of them.

By focusing on adult needs for and use of foreign language skills, we mean to dramatize the point that the national payoff for the current large investment of time and money in foreign language instruction must be measured against adult use. If, for instance, very few people get enough skill to use it in real-life situations, or if whatever skill they learn in school has totally evaporated by the time they become fully functioning adults, then the system must be changed. The trouble is that we know almost nothing about the current or the most desirable adult use of foreign language skills in the United States. Establishing what adult foreign language skills are—perhaps, at the outset, only for key occupational groups—and how those skills are used is a necessary first step in the reorientation of our foreign language instructional system. The technology for such adult needs and use surveys is well established in Europe and elsewhere, and needs only to be adapted for use in the United States.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should cause surveys to be made of current adult use of foreign languages, particularly in key occupations in which foreign language use would be most productive. It should seek to determine how the current use pattern differs from optimal use, from the perspective of the national interest, and to utilize the conclusions of these surveys as guidelines for establishing priorities in an enhanced foreign language education system.*

Pilot Programs

Focusing on foreign language skills held by adults dramatizes another difference between our own society and that of others. We concentrate virtually all of our foreign language instruction on young people enrolled in our formal educational system. In other societies, there are facilities for adults to learn other languages as the need for them becomes apparent. Here, adults' only recourse is a few proprietary language schools, and these tend to concentrate on a single teaching method, to teach only the first levels of language competency, and to cover only the most commonly taught languages. Our formal educational institutions, even in their continuing-education divisions, provide very little foreign language instruction for adults. When they do give instruction, they tend to force it into the same time frame, teaching style, and pacing of regular school classes, while the needs and timing of adults are often quite different. Moreover, we have virtually no facilities for maintaining or refreshing language skills once they are acquired.

While the success of fresh educational ventures must depend upon their long-term economic viability, the current organization of our language teaching system and the fiscal constraints that colleges and universities now face make it difficult for these institutions to take the risks involved in experimenting with the creation of new teaching facilities aimed specifically at adult audiences. What may fill a national need in the long term is not tried by individual institutions for want of venture capital. However, since the collective, national need for language teaching facilities aimed particularly at adults is so clear, a few individual institutions should be given the entrepreneurial support to develop model programs for this purpose.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should support the creation of experimental pilot programs in a few college or university continuing-education programs to give foreign language instruction to adults. Of particular interest would be programs geared to the special pace and learning styles of adults, programs aimed at skill maintenance and rejuvenation, and programs providing instruction in the less commonly taught languages.*

A Common Metric

An equally important agenda item for the Foundation is the creation and diffusion of a common metric measuring, in an objective, consistent fashion, the degree of proficiency a person—student or adult—has in a foreign language. This metric should be equivalent across all languages and be used to certify general competency in all jobs for which a knowledge of a foreign language is relevant: business, government, education, journalism, and so on. In addition, the Foundation should assist in the diffusion of the metric throughout the society so that its use becomes truly universal, and a measurement of proficiency in one language or occupation is equivalent to another. Our current metric for the measurement of language competency—the length of time a language was studied when first acquired—is not sufficient. A new metric must be established that expresses language competency in terms of an individual's ability to use the language in increasingly demanding real- life situations with increasing effectiveness. The metric must measure genuine proficiency in the language, not just time spent in learning it.

The importance of establishing a common metric cannot be exaggerated. For one thing, only with the widespread application of a common metric will we have any reliable way of expressing the real demands on foreign language skill of particular jobs. Once developed, the common metric can be adopted as a criterion of employment in language-relevant government and business positions. This in turn would dramatize to students the utility of a foreign language competency for future employment, providing the motivation for foreign language learning so sorely needed in our educational system.

The development and adoption of a common metric will have other beneficial effects as well. Only with the adoption of a common metric will we begin to be able to measure the effectiveness of all or parts of our foreign language teaching system. Only with the adoption of a common metric will individual students or adults have any idea of how much language competency they do or do not possess, compared either with others like them or with the goal of full proficiency. Only with the adoption of a common metric will we begin to know which of the various language teaching methods works best for what kind of student and in what kind of learning situation.

Fortunately, over the past decade a fair amount of work toward establishing this common metric has been done. A measurement scale ranging from 0 for no competency to 5 for educated native-speaker competency, with half-point increments in between, was developed in the federal government's language teaching programs—first the Foreign Service Institute, then the Department of Defense and other agencies. Steps are currently being taken to make such a scale applicable for employment, job qualification, and promotion in as many federal agencies as possible. Further, a joint government-academic effort has been launched under the aegis of the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages to adapt the metric to the academic learning situation.

As this worthwhile effort toward the establishment of a universally used metric has progressed, a number of crucial issues have arisen that must be faced. For one thing, the scale has to be expanded at its lower end to provide rating gradations fine enough at the beginning stages of learning to measure the small incremental increases in language proficiency that are characteristic of academic classroom situations.

Second, the scale works best for speaking and for listening comprehension, skills that are best measured in face-to-face interviews. Making the metric equally effective for reading and writing skills remains a challenge.

Third, as the metric expands into the difficult languages, particularly those with especially complex orthographies such as

Japanese, Chinese, and Arabic, some of the criteria used for dealing with the European languages that are most like our own have to be specially adapted to their needs.

Fourth, the development of proficiency testing strategies that are consistent and valid in a large number and variety of testing situations is a major challenge just beginning to be faced. What works well in a few tightly controlled testing situations with an experienced staff is easily corrupted when large numbers of people are to be tested, and when the staff administering and judging the tests have widely varying amounts of experience. Transforming pilot programs in applying the common metric into institutionalized, large-scale programs inevitably runs into a series of major problems: inventing new ways of testing a person's language competency that measure genuine proficiency but are relatively immune to variations in the ability and perspectives of those doing the rating; developing tests that can be administered to large numbers of people at the same time; providing training for substantial numbers of professionals to administer and interpret accurately the test results; constructing a national network of testing sites to make proficiency certification universally available—these are major challenges yet to be faced.

And when these challenges have been met, getting the use of the metric to be near-universal in as many sections of the population as possible, particularly among major employers such as international business and government, is a difficult marketing task that will take years to accomplish.

With all of its difficulties, retaining momentum in the movement toward a common metric is essential for the development of a meaningful national policy in foreign language learning and use. Without such a metric we will continue to have no way of measuring performance against objectives, no way of distinguishing excellence in teaching from pro forma, low-quality pedagogy, no way of setting up occupational qualifications that can recognize and utilize foreign language skills, and no way of moving language-competent individuals from one job to another with a meaningful certification of their skill level in that language. It is, indeed, an indication of the non-goal-oriented nature of our language teaching system, and the low value that we place on foreign language competency, that we have not created such a metric before. The further development and diffusion of the common metric should be a major goal of the proposed Foundation.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should continue and expand the efforts already under way toward the creation and adoption of a reliable national metric for foreign language proficiency in as many languages as possible, and in as many employment situations as possible. Support should be provided to create an effective national network of test sites and to train and certify the professionals who would administer and interpret the tests.*

NECESSARY PRIOR RESEARCH

Many of the prerequisites to an improvement in our foreign language teaching system are not ready on the shelf just waiting to be applied. A number of them require prior research, but that research must be highly focused, highly applied in its orientation. It should lead directly to the preparation of new teaching materials or pedagogical practices. As we will note, such applied research in the field of language pedagogy is precisely the kind of inquiry that the existing national programs in support of research, both public and private, tend not to reach. First, however, what are some of the items on the research agenda that are important to the development of our national foreign language policy?

First, we need to develop criteria for evaluating the many competing innovations in language pedagogy. Another revolutionary teaching method—the monitor method, suggestopedia, total physical response, to name just a few of the more recent ones—seems to come along every year or so. We have no systematic way of determining what works best with what kind of student, at what level of instruction, and in what kind of learning situation. It would seem that such information would be essential for teachers or school administrators who are trying to decide what works for them. However, such a methodology for evaluating the effectiveness of language instructional programs is not now available in even the most rudimentary form. At present, the foreign language field is decidedly nonempirical in its decisions about the use of pedagogical techniques; this situation must be changed.

Second, if we are to focus on adult language competencies, then knowing something about the loss, retention, and rejuvenation of school-learned language skills would seem to be a crucial ingredient in the formation of sensible policy. While in the past two or three years, two major research projects have developed—one in the private sector and one in the Department of Defense—to discover something about the rate and pattern of skill loss, we have a long way to go before sensible skill maintenance and rejuvenation programs can be developed.

Third, most of the existing technology for foreign language instruction is appropriate for the beginning and intermediate competency levels. We must develop the capacity to train people to a near-native level of competency in a foreign language, or even the best-trained Americans will continue to be language cripples, using their foreign language skills haltingly and inaccurately. There are no materials available, nor even any general pedagogical guidelines, for instruction in upper-level skills.

Fourth, much of the demand among adults for foreign language competency—for instance, international business managers assigned abroad—is idiosyncratic, comes in fits and starts, and may be highly specialized in purpose. This situation clearly calls for the development of individualized and, to the extent possible, self-instructional materials. However, our foreign language teaching system tends to be classroom-oriented, with students sitting together in a class and marching in step through a common set of materials. Except for some commercially available materials that are of uncertain quality, tend to be limited to the early stages of language learning, and are concentrated in the most commonly taught languages, self-instructional materials are not generally available. Recently, a number of substantial efforts to remedy this situation have been made by the National Association for Self-Instructional Language Programs, by the Ohio State University, and by the Foreign Service Institute. Research leading to the development of materials and teaching strategies for individualized or self-instructional materials is an important area for national investment.

Finally, language instruction lends itself well to automation of some of the teaching and testing processes. A major national investment in the development of effective automated teaching technology may help alleviate some of the problems of the uneven quality of instruction in our highly dispersed language teaching system. It can assist in the development of a common metric and a viable testing network. It can help us create a more individualized teaching system and make language instruction more available to learners outside the classroom. Within the last 10 years there has been a flowering of research and experimentation in the applicability of the newer high-technology teaching devices to foreign language instruction, much of it funded by the National Security Agency. What has been accomplished so far, however, is just a beginning. With a few exceptions, application of the newer technology tends to be limited to the most commonly taught languages, and to the early learning stages of those. Some of the most promising developments are in the use of live video programs picked up via satellite from broadcasts in the Soviet Union and other countries. Research and development in this area should be encouraged, and materials should be made more widely available.

It is one of the peculiarities of the way in which support is distributed throughout the government agencies—and until very recently, private support in this area has been conspicuously lacking—that there is no program under which the funding of these kinds of research comfortably fits. Or rather, it is more accurate to say that while the government has invested substantial sums for research on foreign language instruction, the money has almost all been spent on the improvement of teaching within the government's own language teaching programs. The government has invested very little in the diffusion of the knowledge gained within that system to the nongovernment world, nor has it been engaged in supporting research to improve the national language teaching system as a whole. And no one else has moved in to fill the vacuum. In this regard, it is useful to quote the recent findings in *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies*:

> The private foundations have, by and large, not been interested in investing in the research and development recently, there has been almost no place to go for such support. The

International Education Program of the Department of Education has some research funds under Title VI, but they have generally amounted to less than $1 million annually and must also be used to support all other evaluative and prescriptive research on area studies. Moreover, in part because of the limitation of funds, the International Education Program's tendency has been to fund small, isolated projects; larger, longer-term ventures that might have greater impact cannot be supported.

Research on language pedagogy has not been part of the mission of any of the other granting agencies of the federal government. The Education Division of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) has supported the development of teaching materials—even this seems to be coming to an end—and the training of language teachers on a pilot program basis, but neither the Education nor the Research Divisions of the NEH can support basic pedagogical research for the transformation of the field. The Research Division of NEH does include research related to language learning, but to qualify for funding under NEH's research program, work must be on literature or linguistic features of the language, not language learning itself, and, in particular, not on anything measuring language proficiency or evaluating the effectiveness of alternative methods of language teaching. Even though almost half of the humanists on our campuses are engaged in language instruction, as a research topic, language instruction is not a humanity! Even when the staff of the NEH chooses to encourage the submission of such projects, the screening committees tend to weed them out. . . .

The National Science Foundation's (NSF) lingusitics section might have been expected to be interested in language pedagogy, but it is not. As in the NEH, the moment a research topic becomes applied and particularly when it touches upon language testing or pedagogical research, it falls outside of the self-defined mission of the NSF. . . .

For most of its history, the Fund for Improvement of Post-Secondary Education was not interested in language instruction. Although it is now interested—it has recently awarded a grant for the creation of a major proficiency testing center for the commonly taught languages—its funds are extremely limited. Moreover, it has the same bias as the NEH; it will fund experimental action programs, but not the basic research to inform those programs before they are created.

The National Institute of Education, which does fund pedagogical research and institution formation, has traditionally limited itself to secondary and primary education, to the commonly taught languages, and to bilingual education. Moreover,

> that agency has had drastically reduced funding over the past several years so that a new definition of scope is unlikely.
>
> Recently, the National Security Agency has been awarding funds for research on foreign language pedagogy. It has been particularly active in promoting the use of high-technology instrumentation in language instruction and in the establishment of criteria for proficiency testing. . . .[1]

There have been some changes in this situation during the past year. For instance, the National Institute of Education has appended funding for research on second-language learning to a recent grant for bilingual education research. But basically, the situation described above still obtains. Support for research in foreign language pedagogy falls between the cracks of federal programs in support of research. Support of research on issues such as those suggested earlier should provide a natural role for the proposed Foundation.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should provide sustained funding for research and experimentation related to the improvement of foreign language pedagogy. First priority in that research should be given to (1) evaluation technology to assess the effectiveness of various teaching methodologies; (2) language skill attrition, retention, and rejuvenation; (3) instructional strategies for upper-level skill acquisition; (4) individualized and self-paced instruction; and (5) the application of communications technology to language instruction.*

A NATIONAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTER

The transformation of such a large and diffuse enterprise as our national language teaching system is not likely to occur without the assistance of one or more organizations whose principal task is to carry out that transformation. Just casting government and private funds widely on such an extensive sea

[1]Richard D. Lambert et al., *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies* (Washington, DC: Association of American Universities, 1984), pp. 89-91.

will not accomplish the purpose. Nor will the traditional, relatively passive role of government funding suffice. If major changes in the national language teaching system are to occur, more proactive programs, ones specifically created to effect change, not just to support existing activities, must be developed. What is needed is a national foreign language resource center to serve as a catalyst in that transformation. Its tasks would be to create, evaluate, and work for the adoption of satisfactory techniques of language instruction capable of carrying a wide variety of learners to a high enough level of competency to permit genuine use. The functions of the center would be (1) carrying out or commissioning the research and materials development required for that transformation; (2) implementation of the strategies that emerge from this research, particularly with regard to training; (3) diffusion and articulation; and (4) evaluation. In terms of audience, the center would serve the needs of primary and secondary school teachers and administrators; college and university teachers providing language instruction as part of the general education requirement; language teachers training area specialists; language teachers for government employees; language teachers in proprietary institutions; and language teachers of foreign business language.

Research and Materials

The research agenda of the center would parallel the items listed above in the overall national agenda. We include under the rubric of "research" the conduct of experimental classrooms to ensure that theoretical findings are translated into actual pedagogical practice. Since not all of the requisite skills would be gathered into the center, some of the necessary research would be conducted in a more dispersed fashion at the major language teaching institutions throughout the country, including those in the federal government. With respect to research, in addition to conducting some crucial work in-house, the center's functions would also include setting a collective agenda for research relating to effective language pedagogy, coordinating it, making it cumulative, and ensuring that the research advances actual classroom teaching and student learning.

If a major advance in language pedagogy is to take place, the center must be able not only to create new materials but also to gather and collect feedback from the many dispersed innovators now producing language teaching materials all over the country. The need is particularly great where the preparation of these materials is a cottage industry.

Training

Training, the first aspect of implementation, includes all of the following priorities:

1. The center should develop a capacity to train teachers whose education has been lingustics, the literature of the language, or both. The pedagogical training envisioned would have to be language-specific and geared as much to the linguistic needs of American speakers as to the structure of the language itself.
2. The center should create and administer intensive instruction programs for students enrolled in secondary schools and colleges, as well as those in business and government. That is, the center should offer intensive study "abroad" as an alternative to extensive language programs. Another major audience would be members of the lay public who wanted to study a foreign language intensively and exclusively.
3. The center should act as an institution of last resort for instruction in the truly scarce languages as universities curtail their language and area studies programs, with all of them tending to drop the same peripheral languages.

Diffusion and Articulation

Diffusion and articulation can be considered together, for we need to think of ways to involve teachers at all levels of the educational system in ongoing study of foreign language pedagogy and refinement of teaching techniques. The center would put in place collaboratives that would enable professionals not only to stay in touch with primary research, but also to make contributions to the research agenda. A renewed sense of professional rigor would likely accompany the growth of greater understanding of the teaching of foreign languages.

Evaluation

The center would serve as an impartial evaluator of the effectiveness of teaching programs and teaching methods for different types of students, learning time required, and cost. It would also serve as a major administration and validation center for the common metric.

The creation of such a national foreign language resource center by the Foundation would follow the model of the National Institutes of Health centers, the regional centers established by the National Institute of Education, or the collaborative science centers established by the National Science Foundation. One difference would be that they would be expected to gain nonfederal support as well. Several of the private foundations—Exxon, Ford, Pew—have already provided funds for the creation and maintenance of such a center.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should help create and sustain a national foreign language resource center to assist in the upgrading of the national foreign language teaching system by conducting and coordinating the needed research; preparing new teaching materials as needed; training teachers; administering intensive teaching programs; providing instruction in languages not taught elsewhere; articulating the various levels of instruction; diffusing the results of research and experimentation in new teaching technologies; evaluating teaching methodologies and programs; and managing a national proficiency test network to administer the common metric.*

Chapter 3

International Expertise in Business

As a nation we are engaged in a struggle to establish a new position in the world economy. The evidence of the deterioration in our old position is all around us: huge trade deficits that persist even when the value of the dollar subsides; the intrusion into our economy of vast sums of volatile foreign capital; the surrender in our own country of numerous product markets to foreign producers; the loss of many of our traditional markets overseas and our limited penetration of new ones; the decline in the reputation of our manufactured goods for dependability; the increasing emphasis on the export of raw materials (food, tobacco, lumber, oil) rather than manufactured goods—not long ago a characteristic of developing countries. The well-being of a generation of American citizens will depend on our capacity to overcome these trends.

Part of that capacity is our ability as a nation to train future generations of business leaders to cope more effectively in the global economy. It is essential that we capture the rich experience that American and non-American business leaders have acquired in international business, that we codify it, expand it, and translate it into a learning strategy so that we can train American business leaders of the future to be even more effective in the conduct of our international business. At present, we have just begun this process; international business training both within our corporations and on our campuses is still largely a cottage industry. The proper mix between general

Declassified and Approved For Release 2013/03/13 :
CIA-RDP90-00530R000802120001-3

business skills and knowledge of context and cultural differences; the refashioning of business skill instruction to make it more relevant to international business; and the division of labor and the interface between campus-based and intracorporation instruction have yet to be worked out. The bits and pieces, fits and starts, waxing and waning, of corporate and university experiments in this area have almost no relationship to each other; much less do they come together into a coherent national strategy. It is essential that business leaders and educators face this challenge directly and develop a coherent national strategy to meet it.

The need for a centrally developed national policy is urgent. The national interest is not now being adequately served by the sum of the policies of individual corporations and universities. Waiting for an effective national strategy to emerge from the separate decisions of thousands of companies and educational institutions will not get us there. Indeed, a number of mutually reinforcing trends in American international business are marching in the other direction, diminishing the demand for, supply of, and utilization of international skills by Americans.

First and foremost is the increasingly short-term perspective of many segments of American business. The individual firm's showing a profit on next quarter's balance sheet is what drives strategic decisions about long-run policies for business. Second is the trend toward decentralization, turning firms into largely federal structures in which the overseas sections are mostly staffed by and under the control of foreign nationals. We have gone more than twice as far as the Japanese in this direction, and considerably farther than the Europeans.[1] Third is the sharing by business leaders of America's general devout monolingualism, made possible by the willingness of so many foreigners to learn English. Fourth is the decreasing number of American business employees stationed abroad—quick trips and telecommunications suffice.[2] While part of this trend is a by-product of the sharply escalating costs of maintaining an American business manager overseas, part is due to the high failure rate—higher

[1]Rosalie Tung, "Selection and Training Procedures of U.S., European, and Japanese Multinationals, *California Management* Review, 25: (1983) 57-71.

[2]Stephen J. Kobrin, *International Expertise in American Business*, report no. 6 (New York: Institute of International Education, 1984), pp. 42-43.

than that of any other country—of Americans sent abroad.[3] The combined effect is to shrink the pool of American business executives who become skilled internationalists through prolonged residence abroad, as the current generation did. The fifth trend is the tendency of American international firms to hire foreign nationals at the managerial level as well.[4] America just does not prepare enough of its own citizens to be true cosmopolitans the way other countries do.

While each of these trends is understandable from the perspective of the individual firm, taken together they lead to a shrinking pool of American nationals with the expertise to deal with international business, and an increasing dependence on the nationals of other countries to conduct American international business. Increasingly, it is not a matter of companies' choosing to hire transnationally for the requisite internationally relevant skills; they have no other choice. From the long-term national perspective, as distinct from the short-term perspective of the individual firm, this situation is unhealthy. What is ironic is that we have the greatest national resource base to apply to truly innovative international training, much of it developed at considerable expense to the American taxpayer, but we do not link it with the challenge of international business. And we have within the American business community individuals who are unequaled in the world for their skills in coping with the global economy, who have served as quasi-diplomats and formulators of our foreign economic policy as well as representing their own firms, but we do not harness those skills to the training of the generation that will succeed them.

What is clearly needed is an integrated plan for training a cadre of Americans to lead the American business enterprise in the global economy of the coming decades. It is unlikely that we will adopt the Japanese solution: 70 of the leading Japanese business firms have pooled their resources to establish an International University to train their employees for service in the global economy. Our resources and our solution are likely to be much more dispersed and piecemeal. This makes it all the more

[3]Tung, "Selection and Training Procedures."

[4]Ronald E. Berenheim, *Managing the International Company: Building a Global Perspective*, report no. 814 (New York: The Conference Board, 1982), chap. 2.

important that an intelligent centralized effort be made to develop and integrate the various parts of our national training capacity—within companies, in proprietary schools specializing in executive training, and on university campuses. It is time to think where we would like to be in 10 years, then ask ourselves how we get there.

To develop and implement such a policy should be a primary purpose of the proposed National Foundation for International Studies. For this purpose both public and private funds should be marshaled and administered through an active planning board of international business advisors, much like the National Science Board of the National Science Foundation. This advisory board would include distinguished American international business leaders, educators, officials representing relevant federal agencies, and chambers of commerce. Its initial task would be to ascertain the current state of training for international business and to make recommendations on how it could be improved. Thereafter, programmatic funds would be provided for long-term development of key aspects of the training process.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should assist in the development of a national strategy for training, both within companies and on campuses, future generations of American international business leaders. To initiate this process, a board of international business advisors should be created to assess our current resources, to make recommendations for key points of investment, and to supervise long-term support programs dedicated to the provision of such training. For this purpose, both public and private funds should be collected and administered.*

There are many aspects of the training of future international business leaders that could be addressed, and the set of recommendations offered would differ depending upon whether they were directed at undergraduate business training, the MBA, or Ph.D. training. There are three topical domains that both are central to the process and have high leverage for improving the current situation. Accordingly, they make a natural agenda that such a panel should address: (1) foreign language competencies of business executives; (2) the creation of a combination of business-related, general international, and country-specific skills in a substantial body of specialists resident both within business and within the major universities; and (3) the internationalization of the core business curriculum to affect the training of as many future managers as possible.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE COMPETENCIES

The Need

Nowhere is the lack of international training for American business executives more apparent, nowhere are the long-term costs of the current situation more damaging, than with respect to the very limited command of foreign languages by American business leaders. To do business with us, all others must learn our language. If they can't manage it, we will hire or require them to hire someone of their own nationality who speaks both their and our language to translate for us. And yet they must buy our products.

What makes this arrogance possible is the widespread diffusion throughout the world of varying amounts of English. America is both blessed and cursed by the fact that English has become almost universal as the common language of business. It is a blessing in that it enables English-speaking American business leaders to travel widely throughout the world and find people who have spent many years struggling to learn enough English to communicate with them. They can send and receive communications relatively safe in the belief that most of the time both the sending and the receiving will be in English. The worldwide availability of English is an enormous advantage for American business, one envied by every non-English-speaking country of the world. It is difficult to imagine the remarkable spread of American business throughout the world without it.

The wide pervasiveness of English in the international business community is also a curse. It appears to make it unnecessary for American business leaders to acquire a competency in foreign languages. Study after study[5] indicates the low value

[5]For a full review of the literature on this topic, see Marrianne Inman, "Foreign Languages and the Multinational Corporation," in James E. Perkins, *The Presidential Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies: Background Papers and Studies* (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1979), pp. 247-310.

given to foreign language competency by American business through the mid-1970s, and as recently as the mid-1980s companies were still not using foreign language competency as a criterion for selecting executives for overseas service, nor giving it much importance in the recruitment of new personnel.[6]

One reason for the relatively low importance given to foreign language competency by many American corporations in recruiting American managers for overseas assignments is that it is possible to live and conduct some business in most countries with just a knowledge of English and a smattering of household and travel phrases in the local language. Local colleagues, servants, and the coterie of hangers-on that adorns the edge of any foreign community serve as intermediaries between monolingual American business leaders and the society that surrounds them. Moreover, for official business, company policy can assure that English is used for all of the official documents and correspondence that the American will see. And when an American business leader walks into a conference, the language of discussion immediately changes to English.

All American business leaders know that this pattern is immensely limiting; the monolingual American is a captive of the people who commmand his or her language. This is most dramatic in countries where English is hardly used at all, as in China or Japan, but it occurs elsewhere as well. All of the real business can go on in the native language around the American business executives, across them, and over their heads, with only what is filtered through a translator available to them. As anybody with any foreign experience knows, that filter is often highly selective and skewed. In negotiations, the lack of a command of the local language can be fatal. Moreover, company after company is discovering that crucial communication with foreign affiliates within the multinational firm can often be immensely improved if both sides have some command of several languages.[7]

Whatever the limitations and advantages of the present system of English as a business lingua franca, it is not likely to continue into the indefinite future. For one thing, alas, more and more countries—not just the French—in more and more situa-

[6]Kobrin, *International Expertise*, chap. 4.
[7]Ibid.

tions are unwilling to switch into English when an American is involved. Our monolingualism is increasingly seen as our own problem, not theirs. In the future, if not now, American business will be a prime victim of our devout monolingualism and of the overall ineffectiveness of our national foreign language teaching and learning system.

The implication of this situation is that business has a major stake in the general improvement of foreign language instruction in the United States. It cannot provide within the company all or even a large part of the foreign language skills that a fully effective overseas-based manager requires; for many languages the learning-time demands are too great, and it is too late in life for employees to start learning foreign languages anyhow. More job applicants must appear at the personnel office with a more effective command of a foreign language. Hence, business should participate heavily in the implementation of the general agenda for improving the national foreign language teaching system capacity in our school system as a whole. It has a major stake in the outcome.

A Business Specific Foreign Language Agenda

In addition to a concern for the general improvement of foreign language instruction in the United States, there are specific portions of that national agenda that are of particular importance to business. Here is that subset of items selected from the overall national language agenda, together with an indication of their special relevance to business needs. The items are presented in the order of importance given to them by most business leaders.

Higher-level language skills. While a fair amount of the current demand by business executives for foreign language instruction is for relatively low levels of skill in that language, enough to travel and cope at a level a little above that of a tourist, we need to bring at least some American business leaders to a near-native level of skill in a foreign language. At present, neither the teaching technology nor the language instructional facilities to accomplish this goal exist.

There are prototypes for the provision of skill level training—for instance, the overseas advanced language training schools such as those supported by the U.S. Department of Education in Taipei, Tokyo, and Cairo. However, they serve academic clienteles almost exclusively. In addition, there are a few such advanced-level language training facilities for federal employees, largely those in the Department of State and the intelligence agencies. There are no equivalent schools available for American business executives. Surely, we have a major national interest in moving more American business leaders beyond what might be called "abominable fluency" to a high level of skill in foreign languages. To accomplish this goal will require the creation of new facilities specially geared to the needs of business, or the admission of business executives to the existing facilities.

Adult-oriented language learning resources. Business employees who discover as adults that their jobs require a knowledge of a foreign language should compose the primary clientele for adult-oriented language learning establishments. This is in fact the case in many other countries of the world, where a large number of learning centers and television and correspondence schools have been set up to cater to this need. We have no equivalent institutions, although there are a few proprietary language schools in the United States that will give executives a few weeks of introductory instruction in the major European languages. However, their effectiveness has never been tested, and their use is sporadic and uncoordinated. It is unfortunate that our formal educational system does not serve the needs of adult learners of foreign languages. By and large, our colleges and universities are organized to teach only their own full-time students, and their courses are given in a nonintensive fashion spread over several semesters or years. In addition, most of them seek to teach students only enough language to meet the foreign language requirement, or perhaps to study literature. The needs of business executives just do not fit the time schedule, the objectives, or the technology of traditional college and university courses. Either specialized teaching programs geared to business needs will have to be developed on campuses—as indeed is now being done in a few places for Japanese language instruction—or new mechanisms outside of the current formal educational system need to be established.

Under the general heading of adult language education is an aspect of language instruction that is equally if not more important to business leaders whose work demands occasional rather than continuous contact with other countries. For them, the depreciation of an important occupational asset through the attrition over time of language competencies is a special problem. Our national inattention to the maintenance and rejuvenation of language skills once acquired is especially damaging for American business executives.

Individualized instruction. No matter how much can be accomplished in setting up language schools, the needs of individual business executives, given the nature of their assignments, will often require language learning strategies that can be administered by the students themselves. We have now had several decades of experience in developing self-instructional programs; there is even a national association that encourages and administers such programs on many campuses. There is no reason why a similar set of programs cannot be established for business. Moreover, recent advances in the development of computer-assisted videotape or videodisc instruction programs hold great promise of making language teaching a much more flexible, much less classroom-bound enterprise. Given the fact that the demand for foreign language instruction among business executives is likely to continue to be dispersed and occasional, and to vary from one individual to another, investment by business in the development of these more flexible teaching technologies would be well worth the cost.

Less commonly taught languages. The time and effort demanded of learners seeking to acquire a fluency in the commonly taught languages—mainly French, Spanish, and German—are relatively low. Hence, it is possible to bring substantial numbers of American business executives to genuinely useful levels of language competency in those languages even after their employment by a firm. This is so both because the languages are intrinsically less difficult for English speakers to learn, and because many educated Americans have had a base-line exposure to them in the course of their formal education. This situation does not hold true for those requiring a working knowledge of one of the less commonly taught languages. To reach fluency in these "difficult languages"—mainly Japanese, Chinese, and Arabic—takes much longer and requires much greater effort. Learning them from scratch while fully employed in business is extremely difficult.

American business can, of course, throw up its hands and allow the present situation to continue in which almost no American executive has the ability to communicate in any of the difficult languages. If, however, we wish to remedy this situation, there are two options available. Either business will have to invest both the resources and the time to make the learning of difficult languages possible for their employees—and there are indications that a number of firms are willing to do just that, for the Japanese language at least—or they will have to recruit those who have already had a great deal of instruction in those languages before they come into business, adding the requisite technical skills and company experience after employment rather than the other way around. There is some indication that this is also happening particularly with reference to Japanese.

Whichever way business chooses to go—that is, either providing language training to individuals selected solely for their technical competency and experience in the company, or recruiting with foreign language competency in mind and adding the technical or company-specific skills later—the result will depend on the availability of a cadre of effective teachers. Given the obvious need, it is a national tragedy that the immense resources of our campus-based language and area studies centers, where the less commonly taught languages are already available—a national resource unparalleled anywhere else in the world—are not tapped for this purpose. This is especially true for the rarest of the less commonly taught languages. The only places in the country, and for some languages the only places in the world, one can go to for English-medium instruction in some of the African languages, the languages of Southeast Asia, South Asia, Central Asia, and Eastern Europe, are the American language and area studies programs.

Accordingly, business, through the Foundation, should encourage a number of language and area studies centers to establish language teaching facilities geared specifically to the time and functional demands of business. The teaching of business

French, German, and Spanish is now fashionable on many campuses. It is with respect to the less commonly taught languages for business use that we will have a special need, and our existing facilities will give us a comparative advantage over the rest of the world.

Special business language training units should be developed within one or two campus-based language and area studies centers for each world area. These centers would be chosen on a competitive basis, and should include both domestic and overseas language training. This is a very favorable time for such a development. A decline in student demand for instruction in many of the less commonly taught languages, and increasingly constrained university budgets, may cause many of those languages to be dropped from the curriculum. It will be ironic if in 10 years, as our economic relations inevitably expand into more and more countries, campus-based resources to provide business executives with the necessary training in the languages of those countries will have disappeared. Now is the time to consider fresh ways to encourage the language and area studies centers to serve the language training needs of international business.

A common metric. Little progress can be made in the improvement of the level of foreign language competency of American business executives unless it is included as part of the job requirements for positions in major American corporations. This, in turn, requires two things: first, the recognition that foreign language competency is important, and second, a way of expressing that competency in a uniform fashion so that there can be agreement on its meaning. Hence, business has an interest in the development and widespread use of a scale to measure objectively and consistently an individual's ability to perform in a foreign language. Indeed, business, along with government—for which a similar need is apparent—should take the lead in setting universal standards of measured foreign language proficiency in as many languages as possible, and in helping to construct the mechanisms for national test administration that would make this possible. The adoption of clearly stated criteria tied to occupational use in business would not only further the development of a common metric for the society as a whole, but would dramatize the importance of real language competency for students in the schools and colleges in a way that nothing else could.

Recommendation: *Business, through the Foundation, should encourage the increasing use of foreign languages by its employees, and should strengthen American foreign language teaching capacity in those aspects of particular interest to business: (1) the provision of training at the upper skill levels; (2) the creation of facilities for adult language learning and retention; (3) the improvement of our capacity to provide individualized instruction; (4) the utilization of the resources of campus-based language and area studies programs to provide instruction to business executives in the less commonly taught languages; and (5) the development of a common metric of language proficiency.*

TRAINING OF INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS SPECIALISTS

Content and Curriculum

Reshaping our future in international business will depend in large measure on the creation of a pool of highly trained specialists who have an especially profound knowledge of one or another aspect of our commercial foreign affairs. Some of these specialists will be employed by individual corporations, some will serve in the consultancy organizations that businesses call upon as needed, some will be employed in government agencies, and some will stay on campus to conduct research and to teach. A key leverage point for enhancing our standing in the global economy is in the training of these future specialists.

At present, many of the older generation of specialists have not been formally trained; rather, they developed their skills from service abroad and from on-the-job experience in international business affairs. Increasingly, however, corporations are realizing that dealing with the international economic system is so complex and requires so special a set of skills that they are turning to formal training programs to prepare employees for international work. Many of the largest of the multinationals have themselves developed an in-house training program to serve the special needs of their own executives. There are proprietary schools whose primary purpose is to serve this need. Most of these programs are aimed at midlevel executive training, since for some years to come companies will probably remain more likely to provide training for international service to executives well past the formal education stage than to hire large numbers of new employees who already have such training. Accordingly, attention to the appropriate content and location of such mid-career training is an important element on the national agenda.

In the long run, however, the training of a cadre of international business experts will be the responsibility of our universities and colleges, and this is where the bulk of the growth has occurred. A large number of specialized international business training programs have grown up on various campuses around the nation. It is a rare business school that does not have a center, a certificate program, a major, a department, or a school dedicated to the training of specialists to serve American business abroad.

The fundamental issue in the training of international business specialists is substantive: what should the content of that training be? The component parts of that training as it appears in most centers are clear. A fully developed program will offer training on a full range of technical business skills plus a specialization in one of them; some courses concentrating on the international aspects of those skills; courses on the context of the international system, usually both at the level of the global system and in one or more particular countries; some training in a foreign language; and a domestic or overseas internship with an international company. The field, however, is in a period of immense ferment. The content and utility of each segment, their relative balance and level are being fiercely debated. Particularly troublesome is the mix of contextual and business courses; even when both types of courses are required, they are often just piled on top of each other and left for the student to mix. Indeed, the substance of the field is being formulated right now.

Two preliminary steps need to be taken. The first is to ascertain quickly what the content of the training in most institutions currently is, and what seems to work and what does not. The second is to determine for those students previously trained in the programs what their postgraduation experience has been, so that planning for the future can reflect patterns of actual utilization. Some of the major programs have already begun to review their graduates' careers. A more general review of the kind that the Rand Corporation[8] conducted of language and area studies graduates would be quite useful.

Flowing from the results of these surveys should be a program to promote, make cumulative, evaluate, and disseminate the results of curricular experimentation. The pursuit of a uniform curriculum is neither desirable nor achievable, and various programs operate at different levels and serve different purposes. Nevertheless, some notion of the content of an ideal and of a minimal curriculum would be the goal of this effort. And it behooves the American corporations that have a major stake in international business to take a hand in the creation of that curriculum. It is their future that is being discussed. This should be one of the functions of the Foundation's board of international business advisors.

Recommendation: *The Foundation's board of international business advisors should sponsor preliminary surveys of the current organization and curricular content of training programs for international business specialists, and of the experience of graduates of those programs. Based on the results of these surveys, recommendations for and investment in the development of effective training programs should be made. This shaping of the international business training program would be a dynamic process, one that would require continuous attention over time.*

Organizational Issues

Aside from issues of content and curriculum, there are very general issues of structure and organization that must be addressed.

Demand for Specialists. The first thing to say is that we probably do not need more programs. As in any fashionable movement in higher education, enthusiasms tend to produce

[8]Lorraine M. McDonnell, Cathleen Statz, and Robert Madison, *Federal Support Systems for Training Foreign Language and Area Specialists: The Education and Careers of FLAS Fellowship Recipients* (Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1983).

more academic enterprises, which graduate more students than the market is likely to absorb. Surveys conducted by some of the best-established programs[9] indicate that their graduates are fully placed, but the employment prospects of students trained specifically for international business in many of the newer, smaller programs are less certain. We should not repeat the unlimited supply-side economics followed in our national policy for the training for language and area specialists. Until we have clearer data on effective demand for and utilization of training for international business specialists, it seems prudent to halt the multiplication of programs.

Costs. International business programs, like language and area studies centers, which in many ways they resemble, incur substantial additional costs above and beyond what an established discipline or department encounters. They need to collect faculty with the necessary skills from a wide variety of disciplines and specialties. They require extraordinary expenditures on library and information resources. They need to support foreign language instruction, often in a high-unit-cost, semitutorial form, to produce kinds of skills not encompassed in the normal college-level course, and in languages in which the general enrollments may be quite low.

Travel abroad. More than other university specialties, particularly those in the business school, international business training programs need to develop durable external links both with multinational firms located in the United States and with the foreign environment in which business practices in a wide variety of countries.

Fellowship support. Similarly, the extra costs for students adding the international training and exposure to their regular course load can be considerable. A full two-year program at the Wharton School's Lauder Institute of International Management and International Studies, for instance, can represent an out-of-pocket cost of $50,000 for a student, and this does not include the opportunity costs of the salary forgone while that student is enrolled in the program. This is probably an extreme, and it

[9] Kate Gillespie, "International Business and the MBA: Are There Jobs after Graduation?" Annual Meeting of the Academy of International Business, October 1985 (mimeo).

includes the extra costs of foreign language study and tutorials, internships, and the tuition for a dual degree, one in the business school and the other an area-focused degree in arts and sciences. Other programs may provide fewer of these special features, and the price will be lower accordingly. However, if training for international business is going to select the very best students regardless of their personal resources, some creative financing of these costs, at least for the short run, seems called for. Given the probable future income of many of these graduates, a system with a large loan component is appropriate. And businesses can cut the costs to the individual student by underwriting the internships and the foreign language study out of unrepatriated funds. More generally, extension of Higher Education Act (HEA) Title VI fellowships to include students training to serve in international business, combined with corporate support, the latter possibly comprising fellowships with the company's name attached, would help alleviate this problem.

Another advantage of the establishment of a fellowship program is that it would begin to address a problem that has not even surfaced as yet. The history of the growth of language and area studies indicated that a laissez-faire system of student recruitment and training resulted in an uneven distribution of disciplines and geographic foci, with gaps in specialties and countries where important national interests lay. We have no information whatsoever on the concentration by business specialty of graduates of international business programs. If general impressions have any validity, a bunching of students in a few specialties is occurring, while there are very few students studying to be specialists in others. For instance, in terms of business specialties, there seem to be a large number of managerial generalists being produced, and specialists on international finance and marketing. There seem to be far fewer specialists being trained who know well such subjects as government-business interaction on the international scene, management of manufacturing units, accounting, business law, or labor relations. At some point, a policy of targeting and supplementation of fellowships similar to that used in language and area studies will be called for.

Guarding against obsolescence. Campus-based training for international business constantly runs the risk of obsolescence as the actual conduct of foreign commerce changes with ever-increasing speed. To guard against this, programs must constantly bring to the classroom a flow of business leaders who are engaged in the day-to-day affairs of business, and it must constantly have available at least some of the flow of data that is available to practicing business leaders.

The first of these requires that corporations, as an investment in their own future, make it possible for their international executives to serve as lecturers and short-term visitors on campuses. This is the reverse of the usual executive seminars in which the information is supposed to flow the other way. Let international business leaders help educate the students they may eventually employ. An endowed lecturer-cum-visitor program somewhat like the Chubb lectures at Yale would be an ideal format.

The second calls both for funding for acquisition of data by the campus programs, and for the development of a systematic program of making available on campuses information that flows routinely through international business channels. Students should have to learn to drink from the same gushing fire hose of information that business executives do, and learn to filter that flow, direct it, and utilize it in making business decisions.

Area-specific business skills. Perhaps the most ominous of the gaps in our long-range strategy for international business is our failure to focus very much of the training of international business specialists on the conduct of business with a particular country or part of the world. And yet if we are to improve our performance in the future growth areas of the world, the countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa; if we are to move, as the Japanese did, into the low-cost, widely dispersed markets for consumer goods; if we are to negotiate our way effectively around the labyrinth of government regulations that different countries have erected; if we are, as the traveling salesman in The Music Man put it, to "get to know the territory" then we must find a training pattern that effectively deals with particular business climates in particular countries or parts of the world. Training in general internationalist business skills relating to all foreign countries is just not enough.

Fortunately, the nation already has at hand substantial university resources dealing with particular countries or parts of the world: the campus-based language and area studies centers. Other countries would have to invent such centers to take the steps now available to us. To date, however, very few language and area studies centers or their faculty have had any contact with American international business. A recent review of the publications of the faculty of the government-supported language and area studies centers showed the very limited interest in topics of direct relevance to business.[10] This is so in part because the disciplines represented and the training and research undertaken by the faculty of language and area studies centers tend to be concentrated in specialties—language and literature, history, anthropology, political science—that are of limited immediate interest to business. Moreover, arts and sciences faculty members, who constitute almost all of the language and area specialists, do not have the technical business skills that are required to participate effectively in the business world.

It would be possible, however, to build on the broad strengths of one or two language and area studies centers dealing with each world area by adding supplemental segments of four or five additional staff members versed both in business skills and in language and area competencies. These segments would be added to one, or at most two, of the major centers in, for instance, African studies or Southeast Asian studies, and would consist of a cluster of faculty and students who would combine a deep language and area competency with a specialty in one or more of the business skills and industries relevant to that country. The latter is as important as the former, and a special effort would have to be launched to put these dual skills in the same individual. The beginnings of such supplemental segments already exist: for instance, Stanford and Michigan for East Asia; Michigan State for Africa; Michigan for Southeast Asia; Texas, UCLA, and Tulane for Latin America. The provision of specially earmarked grants from business and HEA Title VI would help to crystallize these center segments.

The purposes of these center segments would be to (1)

[10]Richard D. Lambert et al., *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies* (Washington, DC: Association of American Universities, 1984), pp. 167-68.

maintain up-to-date information on the general business climate in a particular country or region of the world; (2) monitor the flow of that area's business activities within the United States; (3) provide a capacity to conduct basic research on international-business-related-subjects relevant to that area, as well as more applied contract research on topics assigned by particular clients; (4) provide resource people to serve as consultants as needed; and (5) develop courses and training materials for use both within the center itself and by companies carrying out their own training.

Sources of Funding

What kind of funding and management is needed to sustain and enhance these international business training programs? Again, the history of language and area studies centers is instructive. In the early days, the extra costs of maintaining language and area studies centers and supporting their students were met by grants from the major private foundations. They are now provided by public monies through HEA Title VI. Similarly, a decade or so ago, international business programs received foundation and corporate support to help them get started, but that support has begun to wane. However, in contrast to the case for language and area studies, there are no large-scale public programs to provide durable support as the private monies disappear. The one major federal funding program for international business training, HEA Title VI, Part B (now at the level of $2 million per year), does not meet any of these enumerated needs on a continuing basis. Fortunately, this year for the first time, one of the international business centers, the Wharton School's Lauder Institute, has qualified to become a center under Part A of that act. This will provide for that program some of the crucial general support for the kinds of expenses indicated above. The Title VI, Part A, umbrella should be stretched to include several more centers. Similar investments by business in the long-term viability of international business centers on our campuses are called for. Indeed, since the benefits of these training programs would accrue, in large measure, to corporations, the use of federal tax revenues for this purpose should be dependent upon the provision of matching grants from businesses.

Recommendation: *The Foundation, through its board of international business advisors, should help support training programs for international business specialists by expanding their representation in the HEA Title VI, Part A, center and fellowship competition. In addition, the board should help raise the matching private funds to supplement federal support. This support should be directed toward paying the extra costs of maintaining these training programs and of their students, and the creation of supplemental center segments that would combine the resources of existing language and area studies programs with international business centers.*

INTERNATIONALIZING GENERAL BUSINESS EDUCATION

The third of the major agenda items for the Foundation to address, through its board of international business advisors, would be to add an international dimension to the training of as many as possible of the nation's future business managers. It is one thing to produce specialists to serve the needs of international business, but we cannot afford to leave untouched the education of the rest of the business students whose activities, whether they know it or want it or not, will be inevitably intertwined with events in the global economy.

Until recently, international managers could be defined by role: traders, lending officers, expatriates assigned abroad, and the like. Now, however, it is likely that many managers in "domestic" jobs will be involved in international transactions. The postwar revolution in transport and communications and the resulting integration of the world economy is blurring the lines between domestic and international business, between domestic and international jobs. The result is that international business may now be part of the responsibilities of a large proportion of managers in large and small companies. Many will be exposed to crossborder transactions and will need some international skills. Products are developed on a multicountry basis, and product development specialists need knowledge of other markets and regular meetings with colleagues based in other countries. In many industries, production is coordinated transnationally, and plant managers must deal regularly with their counterparts abroad. Cost pressures require that components be purchased where they can be produced most efficiently, and that involves having purchasing managers who are comfortable in an international environment. Packaging and even advertising are increasingly standardized across borders. Product design and marketing decisions call for attention to the needs of a variety of countries, not just our own. Countertrading calls for knowledge of the complexity of many economies at once, and fluctuations in the twenty-four-hour international money markets to guard against severe capital loss. And above all, business leaders need to watch their foreign competitors as they compete for markets both here and abroad.

In a 1984 study,[11] two-thirds of America's major firms reported an increase over the past decade in the number of managers involved internationally through short-term travel or other contacts, and most expected that trend to continue into the future. There are now more than 4 million international trips taken by American business employees each year, and the number grows annually. The pace of international contacts is increasing rapidly, as is the proportion of company employees involved on a regular basis in those contacts. Surely, a larger proportion of the training of all future business executives should reflect these facts and prepare them for the internationally connected role that many of them will be called on to play.

To reach the majority of students training to be business managers, not just those who consider themselves to be future specialists in international business, it will be necessary to change the content of the basic business skill subjects that constitute the core curriculum—management, finance, accounting, business law, employee relations, insurance, marketing, operations management, technology, mergers and acquisitions, and so on. It is in these courses that the U.S.-centered view of the world still resides. Under the guise of teaching abstract, largely quantitive, general principles, the idiosyncrasies of different economic systems or cultural contexts are washed out, and the examples chosen are overwhelmingly American. The normal

[11]Kobrin, *International Expertise*, p. 7.

business training is an exercise in American studies. The cure for this is not the introduction of more specialized courses—like international accounting or international finance—that sit in a ghetto on the edge of the curriculum, to be taken by only a few specialists. Until the perspective of the mainline business skill courses is changed, international business will remain a curiosity tacked on at the end of courses but never quite reached; or it will reside in a few courses taken without enthusiasm by a few students, like a humanities elective. It must be brought into the mainstream of training.

To make the radical shift in perspective that is needed, to wrench these courses away from their overwhelmingly American focus, calls for a national effort something like the one undertaken more than a decade ago to upgrade the teaching of mathematics and science. It will not be easy. A recent attempt by the American Academy of Collegiate Schools of Business to require an international business component in the curriculum as part of its accreditation standards had little or no effect on most campuses.[12] Making the necessary changes will call for a concerted effort over a long haul. It means taking a hard look at the actual substance of the undergraduate and MBA core business skill curricula, with a sharp eye for points where international materials might appropriately be introduced. It means convincing the textbook authors and publishers not just to add a section at the end of the book on international aspects of a particular business subject, but to incorporate an international perspective throughout.

In addition to amending the textbooks and teaching materials in the basic skill courses, if what students learn is to remain current, a deliberate effort needs to be launched to assure that the teachers of the basic courses are supplied with necessary case studies on international problems and issues. A recent study[13] indicated that the supply of widely available case materials in

[12]Lee Nehrt, *Case Studies of Internationalization of the Business School Curriculum* (St. Louis MO: American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, 1981); see also, John Thanopoulos, editor, *International Business Curriculae: A Global Survey* (Waco TX: Academy of International Business, 1986).

[13]Lawrence G. Franko, *Cases in International Business and Economics: Their Availability and Diffusion* (New York: National Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies, October 1984).

international business were old, that they were concentrated on a few topics such as the early stages of the establishment of a factory or fluctuations in currency rates, and that many important topics and sections of the world were very lightly covered. If the training of future business executives for participation in the global economy is to be brought up to speed, it is essential that businesses continuously feed back into the training process the rich experience they are acquiring every day. Dropping behind in the recency and comprehensiveness of teaching materials is like teaching students mechanical skills on antique machinery.

What is clearly needed is a collaborative effort bringing together the experience and insights of distinguished international business leaders and the educators who write the textbooks and teach the classes. It is in the nation's interest that this quantum jump ahead in the international orientation of the education of our future business managers be taken. This is clearly a role that the Foundation, through the board of international business advisors should play.

Recommendation: *The Foundation, through its board of international business advisors, should initiate and fund a continuing collaborative effort of American businesses and business school faculty to deparochialize the core business school curriculum. This effort would include the enrichment of the basic skill course textbooks and the provision of especially targeted case materials.*

Chapter 4

The Training of Academic Specialists

Business executives who can cope in a global economy are only one example of the kinds of professionals with special internationally oriented skills that the nation will need in the coming decades. Similar attention must be paid to the preparation of those going into other professions such as journalism, law, secondary and primary school teaching, public health, government, diplomacy, and the like. However, in these professions there has been much less attention paid to how to train international specialists or how to incorporate an international dimension into training more generally. There are, however, some attempts afoot to address the special needs of the professions. For instance, at present the nine member institutions in the Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs (APSIA) are engaged in a major review of their own goals and curricula under the guidance of Robert Goheen. And various state teachers' organizations have been interested in introducing international dimensions into both the training and the certification of secondary and primary school teachers. These attempts, as they mature, should be of great interest to the National Foundation for International Studies, and should enter into the design of its future planning. By and large, however, the educational issues in these fields are very similar to those for business.

Here we are concerned with the training of academic international affairs specialists. And within that general topic, the emphasis in this chapter, as in the last one, will be training. Many of the issues that pertain to the current operation of campus-based international studies will be considered in subsequent chapters, particularly those dealing with research, information resources, and overseas linkages. The present chapter is devoted largely to the education of academic international specialists.

The most fully developed model for the training of international affairs specialists is what is generally called language and area studies. There are, of course, many other academic international affairs specialists who do not concentrate on a particular country or set of countries, or who do not consider themselves area specialists—for instance, specialists in the politics or economics of the world system; analysts in the field of arms and security; or experts on one or another transnational theme such as world hunger, demography, or labor relations. However, to the extent that the training of such experts is seen as an educational issue, training for such specialized international expertise tends to be carried on within the confines of the normal academic disciplines. Moreover, in the main these specialties are viewed more as research than as training domains, and it is in this aspect that they will be given more direct attention. In fact, when in subsequent chapters we talk about such issues as research, library resources, and durable overseas linkages, it should be clearly understood that we are speaking of all international specialists, not just those who consider themselves part of language and area studies.

With respect to specialized training, however, most of the discussion will concentrate on the education of language and area specialists. This is because most of the issues concerning the training of academic specialists have arisen in their clearest form in such training. Moreover, it is in support of language and area studies that the most fully developed, longest-lasting federal support program for the training of international specialists has been in effect. The discussion that follows will be concerned with three aspects of the training: (1) training in the languages of the area of specialization; (2) the provision of the substantive knowledge of the area sufficient to produce the equivalent of the "old hand"; and (3) the sustenance of the campus-based centers that carry out that specialized training. But first a little history.

ACADEMICALLY TRAINED LANGUAGE AND AREA SPECIALISTS

Our World War II entry into an immensely expanded world affected our educational system as well as our economy. Our academic tunnel vision, focused almost exclusively on the United States and Western Europe, was clearly inadequate, as our national interest was intertwined with events in countries in Asia, the Middle East, and North Africa, countries that most of us knew only as quickly forgotten names in a geography book. As our wartime need for knowledge about these unfamiliar regions became apparent, we realized that except for a handful of missionaries, professors of history or literature, diplomats, and business executives,[1] there were very few of us who knew the societies in those regions well enough to inform either military or public policy. As our war needs for people with a command of the languages and a knowledge of the culture and society of particular countries, especially non-Western countries, became urgent, we established specialized training programs on our campuses to produce what were called language and area specialists.[2]

After the war, when military support was withdrawn from these programs, the universities and the major private foundations—Carnegie, Ford, Rockefeller—provided the resources and the initiative to expand our slim scholarly resources on the non-Western world into a set of full-blown language and area studies centers, only with a scholarly rather than a military focus.[3] The prototypes of the campus-based centers were, therefore, already in place when the government policy was again directed to the costs of our national ignorance about many parts of the world, especially our durable enemy, the Soviet Union.

The federal government's reentry into support for language and area studies followed an ignorance-induced shock similar to

[1]For a history of the early period of international studies, see Robert E. McCaughey, *International Studies and Academic Enterprise: A Chapter in the Enclosure of American Learning* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985).

[2]Kurt E. Muller, "National Security and Language Compentence: U.S. Armed Forces and Transnational Communication" (Masters Thesis, U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth KS, 1983)

[3]Robert B. Hall, *Area Studies with Special Reference to Their Application for Research in the Social Sciences* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1947).

the one we experienced in World War II: the Russians' launching of the Sputnik satellite in 1957 in spite of our firm belief that they were a decade or so behind us in scientific development. The conclusion drawn from this experience was that there were not enough Americans who knew the Soviet Union well enough to be able to foretell this important event. In the following year, the National Defense Education Act was passed, and reincarnated as part of the omnibus Higher Education Act (HEA), it provides the most durable, almost the only, federal support for adding an international component to the American educational system. HEA Title VI of that Act provides support for what are now 93 campus-based centers, 81 of them dealing with a particular world area, not only the Soviet Union, but all of the other parts of the world as well. It also provides fellowship support for students studying to be regional specialists in those centers.[4] A specially targeted section of the Fulbright-Hays Act supports some of the overseas activities of the faculty and students of the centers.

The immense growth of academic language and area studies, nurtured by private institutional, foundation, and state and federal government support, can serve as a prototype of the productive use of national resources drawn from a variety of sources in support of international studies. It is unparalleled anywhere else in the world; indeed, other countries are now seeking to emulate it. We tend to take it for granted, but if it did not exist we would be trying desperately to create it, and at a cost that would be almost unimaginable.

We have now completed some 40 years in the development of our national resource base in language and area studies. During those four decades of growth, years in which our national resource base in academic language and area studies was so small that growth in almost any direction was welcome, our national policy with respect to the composition and functions of academic language and area studies has essentially been laissez-

[4]See Richard D. Lambert, *Language and Area Studies Review*, monograph 17 (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1973), and Sue E. Berryman et al., *Foreign Language and International Studies Specialists: The Marketplace and National Policy*, prepared for the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies (Santa Monica CA: The Rand Corporation, 1979).

faire. Now language and area studies is entering a more mature, less expansive phase. The current need is for assuring long-term support for this carefully built-up resource base, tempered by some greater attention within the field itself to structure and functions, to making it possible for language and area studies to fulfill more fully its original purpose, and to increasing its responsiveness to changing national needs. The current practice of annually threatening an abrupt cutoff of support for the program makes long-range planning impossible. The need for a fresh policy with respect to long-term support of language and area studies is made all the more pressing because the increasing budgetary constraints on campuses, which encourage universities to discontinue instruction in the more exotic languages and coverage of all but the largest countries, have put our national resource base in real jeopardy.

Fortunately, to guide us in the development of a longer-term, more focused national strategy, we have available several[5] detailed surveys of campus-based language and area studies programs and their graduates, and of other members of the language and area studies community. Together they present a fairly complete account of the immense accomplishments that have been achieved, the original goals that have and have not been fully met, and the fresh functions that may now be demanded of language and area specialists by an expanding and increasingly complex national interest. For a highly specific and detailed agenda for language and area studies, these reports should be consulted.

The field of language and area studies encompasses all of the aspects of international studies covered in this report: the training and maintenance of a cadre of specialists; the creation, gathering, storage, and dissemination of information; the internationalization of the education of students in general and important segments of the public at large; and the construction and maintenance of durable international linkages. In this chapter, we will be concerned only with the first of these, the training and maintenance of highly qualified language and area special-

[5]For references, see Richard D. Lambert et al., *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies* (Washington DC: Association of American Universities, 1984).

ists. This, in turn, divides naturally into foreign language competencies and area expertise.

LANGUAGE TRAINING

As in the case of business, a plan for the development of foreign language training in language and area studies parallels the general national agenda, but several portions of that agenda are of special relevance.

A Common Metric

We take as fundamental to the notion of a language and area specialist that such a specialist should have a high level of competency in one or more of the languages of the area in which expertise is professed. However, currently we really do not know the actual level of language competency of most members of the existing pool of specialists, whether at the end of training or later during their professional careers. Since language and area specialists, unlike most high school and college students enrolled in foreign language classes, are striving not only to attain but to use a language competency, both the measurement of the effectiveness of teaching programs and the degree of skill of the individual student or trained specialist are of critical importance. Accordingly, language and area studies has a special interest in the development of a universally comprehensible, uniformly applied standard of measurement of foreign language proficiency.

However, while the need for such a common metric is especially pressing in language and area studies, its development and adoption raise special problems not found in the more commonly taught languages. For instance, given the greater length of time it takes an American to learn languages such as Chinese, Japanese, and Arabic, there are special problems of relating the current proficiency standards to the lower-level language skills. Similarly, the special problems introduced by complex orthographies in such languages make the proficiency standards developed for the commonly taught languages rather difficult to apply. This problem is especially troublesome since the ILR/ACTFL (Inter-Agency Language Roundtable/American

Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages) standards that are increasingly used for the commonly taught languages are rather poorly developed in reading and writing, the skills in which problems of the very different orthographies are most relevant. Third, the nature of the languages themselves, the instructional process, and the availability of teaching materials differ so widely among the less commonly taught languages—for instance, between Yoruba and Chinese—that the construction of a metric that is uniform across languages and still useful for the instructional process is difficult to achieve. A major development effort is needed that is specifically targeted on and adapted to the needs of the various languages most commonly taught in language and area studies programs.

Recommendation: *The National Foundation for International Studies should encourage and support a major effort to extend the common metric to as many as possible of the less commonly taught languages and to all four of the skills: speaking, listening, reading, and writing.*

Higher-Level Language Skills

One of the most common criticisms of language and area studies programs is that they produce too few specialists with a truly advanced competency in a foreign language. Without a precise metric, it is difficult to accept or reject this criticism, and the level of language competency varies from one world area to another. The sharp decline of enrollments in the upper as compared with the lower levels of language instruction and the limited number of semesters of language training seen on many Ph.D.-level transcripts of Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellows would indicate that the problem of too low a level of language competency is a real one. Whatever the data show, however, it is clear that the development of training in higher-level skills is of great concern to language and area studies, where a substantial portion of the specialists should be expected to attain near-native fluency in speaking, listening, reading, and even writing a language of the region as well.

To increase the general level of language competency of students training to be specialists, three interrelated developments must occur. First, the field must establish and insist on a higher level of language skills both among those training to be specialists and among specialists themselves. A start on this process would be to introduce proficiency test criteria into the qualifications for fellowships for advanced training of language and area specialists.

Second, a central part of the planning and support for the training of language and area specialists must include overseas language training. It is difficult, if not impossible, to reach a high level of proficiency solely through training in the United States. Hence, opportunities for topping off domestic language training with directed language learning overseas are essential to the upgrading of the language competencies of area specialists. At present, if such opportunities are provided at all, they take place in the overseas advanced language training centers. But the existence of these centers is precarious: they have never received direct appropriations and are supported under omnibus categories that can always shift to other priorities. Moreover, the number of languages for which such centers is available is under a dozen; there are no such facilities for the majority of the languages taught in the language and area studies programs. And the number of students admitted to the centers that do exist is very limited. A direct, specially targeted, and carefully planned program of support for overseas language training centers is an essential step in raising the level of language competencies.

Third, the technology of instruction and the teaching materials related to the acquisition of upper-level language skills—how to take someone from an ILR/ACTFL level 2 to near-native fluency—are all quite primitive. It is no wonder that many Americans who seek to be experts on a particular country remain language cripples throughout their careers. Each one must invent the upper end of the pathway for himself.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should seek to enhance the language proficiency level of existing and trainee language and area specialists by establishing high language proficiency standards for any fellowships it provides, by creating a direct, planned support system for an expanded network of overseas advanced language training centers, and by promoting research and development leading to the creation of a teaching system and set of materials focused on upper-level language skills.*

Skill Attrition, Skill Maintenance, and Skill Upgrading

As in the rest of the language teaching system, the only systematic investment made is in first-time skill acquisition. For practicing language and area specialists, particularly those whose trips to their country of specialization are relatively infrequent, the language skills once learned can wither quickly from disuse. We have no information to guide us, but it is likely that we are losing language-competent specialists almost as rapidly as we produce them. This wasteful process makes no sense. There are several specific steps that can be taken.

First, we are just beginning to understand what specific aspects of a language people lose and how fast. Our understanding of this process of loss and the tests to measure it should be a high priority for research supported by the Foundation. Second, we are just beginning to set in place programs that will refurbish lost skills. There is no point in trying to fit an established language and area specialist into a semester- or year-long class where instruction is aimed at first-time learners and follows the rhythm and timing of regular student enrollees. Instruction needs to be geared to what the specialist has specifically forgotten, and offered in a format that makes learning possible for the adult learner. Ideally, since it is upper-level skills that are lost, such training should take place in the country where the language is spoken, possibly at one of the overseas language training programs. Third, we have not even begun to develop in a systematic fashion the materials and the teaching technology that will reinforce existing language skills so that they do not erode.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should encourage the development of the necessary tests, teaching strategies, facilities, and materials to sustain and refurbish language skills of the existing cadre of specialists.*

"Endangered Species" Languages

There is another important item on the agenda with respect to language training that is not represented in the more general national agenda: the maintenance of a capacity to teach to a limited number of people a wide variety of languages for which there may be only occasional demand. Our current national capacity to provide instruction in these "least commonly taught" languages lies within the government language teaching schools and, in the private sector, mainly in the HEA-supported language and area studies programs.

Some of the less commonly taught or low-density languages, as they are often called, are taught in the State Department, Defense Department, and intelligence agency language schools; many others, particularly some of the African and South Asian languages, are not. In general, Defense Department and intelligence agency language schools tend to concentrate on the languages spoken in recent or potential enemy countries. It is theoretically possible for the government language schools to acquire staff to teach all of these languages, and to make their own classes available when needed for nongovernment learners. To some extent, this already happens with the Foreign Service Institute. However, as a general policy this solution is likely to be extremely costly, and problems of security when the teaching establishment is in the Department of Defense or other intelligence agencies would make it difficult to implement.

For whatever reason, we have chosen to depend on our universities to sustain our national capacity to teach as full a range as possible of the less commonly taught languages. Given our generally laissez-faire approach and the pressures for curtailment of "fringe activities" that now dominate our campuses, it is not surprising that the coverage of these languages is quite uneven. With respect to each country or world area, there are one or two languages—for instance, Arabic for the Middle East, Chinese and Japanese for East Asia, Hindi for South Asia, Russian for Eastern Europe—for which student demand, while modest compared with that for French, German, and Spanish, is adequate to assure their continued representation on a number of campuses. Outside of these languages there are many others—for instance, most of the African and the Central, South and Southeast Asian languages, and, in the Middle East, Turkish, Farsi, Pushtu, and Berber—that are offered on university campuses as a national service in spite of their high cost and negligible enrollments. However, as resources become scarce on all campuses, it is precisely these languages that are in danger of disappearing.

The capacity to provide instruction in these languages on demand is a precious national resource that no other nation in the world possesses. A collective strategy to retain that capacity must be developed. The current federal investment in scarce language instruction is about $10,000 per center per year for all of the languages the centers teach. Either more of the funds allocated to centers will have to be allocated to the sustenance of the "endangered languages," or a specially earmarked support program will have to be mounted to assure that at least one institution maintains the capacity to teach these languages on demand. Some of these languages can be taught only occasionally in specially mounted collaborative summer programs. As a place of last resort, the national foreign language resource center, described earlier in the chapter on language policy in general, could be utilized to provide such "endangered language" instruction.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should monitor the national capacity to teach the "endangered languages" in both the public and the private sector. A sensible division of labor and arrangements for access to instruction across the public/private line must be developed. Where necessary, funds should be provided to assure the continued offering of instruction in these languages where it is in danger of disappearing. As a place of last resort, the national foreign language resource center could provide instruction in those languages.*

AREA TRAINING

Fellowship Support

The other segment of the training of a language and area specialist is the development of a deep knowledge of the country or world area in which he or she specializes. A number of recent surveys[6] and the analysis of transcripts of graduating students

[6]See ibid., and Lorraine McDonnell, Cathleen Stasz, and Rodger Madison, *Federal Support for the Training of Foreign Language and Area Specialists: The Education and Careers of FLAS Fellowship Recipients*, prepared for the U.S. Department of Education (Santa Monica CA: The Rand Corporation, 1983).

completing their training to be specialists have indicated that the drift of time, the imperatives of the university structure, and the scale and form of fellowship support have combined to curtail the amount and the range of area-specific training that students receive. Overall, these surveys find that the training of specialists has been grafted onto the fragmented structure of classes and faculty that is dispersed throughout the various disciplines. This development has meant that the strongest, sometimes the only, area- specific part of the training of area experts is in the discipline in which they major. Over the years, the nonmajor component of students' coursework has become a smaller and smaller portion of their overall training, and increasingly it tends to come in the form of courses that lie solely within their own discipline. In such circumstances, it becomes more difficult to assure that area experts will have the minimal corpus of general knowledge on their area from the perspective of a number of disciplines that should mark them off as fully qualified specialists.

In short, the strong pressures of the system of graduate education in the United States militate against the breadth and depth of training needed to make a fully qualified area specialist. Stealing the time from normal Ph.D.-level disciplinary training to invest in language training puts strains on the normal educational sequence and lengthens the time of study considerably. Such stretching of the length of training is limited not only by institutional pressures but also by the extra costs to students who, by the time they complete graduate school, are already deeply in debt. A strong generalist component often just does not get added.

The answer recommended by these surveys is the provision of lengthened, targeted fellowships to enable students to add the necessary supplemental components of language and area expertise to their graduate training. The HEA Title VI fellowships which currently provide for only one or two years of training per student, on the average, and whose distribution is totally controlled by the centers, are useful for the initial stage when potential specialists are being recruited. Supplementing this system, we need to establish an entirely new type of fellowship allowing the student time for the extra training required to add together an area, a language, and a discipline, plus a foreign sojourn. To allow for the necessary overseas training, the fellowships should be tenable both in the United States and abroad. These fellowships should be given to individual students based on a national competition in which the student, not the institution, is the basis for the judgment. The training now provided for military foreign affairs officers provides for just such a long-term, flexible combination of domestic and overseas training. To assure that the level of language competency of this select body of specialists is raised and sustained, a qualification for entry into this competition would be the demonstration of a high level of proficiency in a language of the region.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should administer a nationally competitive fellowship program providing for lengthened and broadened training both in the United States and abroad. Acceptance into that program would require demonstration of a high level of language proficiency.*

Disciplinary Distribution

Another consequence of the imprint of academic disciplinary preferences on the composition of the national cadre of academically trained language and area specialists is that the disciplinary distribution of specialists and students training to be specialists is skewed. Both faculty and students are heavily concentrated in just four disciplines: history, language and literature, anthropology, and political science. Economics and sociology, two disciplines that one might have expected to be heavily represented in language and area studies, are opposed as a matter of faith. Indeed, there is anecdotal evidence that the senior scholars who, in spite of these disciplinary antagonisms, have developed a language and area expertise and hold major academic appointments will not be replaced when they retire. The applied and professional disciplines that might both inform public policy and provide employees for the nonacademic sectors of our society are hardly represented at all. This emphasis on the four basic disciplines is not surprising when we remember that for the first two decades of its existence, the federal support for language and area studies was aimed at the production of teachers. In fact, until 1980 candidates for HEA Title VI fellowships had to sign a statement that they would be teachers or the equivalent. The four core disciplines were precisely those in which courses in language and area studies were likely to be welcome and, hence, the educational job market has been strongest.

Education will continue to be the largest employment market for language and area specialists, and from the perspective of the national interest, it is where they can have the greatest societal impact. Hence, the representation of these core teaching disciplines should not be penalized. Moreover, there is evidence[7] that the production of language and area specialists for the academic marketplace, given the rate of retirement and death of the existing pool, is about in equilibrium. Training just for the academic marketplace, however, is no longer enough. As this report argues throughout, the expanding internationalization of many sections of our society calls for the training of specialists with a profound knowledge of other countries but whose disciplinary specialization is in fields not heavily represented in language and area studies. The combination of business and language and area studies mentioned earlier is a case in point. A similar case could be made for engineering, journalism, or even medicine.

It is not likely that increased funding for the training of specialists in general—in the expectation that the desired kinds of specialists will materialize—will alone accomplish the desired purpose. Nor will assigning priorities in the allocation of fellowships to all centers, as is currently the practice, suffice to fill in the missing kinds of specialists. Instead, resources must be directed specifically to pinpointed disciplinary and professional specialties, both to assure the continuation of the existing complement of specialists with unusual combinations of skills where it is in danger of erosion, and to add to the stock where important new competencies must be created.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should develop a separate fellowship competition aimed at the production of language and area specialists in underrepresented disciplinary and applied and professional specialties in which there is a demonstrated national interest.*

---

[7]Elinor G. Barber and Warren Ilchman, *International Studies Review* (New York: The Ford Foundation, 1979), and Lambert et al., *Beyond Growth*, pp. 128-41.

LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES CENTERS

The field of language and area studies is composed of not only individual specialists and trainees but also clusters of scholars organized on campuses as centers or institutes. The scale of such centers and institutes ranges from two or three faculty members and their students to large centers with more than 100 faculty members and an annual budget of $4 million or $5 million. The upper end of that organizational continuum comprises the centers supported under HEA Title VI. Which individual programs qualify for such support varies from year to year, but over the past decade about 10 to 12 centers have been supported for each of the major world areas.

The resultant combination of institutional, private foundation, and state and federal government support can serve as a prototype of the productive use of national resources drawn from a variety of sources in support of international studies. The felicitous consequences of 30 years of combined private and public investment were summarized in a recent comprehensive review of the current state of language and area studies:[8]

> The result was the creation of a network of institutions unmatched anywhere in the world, a national resource whose loss would immensely impoverish the capacity of our democratic society and our government to understand the complex, interrelated world in which we live. In addition to the training of specialists, these centers provide instruction about other countries to a substantial portion of the future electorate; provide a catalyst for internationalizing the perspective of primary and secondary education; inform the general public on important national events in the countries they study; serve the media and the public policy makers; assemble library and resource materials on other parts of the world; establish and maintain training facilities used by government and private sector organizations as well as by their own students who require overseas experience; and provide durable overseas linkages with scholars and political leaders in the service of our long-range public diplomacy.

The creation of this network of centers, and the expanding pool of language and area specialists trained at these centers who

[8]Lambert et al., *Beyond Growth*, pp. 9-10.

found employment in the academic world, government, and business, was made possible by the allocation of both university and external resources drawn from the private and public sectors. It was apparent to all that there were extra costs involved in the creation and sustenance of training programs that marshaled faculty and instructional resources across disciplinary and school lines, constantly upgraded and reinforced that faculty's transnational competencies, offered courses and degree programs on countries and in languages for which general student enrollments would always be light, and made unusually heavy demands upon library and other collectively held university resources. Language and area studies centers, like most interdisciplinary programs on campuses, cut across the grain of most universities, and constant battles need to be fought and fresh resources need to be invested to retain the integrity of those programs.

In recent years, the costs of maintaining a language and area studies program and of training students to a high degree of competency have increased immensely, as has everything else. At the same time, both internal and external funding for these programs have shrunk substantially. The results are what might have been expected. As private foundation support has contracted; as federal support has paid for less and less of the cost of sustaining these programs (it is now down to 5% of total costs, and each year it has been in danger of totally disappearing) as the constraints on university budgets get tighter and tighter; as general support for students declines and the debt load from tuition payments becomes increasingly oppressive; as all these forces conspire to undermine the combination of funding that made the growth of language and area studies possible, the centers are beginning to fray at the edges. Carefully built-up faculty coalitions, the commitment of institutions to sustain these high-cost programs, and the ability of the centers to attract and keep the best students regardless of their personal resources are all seriously eroding. Particularly pernicious has been the annual threat under two administrations to remove the federal part of that combination, the funding provided under HEA Title VI. Fortunately, the U.S. Congress has taken the longer view, but the annual uncertainty about the availability of the crucial federal funding makes any long-term planning immensely difficult and puts these campus centers in increasing jeopardy.

Recommendation: *The Foundation, by sustaining a continuing budget allocation for the items currently included in HEA Title VI, should provide long-term, dependable support for the maintenance of our national resource base in language and area studies and for the training of students to become specialists on other countries.*

Chapter 5

International Information Flows

While there is a clear need for expert personnel in meeting the challenge of the internationalization of our society, only a few experts on international affairs are likely to be employed in our major business, government, and educational institutions. For most of the society, for most of the time, our ability to cope in an international environment will depend not on experts, but on the supply of information and organized knowledge. It is true that experts may help collect and interpret it, but it is the information that is essential.

The normal flow of information into and out of the United States is, of course, immense, and no centralized agency could nor should hope to manage it. However, if we are to marshal our national information resources for the difficult times ahead, we cannot continue to do things as we have done them in the past. We are ill-served by the current piecemeal, lopsided international information system in which tax monies are spent on redundancies and miss areas of high national interest, and square wheels are reinvented with appalling regularity. There is a set of functions with respect to international information flows that are crucial to our national interest but just will not be done unless a central organization like the National Foundation for International Studies undertakes them: agenda setting, constant monitoring of needs and resources, and the creation and maintenance of key support systems. In targeting its activities, the primary focus of the Foundation should be on those aspects of the flow of international information in which our collective need is greatest, the public rather than the private interest is paramount, and the normal processes of information creation, flow, and management are most unsatisfactory. There is much to do.

It is curious that the governmental action that comes closest to a national policy with respect to international information flows is a negative one: controls on the export of the results of scientific and technological research originating in the United States.[1] To deal with this issue we have erected an elaborate legal and administrative structure to attempt to stem the outward flow of high technology.[2] We have not gone quite so far in our concern for technology imports, although there is a growing realization that our survival in the global economy requires an expanded and more systematic effort to import the results of scientific and technological research carried on elsewhere. This realization has encouraged discussion in the White House[3] and in Congress[4] about the advisability of developing a government-supported national information policy similar to those developed in England, France, Germany, Japan, and other countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).[5] Given our persistent reluctance to centralize control of almost any aspect of our economy or our society,[6] it is unlikely that we will construct a government-managed international information policy. It is likely, however, that a national effort will be mobilized to help support services that import international technical information, starting with Japan.[7]

It is also odd that in this increasing concern for the export and import of technological information, we have paid very little

[1] *Report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on University Responsiveness to National Security Requirements* (Washington DC: Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, 1982).

[2] Ibid., pp. 4-1 to 4-10.

[3] *Science, Technology, Development and Innovation: Role of Scientific Information* (Washington DC: White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, 1984).

[4] *Information, Technology, R&D: Critical Trends and Issues* (Washington DC: Congress of the United States, Office of Technology Assessment, 1985), chap. 7.

[5] Ibid., pp. 215-16.

[6] Chalmers Johnson, *The Industrial Policy Debate* (San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1984), pp. 19-26.

[7] "Pace Picks Up in Translations of Japanese Technical Articles," *Wall Street Journal*, December 27, 1985, p. 11.

attention to the collective needs of American international business for information on other countries as it participates in the global economy, or to the needs of those who plan and carry out public policy, or to the needs of social scientists and humanists who help educate the public both within and outside of our schools and universities. It is to serving the information needs of business, public policy, and education that the efforts of the Foundation should be directed.

Fortunately, in developing an effective policy to serve these needs, we have the advantage of long experience and a great deal of public discussion about the role of government and business support for information services in science and technology.[8] With respect to international information flows for international business and international studies, some of these issues take on a greater urgency; there are other issues that arise out of the special problems inherent in all transnational transactions.

First, the national attention that has been almost exclusively focused on the flow of scientific and technological information must be extended to include information specifically about other countries, particularly social scientific and humanistic information. Special emphasis should be given to information that is relevant to our participation in the global economy, to the formation of public policy, and to the needs of our educational system.

Second, a major problem choking adequate information flows is the inadequacy of services for the translation of foreign language materials into English. Our present support system of ad hoc arrangements within corporations, government agencies serving their own employees' needs, and proprietary organizations providing translations for a fee is inadequate.

Third, we have a major national problem in the segmentation of information sources so that strengths in one domain—business, government, academic—cannot be made available to the others. In the absence of adequate mechanisms to facilitate transsectoral information flows, not only do we suffer immense redundancies in both the nature and the costs of the information

[8]See "Testimony of Rodney M. Nichols before the Task Force on Science Policy," Hearings on Science and the Mission Agencies, Committee on Science and Technology, October 23, 1985.

collected, we also encourage a growing set of adversarial relationships, particularly between the government and the academic world, that threaten to make transfers of information and knowledge increasingly difficult.

Fourth, the most effective points of national leverage on international flows of information are the facilities that collect, manage, store, and distribute information and knowledge. Yet we are almost absentmindedly allowing foreign concerns to gain control of some of the most important U.S.-based information services in the natural sciences; and there are almost no equivalents to these scientific information services in business and social sciences.

Moreover, in the face of increasing budgetary pressures, our long-term repositories of information and knowledge, our libraries, are curtailing their acquisition of foreign publications, and all of them are dropping the same things at the same time. Simultaneously, large numbers of previously acquired publications sit in library storerooms either uncatalogued or unshelved, and many of them, because of their more vulnerable physical composition, are deteriorating with each passing year.

This is a large, complex, and costly agenda. Many of the resources for the maintenance and expansion of this segment of our international information policy are dispersed between public and private organizations and at many levels of government. The appropriate role for the Foundation would be at the margin, providing continuous stock taking, agenda setting, support service creation and maintenance, and, where needed, durable, targeted funding to enable our national information needs to be met. Within this broader mandate, the Foundation should concentrate its efforts on those issues in which the combination of public and private initiative could be most effectively used, and leverage at the national level could have the greatest multiplier effect in meeting our national needs. As an initial agenda for its activities, we propose (1) assuring the ready availability of translation services; and (2) sustaining and expanding our facilities for the storage, management, and dissemination of international information. In the implementation of policies in each of these domains, the Foundation should continuously seek to coordinate and make mutually supportive the resources in the private and various levels of the public sector.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should take as a major part of its responsibility the enhancement and management of the flow of international information other than that concerned with science and technology. It should concentrate its activities on translation services and on the management and storage of information.*

TRANSLATION

In view of the low level of foreign language competency among Americans, one obvious chokepoint that inhibits the import of international information is the need to translate almost all foreign language materials into English before we can deal with them. As noted in an earlier chapter, because English has been a kind of lingua franca for much of international communication, particularly in business, we have been able to limp along ignoring materials not available in English. In areas other than business, and increasingly there as the scope of our enterprise expands into new markets, our dependence on English has been, and will become, more and more limiting. Since it is not likely that we will overcome our national foreign language disabilities in the short run, the adequacy of our international information flows will continue to depend upon our capacity to provide translation services.

Curiously, at a national level we have paid almost no attention to this problem. At present, we have a very limited, highly dispersed, uncoordinated capacity for providing translation when it is needed. Translation services tend to be ad hoc, cover relatively few languages, and are not readily available to large numbers of potential users. Our large multinational corporations can meet most of their translation needs within the corporation, but even for them, the large transnational flows of information and the translation of materials in the less commonly taught languages sometimes present problems. The intelligence and external affairs sections of the federal government have their own translation capacities as well. To the extent that translation facilities are available for general use on a continuous basis, they tend to serve the scientific and technical community, but even here the coverage is spotty. For other sections of the society, securing accurate, timely translation of materials, particularly for the non-European languages, can be a major problem. For all practical purposes, most sections of our society are limited in their international information reception to materials in English.

What is to be done? At the outset, we need a national assessment of our capacities and needs in foreign language translation of the kind recently carried out in France[9] by a committee advising the prime minister. We may not want to go so far as to create the American equivalent of a "Centre National de la Traduction," similar to those already in place in a number of other European countries. However, we should at least take steps to assure that the necessary services are available at a reasonable cost and to a substantial number of users somewhere in the national system, and that the availability of these services be made more widely known. This is the system that is proposed for Japanese in the pending Senate bill, the Japanese Technical Information Act. This stock taking, monitoring, and service directory function is one that the proposed Foundation should support.

We can afford to allow the proposed Foundation to play this marginal role where a review of existing facilities indicates that translation services are adequate and readily available. Where they are not, the creation of centrally initiated facilities may be called for. The initiation of facilities to provide translation services for the special needs of business, particularly for the many companies that wish to conduct business abroad but do not have the advantage of a multinational corporation, should be a joint business-government venture. On the business side, the interests of various companies would be served either on a fee-for-service basis or by membership fees. On the government side, various levels of government should be called on to participate. In particular, state governments, and some of the major metropolitan governments, might join with chambers of commerce to help create and sustain such facilities. The role of the federal government, through the Foundation, would be similar to

[9]Jean-Pierre van Deth, *La traduction et l'interprétation en France* (Paris: Premier Ministre, Commissariat Général de la Langue Française, 1985).

that played in the Higher Education Act (HEA) Title VI, Part B, where matching business-federal funding is required to help initiate the creation of new facilities. Indeed, an expansion of the scope of Part B would be a procedurally simple way of meeting this need.

The greatest difficulty, and the need that at present is least adequately met, is in providing adequate translation facilities for what are often called the "critical" or "less commonly taught" languages, that is, the languages spoken outside of Western Europe. In this respect, we have potentially an immense advantage over other countries. National facilities for translation in the European countries deal almost entirely with the languages of Europe, although a few of them cover Arabic, Chinese, and Japanese. No other nation can match our national capacity to deal with so many of the non-European languages, thanks in large part to the development of our campus-based language and area studies centers. In them we have professional staff engaged in the teaching of most of the non-European languages. It is startling to note that we have made no systematic use, indeed to our knowledge almost no use at all, of this national resource to meet this obvious national need.

We cannot, of course, just direct these centers to begin to perform this function. There are special skills involved in translation that the faculty and students currently oriented to academic research do not have. Some supplemental professional training would obviously be required to train language specialists and language speakers to do accurate translation, and the language skill level of many graduates of the center programs would have to be raised substantially. In the short run, foreign-born speakers of the languages will have to be marshaled. Moreover, on the campuses of the major universities where these language and area studies centers tend to be located, it is usually possible to find foreign-born professors and students with the disciplinary skills necessary for technical translation. In the long run, this national resource base in which the public investment is already quite large should be used to provide this service. Adding the supplemental skills in translation, raising the language competency levels of graduates of the program, and underwriting the costs of the extra staff needed to carry out this service would, from a national perspective, be a cost-effective and efficient way to create a national network of translation facilities in the critical languages.

Because of the extra costs involved and current limitations on the demand for these services, it makes no sense to tack this responsibility onto all 93 of the HEA Title VI centers. The identification and support of one translation center for each world area—Africa, East Asia, Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, Central Asia, the Middle East, South Asia, and Southeast Asia—would suffice. There are two possible sets of centers that might be called upon to perform this function. Under the newer version of HEA Title VI, it is proposed to create a national language resource center for each world area. The addition of a translation function to these centers would be one way of providing general translation services.

For more specialized needs, such as those of business, however, it might be more useful to attach this function to those centers that have been identified as having a special research and teaching capacity with respect to business in their world area. It will be recalled that earlier we recommended that supplemental clusters of five or six scholars working in specialized areas such as international business, agriculture, or labor relations be added to a limited number of centers specializing in each world area. The centers that had created these supplemental clusters of specialists would be the natural bases for the establishment of the translation facilities for the use of business. The addition of these translation service centers to existing language and area studies centers would be supported either by an expansion in the current HEA Title VI funding—business-specific centers might be funded under Part B of that act—or through a separate support program initiated by the proposed Foundation.

One further step toward coping with the translation problem is the development of computer translation technology. It is ironic that the first major impetus to the development of such a technology occurred 40 years too early when at the end of World War II, the U.S. military services, particulary the U.S. Navy, invested heavily in making machine translation possible. After a very large investment of funds and a frustrating lack of accomplishment, the effort was turned over to the National Science Foundation, and a few years later, for all practical purposes it was abandoned. In recent years, however, with advances in computer technology and in studies of artificial intelligence, and with the reentry of theoretical linguists into foreign language learning, investment in the development of machine translation is again taking place on a limited basis. There is some evidence that for discourse in limited topical areas with a fairly narrow vocabulary, such as those that may occur in scientific or business communication, machine translations at least as error-free as those provided by a number of different human translators are now possible. Investment in the expansion of this capacity holds great promise for assisting in "unchoking" the international information flow.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should monitor, and where necessary, establish readily available translation services supported by both public and private funds. For the less commonly taught languages, the possibility of establishing such services as adjuncts to existing language and area studies centers should be explored. The Foundation should also assist in the development of automated translation facilities.*

COLLECTIVE INFORMATION SERVICES

A second point of leverage for the enhancement of international information flows is the improvement of the centralized services that gather, manage, store, and distribute international information. For many purposes, the central problem concerning international information is not to increase the flow, but to select what is useful from the gushing stream of raw information that modern states exude, to transform it into a usable form, to store it in such a fashion that it can be readily retrieved, and to distribute it to those who will use it. In this matter we have a great deal to learn from the scientific and technical community, which has been coping with this problem for half a century. Indeed, it is ironic that American scientific information systems have themselves become part of other countries' strategies for enhancing international information flows. There is a growing concern[10] about the purchase by foreign firms of major American

[10] *Science, Technology and Development*, pp. 2-3.

scientific information storage and distribution systems, which let them have immediate access to the products of our high-technology research without worrying about export restrictions. A recent report of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy noted,

> Elsevier of the Netherlands, a major science publisher and owner of the abstracting service Excerpta Medica, in 1979, announced with its acquisition of Education and Economic Systems, Inc. that it was entering the information services market and planned to make further acquisitions. It subsequently acquired Congressional Information Services, Inc. of Washington and Greenwood Press which produces the Index to Congressional Papers (Hearings, Reports, etc.). It has developed a consortium of publishers (Adonis) to provide document delivery (copies of research articles from their journals) in the world, including the U.S. market. It is involved in a joint venture to distribute TV programming in Europe by satellite.
>
> Thyssen-Bornemiszá of the Netherlands acquired several U.S. firms—the Bibliographic Retrieval Systems, which is the third largest vendor of online computerized databases, as well as Information Handling Services, Indian Head and Predicasts. Pergamon Press which is also a major publisher has purchased the UK Infoline to serve as a host computer for Euronet and also provide services into the United States. It has an exclusive agreement with the USSR All-Union Institute for Scientific and Technical Information (VINITI) for English language abstracts of the Soviet literature. It acquired U.S. patent files for a Video Patsearch database (on line access with interactive videodisc display of drawings and chemical structures). This is available through the Pergamon Infoline network. Pergamon has also reached database agreements with several research centers in the UK which has resulted in the withdrawal of these databases from the U.S. Organization, Dialog. Pergamon has joined with Telesystems in France to form a company to acquire other companies and databases so that it will become a major European force in online information retrieval.[11]

The problem with social science and humanistic information service organizations is not that they are so valuable that other nations are vying to acquire them, but that they are at about the stage that the natural sciences and technology had reached 40

[11] Ibid., pp. 3-4.

years ago. And within the general set of services, those relating to international information are even more primitive and underdeveloped. We cannot hope to cope with the huge and rapidly expanding flow of information from other societies without facing squarely the problem of managing that flow. In this, we have much to learn from our experience in the management of scientific and technological information flows. We are far ahead of every other country in the reservoir of people and organizations that focus their activities on other countries, particularly countries outside of Western Europe. We have just begun to create and sustain the national-level institutions to service information about other countries. Moreover, as in so many other aspects of our society, the relevant people and organizations are scattered throughout the various segments of our society, and we have almost no mechanisms for pooling information across their natural boundaries to serve our overall national interest. As we will note below, the flow of information between our intelligence agencies and our academic community raises special problems, but this is less true of other agencies of the federal government such as Agriculture, Commerce, the Agency for International Development, Treasury, and Health and Human Services, and not true at all of state and local governments. In addition, we can surely do more in the interface between business and the academic world, and this is a good place to start. The model proposed below might well be adapted for use with specific mission-oriented governmental agencies.

Business-Academic Links in International Information Flows

It should be said at the outset that most of the international information needed on a day-to-day basis by business leaders is quite specific to a particular firm or industry, must be tailored to the solution of a very specific problem, and must be available almost immediately. Moreover, a great deal of information is proprietary and is part of the competitive advantage of one firm over others. There is nothing in the academic world that could or should attempt to service such needs. Where a link between business and academic international information services would be fruitful would be in the processing of information of longer-term importance, particularly background information on particular economies and societies that form the context for business decisions. It is foolish to have every company assembling and interpreting demographic, political, attitudinal, legal, and social organizational information on its own. And when one dips below the level of the largest multinationals—and even there, for many countries—the internal capacity to gather and interpret such data is totally lacking. Most companies must fly blind in conducting business with many countries of the world. This may not show up in short-term, individual business decisions in which the terms of a decision can be narrowly circumscribed and the cost of errors is bearable, but for our long-term interests in the world economy, ignorance can be truly costly. And from the standpoint of the society as a whole, knowledge about those business-related issues that are relevant to the formation of public policy—for instance, the overall profile and conduct of a country's economy vis-à-vis the United States, the relationships between currency control, industrial subsidies, and tariffs, the collective impact of countertrading on our international business position, the aggregate effect of separately negotiated loans, expropriation policy and practice—is not likely to emerge from the information that individual firms collect and publish.

To meet these needs, it is proposed that a series of experimental centers be established to gather, store, and disseminate such information relevant to mid- and long-term business policy. To some extent, such facilities exist. Campus-based econometric research centers, trade associations, international banks, proprietary consultancy services, and overseas subsidiaries already serve as international information processors. A first priority should be a national assessment of the coverage and availability of such services. This should be carried out under the aegis of the board of international business advisors of the Foundation recommended in the previous section. What is unlikely to be widely available are the country- or region-specific services that permit a variety of indicators and information sources to be placed side by side to make a coherent picture. Especially for countries where the interpretation of government-issued statistics is an arcane exercise in tea leaf reading, and where they are published in languages and scripts not easily comprehensible to most business executives, the processing and interpreting of data require expertise not readily duplicated in individual companies. For the countries of Western Europe, the need is less pressing.

It is in the interest of the business community, the academic community, and the nation to build information processing, storage, and dissemination facilities close to the existing cadres of experts who can judge their value and interpret them. Such a procedure would be considerably more effective and considerably less costly than the wasteful duplication of such services by every company wanting to do business abroad. As in the case of translation services, such services should be established either as part of or adjoining carefully selected language and area studies centers. Also as in the case of translation services, special skills and facilities would have to be added to the existing cadres of scholars. There are some prototype centers that now publish business-relevant information series, mainly for Latin America, but what is called for is a combination of business and academic experience not now encountered in any center.

From the perspective of business, such information service organizations would serve as resource centers for a broad range of information on particular countries or world regions, collected and interpreted by individuals for whom the study of that country or world region is a life work. For the academic community, it provides a basis for educating both faculty and students to the most current needs of business. For the nation it provides an information base to assist in the formation of national economic policy, and it begins to use some of the skills built up at considerable public expense to serve public needs outside of the educational system itself. Given these interlocking interests, the cost of establishing and sustaining such centers should be borne by private business, government, and the university in a matching grant formula similar to that currently employed in Part B of HEA Title VI, only with a five-year support basis so that the center could have time to get under way and to plan for a substantial period of time. In addition, the center should be able to charge a fee for unusual demands on its time or for services tailored to individual company clients. Aside from putting some of the burden on the principal beneficiaries, this sort of funding would assure that such centers would be responsive to business and public needs.

Declassified and Approved For Release 2013/03/13 : CIA-RDP90-00530R000802120001-3

Recommendation: *The Foundation, through its board of international business advisors, should cause to be conducted a survey of existing information management systems serving international business to determine where significant gaps occur. On an experimental basis it should also initiate centers affiliated with or part of one or more existing language and area studies centers for each world area to gather, interpret, and distribute business-relevant information. The costs of such centers would be jointly met by business, government, and the host university on a matching basis similar to that contained in Part B of HEA Title VI.*

Large-Scale International Data Sets

There is another clear need and point of leverage for the management of international information that is similar to, indeed overlaps, information services tailored to the needs of business. We refer to the need for research support systems to manage international information flows for the social sciences more generally. In particular, we refer to the special costs and problems of control raised by large sets of social and political data that are increasingly needed for the more sophisticated analysis of international affairs. Social science research on other countries, which has traditionally been a kind of cottage industry carried out by individual scholars performing a small amount of processing on limited amounts of data, is increasingly being supplemented by more elaborate analysis of large bodies of data. In the natural sciences, the recent acceleration of this increase in the scale of the data to be managed is being serviced in part by the National Science Foundation's making available supercomputers for the use of the scientific research community. The volume of reliable quantitative data about economic, political, and social phenomena that are important for research on international affairs has increased dramatically since the 1950s, in terms of both geographical and substantive coverage.

Quantitative data about economic, political, and social phenomena are collected by a variety of public and private resources. Governments collect basic census data. All governments maintain basic national economic accounts. Many governments collect other economic and social data. International organizations compile, standardize, and publish these data. Opinion data are collected in most countries by a variety of public and private sources. Data about sensitive political and social phenomena are collected mainly by scholars. Some of these data will make up part of the information base for the proposed region-specific international business information centers described above. Others will be of interest primarily to researchers both in and out of government. Such data involve acquisition and management costs that are prohibitive for any individual researcher or any particular investigation. They constitute what Kenneth Prewitt has called "a collective resource."[12]

Some facilities for collecting and managing such data already exist. The most important of these is the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR). Founded in the 1960s, the ICPSR is a consortium of some 300 academic institutions and consortia of academic institutions. More than 50 are outside the United States. The ICPSR archive has about 20,000 data sets, about two-thirds of them dealing with other countries, mainly those of Western Europe. The Roper Center at the University of Connecticut is headquarters for the International Survey Library Association and maintains an archive of basic data from more than 10,000 public opinion surveys. The international ones—about 45% of the holdings—are supplied by 80 organizations in 74 foreign countries. There are similar archives and data bases available for more specialized topics, such as the Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

As in the case of business, these central information storage services are good points of leverage for managing international information flows, and they are therefore useful places for the Foundation to direct its attention. There are three issues that should be on the Foundation's agenda.

First, the coverage of data is limited by the special purposes of the archiving organization and by the differential participation of various countries around the world. This is especially true for noneconomic issues and for countries beyond those relatively

[12]For a discussion of the needs of social science in this respect, see Kenneth Prewitt, "Annual Report of the President," *Annual Report 1984-1985* (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1985), pp. xviii-xxi.

industrialized countries that are members of the OECD. There are many existing data collections dealing with demographic and social phenomena that are not included in archives. Funds should be provided to include these collections. Obtaining data from non-Western countries would probably depend on, among other factors, developing a more extensive network of contacts with scholars in these countries, a point we will return to later.

Second, data collected in other countries often need to be standardized. A great deal of useful work on this problem has been accomplished by international organizations, and the National Science Foundation has invested substantial resources and planning in greater standardization. Relatively little progress has been made, however, with respect to data collected by individual scholars and teams of scholars. Standardization among academics will be achieved only through voluntary collaboration and greater contact among scholars in different countries. The Foundation might fruitfully join the National Science Foundation in working toward that goal.

Finally, the overriding problem of all data archives is to increase their use by those for whom the data might be helpful. For instance, while data concerning non-U.S. surveys constitute almost half of the holdings of the Roper Center, they account for only 2% of the use. This poses two problems. The first is to assure that the data are in good condition and that their existence is widely known. The second is to invest in ways to transport either the user to the data or, in this age of microcomputers, the data to the user. Both require the investment of funds. As a rule of parsimony, however, scarce financial resources should not continue to be invested in sections of data collection where evidence indicates that such data are never, rarely, or unlikely to be used. This is particularly true of some of the time-bound data with a short life span.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should invest in the management and storage of international information in existing data banks and encourage the creation of new ones where major national need can be demonstrated. It should be further concerned with extending their coverage, standardizing the form for crosscountry comparability, and expanding use of the archives.*

LIBRARIES

The Scale of International Collections

Most information services and data banks have the historical depth of a ticker tape. The repositories of durable international information are, of course, our libraries where materials that have made it into print and binding are stored. We have developed magnificent collections of periodicals and books from all parts of the world and scattered them among our major research universities. As financial constraints on libraries in general and on international studies interests in particular have increased, our ability to sustain and expand these collections diminishes. Many of the problems faced by international studies are merely exaggerated versions of those facing libraries in general; others are specific to the assembling and maintenance of international publications.

The expansion of university library collections to support international studies generally and research and instruction on specific world areas is largely a development of the past 30 years. The increase of area studies centers and the globalization of acquisitions by many research libraries transformed those libraries in terms of costs, staff composition, managerial organization, and space requirements. The development of campus-based language and area studies centers in an increasing number of universities both brought to the campus extensive government and private foundation funding and put pressure on universities to pour their own resources into the acquisition and management of periodicals and books from abroad. The P.L. 480 program brought even greater quantities of publications to libraries. The result was immensely accelerated library growth and a tradition of self-sufficiency for each campus collection—and the size and costs of area-specific collections are immense.

The scale and costs of sustaining the largest and the average area-specific collection differ by world area. In 1981, for instance, the average size of an East Asian collection at a university with an HEA Title VI center[13] was about 300,000 volumes, of which

[13] Ann L. Schneider, "Libraries of Title VI Centers: Some Impressions and Some Questions," (Washington DC: Department of Education, 1982), p. 2.

248,000 were in Asian languages. The largest collections contained approximately 700,000 volumes. Publications from Africa and Southeast Asian countries were considerably smaller, at about 70,000 on the average, but got as high as 200,000 volumes. The average annual cost of acquisitions for an East Asian collection in 1981 was about $140,000, plus an additional $11,000 for specialists to handle it. The largest East Asian collections cost $250,000 annually for acquistion and $40,000 for personnel. Taking all of the world areas outside of Western Europe, the universities with HEA Title VI centers had acquired on the average 1.25 million books published in or on those countries, of which 850,000 were in languages other than English. If one were to add the books on Western Europe and Canada, the numbers would expand immensely. These are, in short, huge collections hungry for funds to provide for their maintenance and expansion.

The strong financial picture that prevailed during the years of development and made this impressive growth possible has now changed. Foundation and government support for international programs has declined for more than a decade, and libraries have borne more than their share of the cuts. In a battle between the urgent and the important, between, for instance, sustaining faculty salaries and the purchase of books, the former will always win out. Moreover, much of the P.L. 480 program, which provided for the acquisition of books with "excess" currencies, has been phased out. Of the last remnants, India went on a dollar payment basis in October 1985, and Pakistan will do likewise in October 1986. The gradual erosion of "soft money," coupled with a long period of inflation in book and journal costs, has reduced and distorted established collecting patterns, making them broader in coverage but less comprehensive in terms of depth. As a result, very few research libraries are now maintaining retrospective acquisition programs as they once did, and related activities such as preservation have largely fallen by the wayside.

It is clear that in these times of greater fiscal restraint, it is unlikely that external funding characteristic of an earlier era will be sufficient to continue to maintain all of these substantial library resources at their former level. It would be a tragedy, however, if the financial constraints common to all libraries were to cause all libraries to stop acquiring the same kinds of books and the same periodicals. Some libraries must be enabled to continue collecting and processing as comprehensively as possible in a particular world area. It would also be a tragedy if accidental shifts in the availability of external funds for particular world areas were to bias inordinately the extent and shape of our collections. For instance, the U.S.-Japan Friendship Commission has provided support for university-based library collections on Japan, as have Japanese business interests through the Japan Foundation. In the absence of similar funding for other countries, our collections will inevitably become skewed.

It is in the national interest, not just the local university's interest, that several repository collections be sustained for each world area, and therefore central funds should be directed to a small subset of libraries identified as national resource collections. Other libraries should be encouraged to find an appropriate level for somewhat smaller, less comprehensive collections that would serve most of the needs of their own faculty and students and the surrounding region.

To assure the continued vitality of libraries at these different levels, funds should be allocated to meet the extra costs of acquiring and handling non-Western materials. These supplemental funds could be administered through the current HEA Title VI machinery, and the choice of national versus regional or local collections should be made on a competitive basis. To assure that the funds were, in fact, spent on libraries, this allocation would appear as a line item in a center's budget, would have to be used for specifically library-related purposes, and would require separate annual reporting by the grantees.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should monitor and help sustain our major collections of books and periodicals in the libraries of our research universities. It should help establish several target levels for collections, ranging from comprehensive national resource libraries to smaller, inwardly focused or regional libraries. It should administer a program of support for the extra costs of international collections graduated by such collection levels.*

Collaborative Efforts among Libraries

In addition to nurturing individual library collections with specifically earmarked funds, as in the case of the other international information import systems discussed earlier, the key points of leverage to sustain and improve these collections are in the central mechanisms that allow for cooperation, division of responsibility, and freer movement of materials among institutions. If such collaboration and exchange facilities do not work well, all pressures to plan for rational, multilevel growth among the various universities will fail.

Libraries have realized this and are turning to cooperative ventures and seeking ways to establish productive interdependence. Their search for cooperation and reduction of redundancy started early. Immediately after World War II, the Farmington Plan promoted the concept of shared responsibility for collecting, with the objective of assuring the availability in the United States of at least one copy of every important book. Since then, important collaborative organizations have emerged to help share the load. The On-line Computerized Library Center (OCLC), which has some 37,000 libraries as members, the Research Library Group, and the Center for Research Libraries already provide a number of centralized, collaborative services for their members, as does the Library of Congress. These include supplying records to the bibliographic system; cooperative cataloguing; the construction of master bibliographic files; a linked computer system to promote cooperative cataloguing; providing for uniform transcriptions of non-Roman alphabets; and computerized files of information characterizing the strength of existing collections and the level of current acquisitions.

There are other collective tasks, either just begun or still in the future, in which cooperative efforts would be quite rewarding. These include bringing sizable backlogs of uncatalogued or partially catalogued materials on-line; cooperative acquisition programs to make the hunt for materials in other countries more mutually supportive and less competitive; training a larger number of librarians dispersed throughout our national library system to handle materials in the less commonly taught languages; raising the technical level of librarians whose specialty is the handling of materials in foreign languages but who have not kept current in the rapidly moving area of computer and videodisc technology; making the transfer of stored materials and not just bibliographic references easier among libraries and between libraries and users; linking intragovernment bibliographic services such as the Department of Commerce's National Technical Information Service with those on campuses; and transferring to microfilm or other long-term storage systems the materials deteriorating on many library shelves.

The Foundation's concentration of resources on these collective needs and collective solutions would be an effective way to use our scarce national resources parsimoniously. Its special role should be to meet the extra costs and special problems arising from the fact that the materials to be collected and processed are international; it should serve as a kind of special pleader or amicus curiae, to more broadly based support programs, to assure that these extra costs and special problems receive the attention they require. Indeed, one of the Foundation's first steps should be the creation of a public-cum-private committee—much like the board of international business advisors discussed earlier—that would draw up a highly specific national agenda.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should support the national effort at collaboration and collective planning in the field of library resources with a special emphasis on assuring that the collaborative programs adequately manage international materials. To this end, a national advisory committee to oversee international aspects of library development should be created, and it should advise the Foundation on where its funds might most effectively be expended.*

Chapter 6

Research

We cannot simply depend upon the flow of information routinely coming from abroad, no matter how abundant and wide-ranging it is. That information must be turned into organized knowledge, and most frequently fresh information has to be gathered to provide intelligent answers to important questions. In short, the management and utilization of the expanding flow of international information calls for a capacity to conduct research and for the resources to make that research effective.

Our current system of support for internationally focused research is seriously flawed. It is costly, highly variable, and without directive intelligence where that is appropriate. It concentrates on the most immediate, most client-specific issues at one extreme, and at the other, on the most general research issues as specified by academic disciplines rather than what we need to know about other societies. Moreover, it is absurd that we have now spent well over a quarter of a billion dollars through Title VI of the Higher Education Act (HEA) to create, shape, and sustain a pool of experts on other countries, but we have given no concerted attention to enabling them to conduct the research they are trained to do. Nor have we any way to specify what kind of research is needed to serve our various public purposes. There is no central place where the question can be asked as to what we need to know about our international environment and for what purpose, nor any way of putting resources into the search for answers. Nor are our facilities well developed for encouraging the undirected investigator-driven iniatives such as those that nourish basic research in the natural sciences.

The results are a national research product on international affairs that is haphazard and noncumulative, and a system that neither directs research into topics of great public interest nor encourages the free creation of a body of basic knowledge about other countries in the humanities and social sciences that will inform our long-term educational and public policy needs. The time has come to reallocate existing funds and to provide new monies for internationally oriented research to better serve the national need.

The construction of a new centralized initiative in the promotion of internationally oriented research in the social sciences and humanities raises the same series of issues that delayed the founding of the National Science Foundation for five years, and that still bedevil relations between the research community and the federal government in the natural sciences:[1] the value of pluralism versus centralization in support sources; applied versus basic research; the propriety of government versus private support for particular activities; research in which both the topic and the conduct of the research are set by mission-oriented agencies, versus investigator-initiated research supported by general granting organizations; prescriptive versus reactive project selection; research taking place within an agency or company versus research contracted out.

The fact that the new initiative we are proposing deals with the social sciences and the humanities, and will sponsor research that is transnational instead of domestic in scope, gives these issues a special importance. We need a strategy for creating the best mix of centralized versus individual decision making and private versus government support, a mix that draws on the experience in the natural sciences, but is tailored to the particularities of internationally oriented research. We will try to provide a framework for sorting some of these issues out, for making the clear distinctions that will make it possible to have

[1]For an insightful discussion of these issues as they relate to the natural sciences, see "Testimony of Rodney M. Nichols before the Task Force on Science Policy," Hearings on Science and the Mission Agencies, Committee on Science and Technology, U.S. Congress, October 23, 1985.

the benefits of prescriptive, instrumental research where it is called for, while preserving and expanding our facilities for individual-initiated basic research in the social sciences and, especially, the humanities. Above all, we need a strategy that will disarm some of the hostility that ill-placed mixing of these domains has too often created.

To achieve such a strategy for promoting internationally oriented research in the social sciences and the humanities, it is useful to consider a rough classification that is commonly used in planning for research and development in the natural sciences: (1) product- or problem-targeted research that serves the specific needs of a business or mission-oriented government client; (2) technological research that, while still applied in its purpose, serves more general developmental needs of many potential clients; and (3) basic research that provides the underpinning for the other two. The first of these takes place largely within particular companies, the government's own research establishment, or in highly focused contracts between government and business and campus-based research establishments. It is in the second and, to an even greater extent, the third category that the immense sums ($4.2 billion in 1982) in support of scientific research on university campuses are spent. For instance, in that year the Department of Defense alone allocated 47% of its budget for fundamental research and development to campus-based activities, 35% to government laboratories, and 18% to industry. Paralleling this continuum from the most applied to the most basic research are differences in the extent to which the user or the investigator sets the research agenda.

A similar distinction can be made with respect to social science and humanities research on international topics. One type of research responds to the very specific needs of a client, such as a particular business firm or a mission-oriented agency; the second focuses on broader topics of more general interest that are nevertheless still oriented to the needs of eventual users, such as those making public policy or conducting international business more broadly defined; and the third is the undirected, basic research in which the topic reflects the interests of the investigators and not a specific set of clients.

It should be made clear that these are general divisions about the nature of the research enterprise, not necessarily about the people who conduct the research. Indeed, one of our major national needs is to encourage those who normally confine themselves to client-targeted research to engage in the investigation of broader policy themes or in basic research, and for some basic researchers to get a sense of service to specific clients or the policy needs of the nation at large. It should also be clear that listing these three different research functions in the above order does not constitute an assertion of their intrinsic importance, or an implicit judgment of the relative scale of support to be allocated to each.

CLIENT-TARGETED RESEARCH

If we count the immense volume of internationally oriented research that takes place within individual corporations and add research carried out by the intelligence agencies, the overwhelming proportion of our national investment in international research now falls in the first category, research tailored to the needs of particular clients. The vast majority of such research is conducted in-house; indeed, outsiders usually either lack the specific technical expertise or share the client's perspective on the particular problem too much to be genuinely helpful. There are, however, a few examples of external contracting of client-targeted research. Businesses occasionally contract with universities for targeted project research on international matters. For instance, the University of Minnesota has recently established a University Research Consortium attached to the campus where faculty members provide precisely this kind of service on a fee basis. More commonly, companies engage the services of one of the nonacademic research and consulting organizations like the Conference Board in an ad hoc fashion for particular projects. Similarly, a government agency may contract with a not-for-profit research organization like the Rand Corporation for analysis of very specific policy issues of interest to them. Indeed, the Rand Corporation was initially established by the U.S. Air Force precisely to play such a role.

The support of such client-targeted research should not be a function of the proposed National Foundation for International Studies. Its beneficiaries and purposes are too narrowly defined to make a claim on general public research funds. Moreover, when such research involves university personnel, it often runs head on into a dispute about the openness and general availability of the results of campus-based research and the uses to which it will be put. Most business information gathered through research is proprietary and closely guarded as part of a company's comparative advantage. It is not available for general dissemination. The problem is especially troublesome in contracting for internationally oriented research conducted by the academic community for direct use by the intelligence community. Not only are the results of government-contracted research sometimes classified, but for most members of the academic international studies research community there is a strongly held belief that the direct mixing of academic and intelligence-oriented research is unhealthy. At the minimum, as we will note later, such mixing can raise immense barriers for academics trying to gain access to other countries to conduct research. Whether it should or not is irrelevant; it does. In a curious variant of the Heisenberg principle, intelligence agency sponsorship of overseas academic research can make it impossible to gather the information it is designed to collect.

Government mission agencies other than those concerned with intelligence—for example, State, Treasury, Commerce, Agriculture, the Agency for International Development, Labor—have long and successful traditions of supporting targeted research on international topics of direct interest to them. The basic point is that such research lies outside of the scope of the Foundation, and should continue to be funded by and under the control of the client corporation or agency that supports it.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should not assume responsibility for the promotion of research that serves the special needs of particular clients either in business or in government.*

TOPICALLY DIRECTED RESEARCH FOR MORE GENERAL USE

It is one thing to let the market completely determine the conduct of research serving the very specific interests of corporate or agency clients. It is quite another to be unable to set any research agenda at all, to have no way to direct research toward topics of pressing national interest. We should be able to encourage high-quality research on general questions whose answers are crucial to, for instance, our international competitiveness in the world economy, or problems to which those charged with the conduct of our foreign policy wish to direct some of our best research minds. Such research is the equivalent of the second level in the tripartite classification of natural science research discussed earlier.

It is interesting to note that in the private sector, we have already shifted much of the support available for internationally oriented research to this second category. With a few exceptions, many of the major private foundations have focused their grants on research into topical domains of the foundations' own choosing, rather than that of an investigator. Such foundation-set research agendas tend to cover a fairly narrow span of topics. Arms and security studies and peace research are only the most recent examples.

In contrast to private foundation research funding, we have no mechanism for setting a research agenda for the allocation of public funds, nor can we establish proactive programs to encourage research on topics of great national importance. We tend either to fund client-specific research of the first kind discussed above, or to provide unrestricted support for the third kind of research to be discussed below, in which the topic is completely at the discretion of the investigator. We have no mechanisms for directing our national research effort into the middle ground left untouched by the short-term interests of particular clients or the topical drift of self-nominated investigators. It is in this area that the Foundation might make a major national contribution.

What kind of topics might make up such an agenda? Examples might be taken from a list recently published by the Committee for Economic Development[2] following up on the President's Commission on Industrial Competitiveness:[3]

[2] *Suggested Additional Research on U.S. Industrial Competitiveness* (Washington DC: Committee on Economic Development, September 1985).

[3] *Global Competition: The New Reality* (Washington DC: President's Commission on Industrial Competitiveness, January 1985).

> Compare the tax treatments of particular industries in the major trading countries of the world, and judge their relative effects on resource flows and international competitiveness.
>
> Monitor and evaluate various kinds of government intervention in or regulation of foreign exchange markets.
>
> Synthesize existing findings on invasions of international property rights and evident gaps in the protection thereof. . . . Design a model program for worldwide protection of intellectual property rights.
>
> Develop a statistical series showing the comparative after-tax costs of private capital in several of the world's leading financial markets.
>
> Develop a sound and convincing basis on which the long-term structure of future debt and equity flows to LDC's can be built.

These topics, of course, pointed as they are to international business, are all transnational and lie within the discipline of economics. However, similar lists could be, in fact have been, drawn up for other disciplines and topical domains: terrorism, revitalizing mature cities, historical roots for pro- and anti-Americanism, the absorption of guest workers into host societies, comparative patterns of public and private support for the arts and the humanities, Islamic civilizations. In general, such topics would have a very general relevance to public policy, and would be broadly stated so that the creative problem shaping of the researcher could help clarify the issues. They would be chosen not only for their intrinsic importance but because they are neglected by the general drift of research topic selection.

There are a number of dangers that must be avoided in establishing such a program of targeted research support. To mention just a few, if we select as an agenda a set of issues that focus solely on the implementation of existing public policy, we will quickly destroy the usefulness of the process. The topics should be chosen to cover a wide range of subjects. If they are to serve their purpose, they must guard against being translated into client-oriented projects of the kind described in the first category above. Moreover, the agenda setting must be distributed widely throughout the society and among the various mission agencies of the government. Rodney Nichols, in his recent testimony before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Science and Technology,[4] eloquently warned against the consequences of growing single-agency dominance in the funding of scientific research. Such a development would be even more damaging in the social sciences and humanities.

In addition to setting a national research agenda of topics of special interest, the Foundation should adopt a proactive policy in several other respects. In spite of the efforts of federal policy under HEA Title VI to develop scholarly resources focusing on all of the non-Western world, within each of the major world areas, some countries and sections of countries get the lion's share of the attention. In South Asian studies the most studied countries are India—and North India at that—and Pakistan. In Latin American studies they are Brazil, Mexico, and Argentina. In the Middle East they are Egypt, Turkey, Iran, and Israel. In Southeast Asia they are the Philippines, Indonesia, and Thailand. In Africa they are South Africa, Nigeria, Ghana, and Kenya. In Eastern Europe they are the Soviet Union and Poland. Similarly, there are particular languages within each world area on which the research needed to prepare adequate teaching materials concentrates, leaving other languages only very lightly covered.[5]

It is interesting to note that in the normal drift of academic research interests, later generations of scholars tend to spread out into countries and regions for which the density of prior research is low.[6] There remain a number of countries, regions, and languages that fall almost completely outside of existing research interests, yet they are of current or possible future importance to public policy. Examples of such countries and regions are the Indian Ocean, the mountain states of the Himalayas, the Baltic and Balkan states in Eastern Europe, the island states in the South Pacific, many parts of Africa, the Caribbean countries, Belize, Guyana, Inner Asia, the Dead Sea states, and, within the major countries, whole sections like Western China or Northeast India. There is an equivalent list of neglected languages for which neither the government nor the university

[4]Nichols, "Testimony."

[5]These country and language concentrations and omissions are given in detail in Richard D. Lambert et al., *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies* (Washington DC: Association of American Universities, 1984).

[6]See Richard D. Lambert et al., *National Targets for South Asia Specialists* (New York: National Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies, 1981).

community has carried out the research needed to prepare teaching and translating materials.[7] These regions and languages are excellent candidates for a targeted research strategy. We have no way of directing research toward them now.

Additional candidates for targeted research are those studies that serve the overall needs of the field as a whole. Here is where the research needed to carry out the transformation of foreign language instruction would be supported.[8] What the highly dispersed and amorphous field of international studies needs is the capacity to carry out rigorous evaluation and planning activities, charting the national need and determining what has worked and what has not. Except for a tiny program under HEA Title VI, international studies has no capacity for self-evaluation now. Even the Evaluation and Assessment Branch of the National Endowment for the Humanities no longer funds such research. Without this evaluation and planning capacity, neither the Foundation nor anyone else can perform the crucial monitoring and agenda setting; and, except for the hunches and enthusiasms that have dominated policy formulation so far, there is no sound basis for directing national investment to the points of leverage where its impact will be greatest. In the natural sciences, such research is conducted by organizations like the National Academy of Science or the various disciplinary associations. There are no equivalent mechanisms in international studies, where the need is, if anything, more pressing. Support for such work in the social sciences and the humanities as they relate to international studies should be made available on a proactive basis under this part of the Foundation's program.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should establish a proactive program of research support to direct research toward topics of great national importance, to fill in gaps in country or language coverage, and to carry out the evaluation and planning activities for the field as a whole. To establish the priorities for and to supervise this proactive program, a distinguished national ad-*

[7]John L. D. Clark and Dora E. Johnson, *A Survey of Materials Development Needs in the Less Commonly Taught Languages* (Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1982).

[8]For a detailed research agenda, see Lambert et al., *Beyond Growth*, chap 2.

visory group should be established, comprising research scholars and representatives of universities, major international business firms, national research organizations and government agencies along lines similar to the National Science Board. Both private and public funds should be provided to support research on the topics selected by the group.

INVESTIGATOR-DRIVEN RESEARCH

Unrestricted Research Support

It would be exceedingly foolish to concentrate all research funding in the client-oriented and proactive categories. Indeed, the American research tradition, the envy of the world, assumes that research managers, no matter how wise and prescient, cannot predict the great ideas, the ways of viewing a problem, that at first seem merely curious. Policymakers for the natural sciences[9] are acutely aware of the need for a balance between research in which the topic is targeted by the client to be served and the basic research carried out under open, peer-reviewed competitions, in which the subject is chosen by the investigator.

It was to serve this tradition that the National Science Foundation (NSF) and, later, the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) were established. One might have expected that these two organizations, one covering basic research in the social sciences and the other in the humanities, would suffice. A review[10] of the recent grant-making history of the two organizations indicated, however, that they only touch the edges of the need. While each organization does provide support for a certain kind of international research in the social sciences and humanities—for instance, in fiscal 1983 the Social and Economic Sciences section of NSF awarded $3 million in grants that had an international component, or 12.5% of its overall grants in that category—their defined missions permit them to cover only a

[9]See Nichols, "Testimony."

[10]For the *Beyond Growth* study, a detailed analysis was made of all grants between 1978 and 1980 that had an international focus and the membership of all relevant selection committees for both NSF and NEH.

portion of the research that would provide the necessary organized knowledge about other societies.

NSF conceives of its function as the advancement of basic science, primarily the natural sciences, and the academic disciplines that compose it. Consequently, NSF tends to fund only research at the "hard science" end of the social sciences; this research must therefore be heavily quantitative and bent to the format of scientific proof, and it must have methodological or theoretical importance for the discipline as a whole. NSF's grant competitions and screening committees are organized around disciplines or subdisciplinary topical themes; and its international grants fit into this format. This is an immensely useful function, and the management of such grants belongs precisely where it is—within the NSF format. The difficulty lies in the fact that such a structure does not lend itself to the awarding of grants on the basis of what we need to know about an international problem or a particular country. Such grants may be as rigorous in their methodology as those supported by NSF, but their special appeal is their contribution to our understanding of the global society, not the extent to which they contribute to the advancement of a discipline or basic science in general.

The approach of NEH represents a different problem for international studies. Except for regranting programs administered through the joint committees of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies, which we will mention below, NEH's regular peer review system for research proposals prefers projects that are historical or literary in focus, and preferably both—in other words projects that rather faithfully reflect the center of gravity of the humanities disciplines. The coverage of topics in what might be called the contemporary humanities—that is, the current cultural and literary trends that help us understand other societies today—is much slimmer than the coverage of great civilizations and literatures of the past.

The basic point is that neither NSF nor NEH is concerned with the production of organized knowledge about other societies; they march to different drummers. In neither organization would the argument for research support be persuasive on the basis of the importance to the United States of acquiring substantive knowledge of an internationally oriented topic—that is, on the grounds that the nation desperately needs to know something about the character of terrorism in the Middle East, or the influence of tribalism on politics in Africa, or the manipulation of exchange rates in less developed countries, or the effect of fundamentalism in Israel on its foreign policy, or the doctrinal basis of Shiite revolts. Such projects would be acceptable to NSF screening panels not on the basis of the intrinsic importance of the topic, but on the "high science" style of analysis. The essentially descriptive treatment that such topics require would not qualify. Similarly, most of them would not pass the review panels of the traditional humanists who screen projects at NEH.

Nor would other federal programs that one might expect to support such research be likely to do so. The Fulbright program is not primarily oriented to research, and support under that program is limited to individual fellowships for relatively brief overseas sojourns, not for the more extensive and longer-range research that significant work on these topics would demand. Moreover, the topics of research projects are screened by binational selection committees involving both the United States and the host country where the research visit is to take place. It is difficult to imagine any of the topics indicated above surviving the Fulbright selection process.

In order to understand how the mosaic of federal research support programs, each with its own definition of what is appropriate research, misses important internationally oriented research domains, it is instructive to take the classic case of a research topic that is vitally important to international studies but falls between the cracks of all existing federal funding programs: research leading to the improvement of foreign language instruction. NSF will not touch it because it is too applied and too atheoretical. NEH will not fund such research because its interest is the content of documents in other languages, not how anyone develops the skill to read those documents or communicates with the people who write them. There is a tiny program under HEA Title VI in which foreign language teaching research can compete with a variety of other evaluative and planning research topics for one or two $30,000 grants annually. The rest of the Department of Education is not interested in research on foreign language teaching, except as a small adjunct to bilingual education. In a recent round of substantial Department of Education grants to support 10 campus-based centers for research related to education,[11] none of them was concerned with foreign language instruction. Until quite recently, there was a program within the National Security Agency supporting external research on foreign language instruction, but the agency's mission orientation limited the scope of the research it could fund, and it now appears that even that program will disappear in any event. In the meantime, the federal government invests millions of dollars each year in research and development of its in-house foreign language teaching capacity, but it has no mechanism for developing such a capacity in the private sector, where the national need is at least equally great.

A similar case could be made for many important domains of internationally oriented research. This mismatch between the research tasks that need to be done and the general mechanisms we have for allocating resources is one of the primary incentives for creating a freestanding National Foundation for International Studies. We are very unlikely to be able to put in place the organization of information and knowledge about other parts of the world so long as we try to fit the requirements of that task about the edges of existing programs whose principal orientation is elsewhere. The analysis of political trends in other societies need not be "hard science" to merit public support. Work on modern foreign language teaching need not remain unfunded because it is not a traditional humanity. Selection of overseas research topics should not be determined by the least common denominator among the interests and sensitivities of two countries.

Recommendation: *A major function of the Foundation should be to supply dependable, substantial funding for investigator-initiated research on topics selected for their importance to our understanding of other countries and the international system.*

Regranting Programs

In establishing a program to support internationally oriented research, it would be well to avoid constructing another major

[11] "$54 Million Awarded by the U.S. for 10 Education Study Units", *New York Times*, December 1, 1985, p. 39.

administrative structure similar to those now managing NSF, or NEH, or similar research funding agencies. Moreover, the kind of country, regional, and topical expertise needed for the selection and review of projects in international studies is exceedingly complex and requires special knowledge, much of which can be found only in the private sector. The most efficient way to proceed is through contracting for the services of regranting organizations. One of the first tasks of the Foundation should be to explore the several experiments in allocating research funds to the nongovernmental organizations that serve as regranting authorities for the allocation of specific research grants, subject to general policy setting and review by the Foundation.

Fortunately, some models have already been developed for that purpose, and before proceeding their experience should be reviewed. In the private sector, the Ford Foundation has long provided funds in support of unrestricted basic research through the joint committees of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) and the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS). Over many years, the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX) has received substantial support from a number of private foundations, as has the American Institute of Indian Studies (AIIS), to distribute grants for research in Eastern Europe and India, respectively. The Hewlett Foundation has provided endowments to a number of the major research universities to provide seed money for international research by scholars on particular campuses. Within the federal government, one of the most successful programs in support of unrestricted, investigator-originated internationally oriented research is administered by NEH. It is essentially a regrant program bypassing the normal NEH review process for individual projects. NEH makes available to the area-specific joint committees of SSRC/ACLS funds for internationally oriented humanities research, with "humanities" defined very broadly. There is no equivalent social science regranting program at NSF, although while excess currencies were available, NSF, NEH, and, more consistently, the Smithsonian Institution provided nonconvertible Indian rupees in the equivalent of a regrant strategy to the AIIS to be distributed to individual American scholars in support of their research in India.

Another federal regrant program supporting internationally oriented research was recently established for Soviet and East

European studies under the Soviet-East European Research and Training Act of 1983 (P.L. 98-164, Title VIII, 97 Stat. 1047-50). This program, administered through the Department of State, is in its second year of operation and is entirely a regrant program. More than $4 million is allocated annually, mainly for research in block grants to national-level scholarly organizations such as the SSRC/ACLS joint committees, the Kennan Institute of the Woodrow Wilson Center at the Smithsonian Institution, IREX, the National Council for Soviet and East European Research, the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, and the Harvard Russian Research Center. They, in turn, distribute the funds on competitive application to individual researchers. In addition, a few grants are given to nonprofit organizations and universities for activities in training, bibliographic work, and publication, but essentially Title VIII is a regrant research program.

It is interesting to examine a sample of the topics of the research supported by Title VIII, topics that illustrate clearly the functions of basic, investigator-originated research in enriching our understanding of other societies. They provide the broad canvas against which public policy deliberations must stand.

1. The Demographic Revolution in the USSR
2. Soviet Support for Revolutions in the Third World
3. Soviet Political Leadership, 1976-1986
4. Bank-rolling in the USSR: Impact of Western Capital on the Soviet Union
5. Construction of East European and Soviet Macroeconomic Databank
6. End of a Peasant Society: The Transformation of the Soviet Countryside
7. Female Labor Force Participation in the USSR
8. The Genesis of Soviet Threat Perceptions
9. History of Russian and Soviet Public Health
10. Islam and Nationalism: Ivan's Political Agenda
11. Soviet Data Bank: Career Patterns in the Soviet Bureaucracy
12. Soviet Union and the Two Germanies: Perceptions and Policies, 1984-1986

13. A Very Long Dream: Sixty Years of Czech Communist Literature
14. A Social History of Engineers and Engineering Culture in Russia and the USSR, 1880-1980

Evaluation reports on NEH and the Title VIII regranting programs indicate that they have been quite successful in providing funds for an impressive array of research on topics of the investigator's choosing. The record also shows that the regranting organizations have administered the selection process so that issues of quality and the importance of the topic were paramount. This experience with regranting programs suggests ways in which the basic, investigator-originated segment may be funded without the construction of an elaborate intragovernmental infrastructure and without bending the research agenda to the current, short-term needs of particular clients.

There are problems with these programs. First, not all world areas or topical domains have as rich a national scholarly superstructure that can be marshaled to direct a regrant program. In South Asian studies, the AIIS has, to date, been solely concerned with overseas research, and there is no mechanism for dealing with U.S.-based research projects. Where natural regranting organizations do not exist, either the Foundation would have to assume responsibility for the programs itself, or perhaps another organization with long experience in managing international scholarly research, such as the Smithsonian Institution, could be called upon to play the regranting role. The second problem is that these programs are too limited in scope, and the third is that their funding is too uncertain. The NEH regrant program covers only the humanities, and is subject to the uncertainties of biannual application and funding. The Title VIII program supports research only on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and its future is uncertain, since it is a small program buried in a mission-oriented agency whose primary mission has nothing to do with research.

Pilot projects and piecemeal solutions will not meet the demands for organized knowledge about other countries that the coming decades will bring. To provide durable, cross-sectional support for research in international studies, an organization for which this is a principal purpose will have to be created. This is a task for the Foundation.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should explore ways of expanding and reproducing successful regranting programs to cover all of the world areas and relevant disciplines. Where a sufficient number of existing organizations have a demonstrated capacity to administer such grants, they should be asked to compete for and administer the funds. In those areas, the Foundation should play a policy setting and review role. Where there are no or too few such organizations, the Foundation itself, or another federal organization with a history of successfully administering internationally oriented research (such as the Smithsonian Institution), should administer the funds.*

Chapter 7

Overseas Linkages

We obviously cannot deal with the increasing internationalization of our society by staying at home. Nor do we. Our increasing absorption into the global society has been accompanied by an American diaspora sending our citizens in ever-increasing numbers to each and every part of the world. Before World War II American travelers to, say, New Delhi or Osaka were few and the number of American residents there minuscule. Now it is difficult to stand for very long in the airport of even so remote a place as Leh, Ladakh, without meeting at least one other American—tourist, business executive, government official, professor, student. Recent terrorist attacks on air travelers and eddies of anti-Americanism may stanch some of the flow for a while, but millions of Americans will continue to travel abroad.

There is little point in trying to limit or direct much of this outflow, but part of the movement of people, ideas, and skills is so essential to our national interest that special government and privately supported programs have been developed to sustain it. Basing our international linkages solely upon the somewhat random process of individual-initiated journeys would assure that some of the most important ones would not occur. It is not surprising, therefore, that a thicket of intersecting but separately funded and administered programs, both public and private, should have grown up to foster what are usually referred to as international exchange and training programs. Almost every federal government agency and many private foundations have their own. Together, they constitute a potpourri of nationally supported international exchange and training programs, amounting to somewhere near $1 billion annually. In 1984, federal programs for international exchange and training involved approximately 90,000 participants moving into and out of the United States and cost $742.1 million,[1] and this is without counting an approximately $100 million program conducted by the Department of Energy for taking physicists and other atomic scientists to and from the United States. Programs sponsored by nongovernment organizations, universities, and colleges would add many more millions of dollars and thousands of participants.

In addition to programs of the U.S. government that provide direct support for international exchanges, federal funds mix freely with private funds and even those of other governments to sponsor a number of exchanges. The Institute of International Education, a private organization in New York, in 1984 administered 163 different transnational education and training programs sponsored by 120 governments, foundations, corporations, universities, and binational and international agencies worldwide.[2] In 1984, the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) and the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) jointly expended federal funds (primarily on regranting authority from the National Endowment for the Humanities) and private foundation funds (primarily from the Ford, Hewlett and McArthur Foundations) to send 67 predoctoral and 132 postdoctoral research scholars to 66 countries. In 1984, the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), again mixing federal and private monies, sent 25 American graduate students, 27 professors and 31 language teachers to the Soviet Union while 21 students, 25 professors and 32 language teachers came here. Additionally, the United States sent 63 junior and senior scholars to the seven other East European countries with which IREX organizes exchanges, while 78 scholars came here. Some foundations run their own programs, for example, the Marshall Fund,

[1]For these and other data on governmentally supported international exchange and training programs as of 1984, see *Report on U.S. Government International Research and Training Programs*, 1984 (Washington DC: United States Information Agency, 1985, mimeo).

[2]*Sponsored Projects, Nineteen Eighty-Four* (New York: The Institute of International Education, 1984), p. 5.

the Scandinavian Foundation, and the Luce Foundation. And individual multinational corporations sponsor educational exchange programs for their own employees' children as well as others, for example, Caltex, American Express, Banco de Bilbao, Chase Manhattan, Citibank, Ford Motor Company, RCA, and Levi Strauss. In aggregate, then, these programs involve substantial sums of public and private monies, and large numbers of people.

The consequence of such a rich array of programs for international exchange and training is, in one respect, a tribute to our country's diversity, its mix of public and private support in meeting national needs. Seen cross-sectionally, however, it borders on chaos. For instance, the combination of U.S. government agencies separately sponsoring exchanges seems bizarre to the cultural affairs officer sitting in an embassy overseas who has to deal separately with each program. For example, in India for 1984, programs bringing Indians to the United States included two different programs in the Agency for International Development (AID), two in the Department of Agriculture, one in Commerce, three in Interior, two in Transportation, six in Health and Human Services, two in the National Science Foundation (NSF), and seven in the U.S. Information Agency (USIA). There were 17 different U.S. government programs taking Americans to India. Similarly, there were 25 different agency programs taking Japanese to the United States and 27 taking Americans to Japan.[3] And if we add the privately funded programs, the complexity increases even more. Each of these programs doubtless has its own rationale and mandate, but surely some overall planning articulating the various programs would not be out of order. Is a mirror image of the American governmental structure the way to organize our exchanges with these countries, particularly when most individual agency programs have developed with little reference to what other agencies are doing, or to the overall complex of government-sponsored programs?

Similar questions could be asked about the overall geographic profile of our exchanges. If we were to start from scratch, would the distribution of international exchange and training

[3]For country profiles, see *Report on U.S. Government International Research and Training Programs*, 1984, appendix A.

programs among the different countries be what we have now? Leaving aside the Department of Defense training programs as a special case, would we by design put some one-fourth of all of our exchange and training resources into just six countries: the United Kingdom, Germany, Egypt, India, Japan, and the Philippines? Would we send almost one-third of the Americans we send abroad under official auspices to Western Europe and Canada, and only half as many to Latin America and the Caribbean? Perhaps, but at a minimum this pattern of concentration needs to be debated.

And given the likely change in the nature of technology flows in the world of the future, should we spend so overwhelming a proportion of our national resources on training people from other countries compared with the need to send Americans abroad (42,252 foreigners versus 14,736 Americans in 1984)? Would we put quite so much stress on training and the export of American technology,[4] compared with a strategy for importing or exchanging technology and ideas with other nations? Would military training supported by the Department of Defense (16,980 foreigners) loom quite so large in our strategy, or AID (10,143), or the Peace Corps (5,661)? Together these programs alone reach almost twice as many foreign nationals as the total number of Americans served. Reflecting, as it does, the period of unrivaled American technological supremacy, the period in which we believed that the answer to the world's problems lay in bringing all nations to a technological par with the United States, is this emphasis on technology export the one best suited for the decades to come? And if the balance ever was heavily tilted in favor of American intellectual supremacy, the intellectual world is much more clearly multicentric now. How, in these changed circumstances, do we develop a technological and intellectual import policy to match our highly developed export policy?

These are the kinds of issues that the National Foundation for International Studies should address through the collection of the relevant data and through the conduct of the public dialogue

[4]For an interesting discussion of this issue with respect to our reopened scholarly relations with China, see David M. Lampton, Joyce Madancy, and Kristen M. Williams, *A Relationship Restored: Trends in U.S.-China Educational Exchanges*, 1978-1984 (Washington DC: National Academy Press, 1986).

needed to create an overall national strategy. We are not suggesting that in the area of overseas linkages, any more than in the support of research discussed in the previous chapter, our system of productive pluralism should give way to a single czar in charge of all exchanges, nor that our exchange policy should be bent to a single purpose. It would be useful, however, if the Foundation were to take a more than occasional look at what the full range of transnational exchange and training programs is with respect to a particular country or set of countries, private as well as public. A start on this process is represented by the establishment within USIA of an Exchanges Policy and Coordination Unit, which maintains a computerized file of federal agency programs, and issues an annual report summarizing and aggregating data pertaining to those programs. This unit was established as a result, in part, of a General Accounting Office report[5] urging "meaningful coordination" of our international exchange and training programs. There is no evidence, however, that policy decisions have been made on the basis of these data, nor do they include consideration of any of the diverse private programs that are also operating in this area.

The essential point, however, is not just to assemble another computerized data bank, no matter how rich, but to use the cross-sectional data currently available to consider what our overall national policy ought to be. For a while, it looked as though this would be done. In June 1982, USIA established an Advisory Panel on International Educational Exchange. At the outset it seemed as if it would make an attempt at establishing an overall federal policy in this area. Its mandate was to determine "the purposes, magnitude, and format of international exchange programs in each of the following sectors in the United States: the U.S. Government, the private non-profit sector, the private-for-profit sector, and higher education."[6] However, by the time the final report was written, the panel's recommendations were focused solely on the Fulbright program, leaving the others in the data bank.

[5]*Coordination of International Exchange and Training Programs* (Washington DC: General Accounting Office, 1978).

[6]Minutes of the First Meeting of the Advisory Panel on International Educational Exchange (Washington DC: United States Information Agency, 1982, mimeo), p. 1. The final report was issued in March 1986.

What is needed, of course, is a periodic look at the overall dimensions of our transnational exchange and training programs. At the minimum we must create a grid of purposes, clients, countries, and programs so that the government's various programs can fit into an overall national strategy, privatizing and helping to marshal nongovernmental resources where appropriate, funding and administering those that are obviously the responsibility of the federal government, and helping to facilitate and coordinate the full range of national activities. We mean by this "coordination" and not "central control." International exchanges are almost the prototype of the "mixed economy" in international studies—that is, some portion comprises governmental activities, the other private. The sponsors are widely dispersed both within the government and in the private sector. The exchanges also involve delicate bilateral negotiations that must be conducted separately with many different foreign governments. The difficult task is to develop a coordinating and facilitating strategy that retains the best of the energy and inventiveness of the individual initiatives but allows the nation constantly to take the overview: measuring the effect of the many dispersed initiatives against an overall national agenda; calling attention to cross-purposes and overlap; consolidating or subdividing programs where that is useful; and calling attention to, and in some cases actively seeking to fill in, glaring gaps in our national coverage.

This would surely be a useful role for a Foundation concerned with international activities more generally. Its proposed role as both a private and a public entity would enable it to address both kinds of programs. Whether it should carry out these activities internally or contract them out to an organization is a question to be decided on the basis of efficiency and cost-effectiveness. In any event, the criterion for judging the success of such a venture should not be the comprehensiveness of the data base—although this is surely a consideration—but the extent to which policy decisions are made based on its findings.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should play a central role in international exchanges as fact finder, planner, coordinator, resource marshaler, and, for some programs, funder and administrator of international exchanges.*

THE FUNCTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGES AND TRAINING

Questions concerning the mix of sponsors, countries, and domestic versus overseas investments are worthy of examination. Even more important, however, is a fresh look at the fundamental purposes of exchanges, with a particular eye to whether some of the important purposes outlined in the preceding sections of this report are being realized. In the most general terms, our international exchange and training programs serve the following principal purposes:

1. They train nationals of other countries in a particular skill or, more generally, expose them to our educational system, particularly echnical education. This function includes, for instance, such programs as the Department of Defense's International Military Education and Training Program and Foreign Military Sales Program; AID's Academic and Technical Training; the Food and Drug Administration's Foreign Visitor's Program; the Center for Disease Control's Visiting Scientist Program; the Peace Corps; the Department of Agriculture's International Training Program; the Department of Interior's training programs administered through the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the U.S. Geological Survey; the Department of Labor's Technical Assistance Programs; and, in the Department of Transportation, the Federal Aviation Administration's and the U.S. Coast Guard's classroom and on-the-job training for foreign nationals. To some extent, the Fulbright lecturers program fits within this category as well, as do what might be called the "show and tell" programs in which the various agencies—in addition to those mentioned, such organizations as the Census Bureau, the Library of Congress, the Small Business Administration, and the Social Security Administration—introduce foreign nationals to their activities.

   In addition to the publicly supported programs, there are a wide variety of private programs dedicated to the provision of technical training for foreign nationals. For instance, this has been a principal interest of the Ford Foundation for many years; and the Rockefeller Foundation has just committed \$300 million over the next five years to promote social and economic development in the third world, building upon the 2,000 or so scientists and technicians it has helped train over the years. There are a number of nongovernmental organizations that specialize in providing just such services. And of course, substantial university funds serve this purpose through the award of fellowships or teaching assistantships to foreign students.

2. Historically, our second major purpose in international exchange and training programs is to expose foreigners to the United States and Americans to other countries as part of our public diplomacy, and as an investment in long-term familiarity with and friendly attitudes toward the host country. This is the central purpose of USIA's short-term visitor program and the Fulbright program, which explains their traditional emphasis on first-time visits. It motivates the recently inaugurated Youth Exchange Initiative, the East-West Center, most of the General Exchange Agreement with the Soviet Union, the programs of the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission, and a large number of privately financed programs for high school and college students, including many study-abroad programs financed jointly by institutions and individuals. It is to serve this purpose that the various cultural exchanges in the visual and performing arts are conducted.
3. A third purpose is to facilitate the more equal exchange of technology and information—to create and maintain an international scientific network. This sort of network, including transnational sharing of research facilities and collaborative research, has been especially notable in the natural and health sciences. This includes the public health visitor and guest worker programs in which foreign scientists are invited to work in various laboratories, such as those maintained by the National Institutes of Health, the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, the Food and Drug Administration, the Department of Energy, and NASA. NSF's cooperative science program falls into this category. Its goal is to maintain a two-way street between the United States and other countries in the promotion of international science. In addition, other governments, international organizations, and major universities contribute to this function of international exchange.
4. The fourth function, the least developed of them all, is the support of research about other countries and the overseas training of those who conduct that research. This includes the research scholar portion of the Fulbright programs, the Smithsonian, and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) and NSF international research grant programs, plus research funds provided by private foundations either directly or through broker organizations such as IREX or the SSRC/ACLS.

These, then, allowing a little for overlap and for a few specialized rograms that do not quite fit, are our de facto policy goals for international exchange and training programs. Clearly, the proposed Foundation could not and should not attempt to intervene in all of these programs. It would be foolish to try to recreate in a new entity the expertise and experience required to carry out the first two functions, and, to the extent that it involves the natural and health sciences, the third function. The Foundation's special contribution would lie in other areas: (1) extending the goal of durable international science networks (the third goal mentioned above) to the social sciences and the humanities; (2) putting on a solid footing programs to promote adequate research on other countries (the fourth goal mentioned above); and (3) introducing fresh programs to serve several goals that are high on the national agenda for the future, but that are not covered in any of the existing programs. Let us start with the latter.

LANGUAGE STUDY ABROAD

Until very recently, there was little, if anything, in exchange and training programs that was dedicated to raising the level of foreign language competency of Americans. This statement is a little too sweeping in that occasionally there were foreign language prerequisites, explicit or implicit, in predoctoral-level overseas research grants, and sometimes individuals were allowed to spend some of their fellowship time studying a language. Fellowships granted under Title VI of the Higher Education Act (HEA) can be and have been held at the advanced overseas language training programs. And many university- and college-sponsored study-abroad programs are either overt or thinly veiled foreign language learning programs.

What the statement means is that we have not really looked at the relationship of overseas exposure to the acquisition and reinforcement of foreign language skills. And yet, if citizens whose career requires a foreign language skill are to be other than novices, they will benefit by topping off their domestic training with a disciplined course of training overseas. If they are going to keep those skills active or rejuvenate them after a period of disuse, then repeated periods of exposure in the country where they are spoken is absolutely essential. And while professionals who need to use a foreign language skill for professional purposes need such exposure, an even more urgent case can be made for foreign language teachers who might infect generations of students with their inadequate or decaying competencies. The rhythm, purposes, and mode of selection of our current overseas fellowship programs are not, to put it gently, pointed in that direction. The Rockefeller Foundation has just introduced a competitive program to send secondary school teachers abroad for just this purpose. This pilot program needs to be watched and, if successful, extrapolated with a combination of state and federal funds. Similar programs need to be aimed at other groups with "a need to know."

What is needed, of course, are not just the fellowships to send the people abroad for language training, but the creation and sustenance of the institutions where that training can effectively be given. Although not limited to them, this need is especially pressing with respect to some of the less commonly taught languages, and has led to the creation of interuniversity consortia to provide post-second-year intensive training in six countries for students training to be language and area specialists. Oddly enough, the federal support given to these programs comes not from funds appropriated for this purpose, but out of Fulbright-Hays funds administered through the Department of Education, which are designated for group projects abroad in general. This is a precarious source of funding and makes difficult the establishment of long-term planning attuned to the needs of overseas language training. Beyond that, it puts these students into competition for funding with a host of other unrelated applicants and, given the limited amount of funding, makes their support uncertain. The overseas advanced language training centers require an appropriation at a level sufficient to carry out an expanded mission.

These programs are now limited by and large to students preparing to be area specialists. The need is much more general. As is the case in other aspects of foreign language training, the overwhelming allocation of government resources is confined to government personnel. The Department of State and the Department of Defense maintain extensive overseas language training programs for government employees. As already noted, some resources need to be invested in the private sector as well. Similar overseas language programs are needed for American business executives, for established academics, and for other professionals with a need to acquire high-level skills. Training in the United States is not enough, and just dumping these learners into jerry-built indigenous language training schools in many countries of the world is not a solution.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should provide sustained support for overseas language training centers to provide instruction at an advanced level and on an intensive basis for academic and nonacademic personnel.*

FOREIGN EXPERIENCE AND THE TRAINING OF INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS EXECUTIVES

The second aspect of the national agenda that should be of concern to the Foundation is the training of future business specialists to help improve our international competitiveness. It is curious that this pressing national need has entered so little into the planning for future directions of exchange programs. Part of the reason for this is that our notion of the function of exchanges is still rooted, in part, in the notion of the United States as the principal creator of science, technology, and business systems. It is under this premise that such a large portion of our international exchange and training is aimed at one-way technological transfer, as indicated earlier. The tens of thousands of foreign visitors who come to learn under our technology-transfer exchange and training programs, plus the 350,000 foreign students who annually study at our major universities, indicate that we still have a major scientific and technological base that draws people from abroad. But in many areas our dominance, our near-monopoly of technology and technical education, is beginning to slip. The countries with substantial AID and Peace Corps programs are contracting more and more to a subset of the least developed countries in Africa, the Middle East, Southeast Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean. In earlier days, international science was dominated by Americans. Now only about a third of world-class international science is carried out in the United States. The same is true in the health sciences.

Nowhere is this multicentric trend in the location of technological innovation clearer than in business training. While Harvard, Stanford, and the Wharton School still attract large numbers of foreign students, increasingly other institutions, particularly in Europe, are drawing them as well. The training pathways of American students studying to be business leaders, particularly those planning to specialize in international business, need to be rethought. They must learn to live in a multicentric business world where both companies and educational institutions are worldwide. Some recognition of this fact may be seen in the decision by the American Society of Engineers to send several hundred American engineering students to Japan. American business students need to be exposed to the different business perspectives in companies and training institutions in other countries. They need opportunities to study or intern abroad to give them a more global perspective on the conduct of American business. And what is good for students is also appropriate for the continuing educational experience of business leaders. Executive seminars that provide training to midcareer business executives now occasionally take place in a foreign setting. This practice needs to be much more general.

Needless to say, none of the federally supported exchange and training programs is aimed at the needs of students training to be business leaders or of those already engaged in business. To some extent, international exposure and training already occurs within the large multinationals, but it is not generally available outside of them. A more collective national capacity to foster such international experience is clearly needed. And since the investment in international expertise of business students and executives will benefit individual companies as well as the nation as a whole, some of the costs of this kind of exchange should be borne by business. There are already precedents for this in the Office of Private Sector Programs and in the private sector contributions to the President's International Youth Exchange Initiative in USIA. An easy way to begin experimentation in this area is to include overseas activities under Part B of HEA Title VI.

Recommendation: *The Foundation, through its board of international business advisors, should help to accumulate both public and private resources to create opportunities for students to* *study in business training schools abroad and to intern with foreign-based firms.*

OVERSEAS TRAINING AND RESEARCH OF AREA SPECIALISTS

Students

Opportunities for foreign study among students training to be academic specialists on other countries are currently funded through a variety of sources. They include a section of Fulbright-Hays that is administered by the Department of Education in conjunction with the HEA Title VI program for just this purpose; dissertation-level grants, largely using NEH and Ford Foundation funds, retailed through the area-oriented joint committees of SSRC/ACLS; a similar program through IREX; an indeterminate share of USIA's general Fulbright program for American students wishing to study abroad; and fellowships, again largely with federal funds, awarded by overseas research service organizations like the American Institute of Indian Studies (AIIS), which regrants NSF, NEH, and Smithsonian funds, largely in "surplus" currencies.

This diversity of sources, each with its own guidelines and application procedures, makes the search for fellowship funds for exposure to the country on which one wants to become a specialist a complex and harzardous process. The rhythm of graduate training brings the student to the fieldwork stage of his or her education in a particular year; the scramble to find the resources to conduct that fieldwork—without which the student will not become a fully trained specialist—leaves both the timing and the outcome of that search in considerable doubt. The funds available for work in particular world regions is dependent on program preferences that have little to do with the nation's need for trained specialists on that area. Moreover, funds for the foreign sojourn come almost entirely at the dissertation stage, when all of the coursework has been completed. Equally fruitful would be opportunities for students to spend abroad perhaps briefer periods of time, earlier in their training, both to advance language skills and to give substantive courses the sense of reality that only a visit to the country of specialization can provide.

In short, the current system of providing grants allowing future language and area specialists to visit their countries of specialization is capricious, inflexible, and poorly tailored to the needs of students. There is a provision in the newly reauthorized HEA Title VI for the incorporation of funds for foreign travel into the fellowship package of students chosen for longer-term support. If this second tier of fellowships is adequately supported, overseas training may be fitted more effectively into the overall training of specialists. There will still be a need, however, for open-competition fellowships for students who do not quite fit into the full longitudinal pattern—they come to an area specialization too late, they are in disciplines in which the amount of time that can be devoted to area specialization is limited, they are trained at universities where there is no major language and area studies center for their region.

The support and management of the overseas training of future language and area specialists is a finite task that should be at a minimum coordinated and at a maximum fully carried out by a single organization, preferably one concerned with the support and management of the other aspects of language and area studies as well. It could allocate the individual grants through national organizations such as the SSRC/ACLS joint committees, IREX, or AIIS, where peer review and selection can be most effectively carried out; but a collective intelligence would be given to issues of distribution, numbers, and evaluation so that the process could best serve the national interest. The proposed Foundation is a natural candidate for such a role.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should fund a program of fellowships for overseas study and research by students training to be language and area specialists. Some of this fellowship support would be integrated into the new second-tier fellowships to be created under the reauthorized HEA Title VI, while some of it would be retained in a pool available to a wider range of students. These funds could be used not only for dissertation-year research but for earlier visits for language training and general familiarization. The Foundation could dispense fellow-*

ship monies through existing national organizations currently engaged in selecting and monitoring such grants. It would continue to play a planning and monitoring role in the overall fellowship program.

Established Specialists

The need for overseas exposure for those training to be language and area specialists is equally great for established specialists. By the term "established specialists" we mean not just academics on the faculty of universities, but people with a high degree of competency on other countries. This would include people in public policy positions, journalists, educational administrators, and others who are fully using that competency professionally in various occupations throughout the society. For all such people, the obsolescence of a language and area competency can be very rapid indeed, and normal sabbatical rhythms make the fraying of competencies likely. It seems odd that we invest so heavily in the training of new specialists but do so little to sustain the competencies of the existing pool. The situation of sparse, uncoordinated, ill-fitting fellowship support for students is even more striking for specialists. The only fellowship support specifically aimed at their needs is the small program of 40 grants annually covering all countries for faculty research abroad under Fulbright-Hays as administered by the Department of Education, plus a few country-targeted programs administered by regranting organizations such as IREX and AIIS. The joint committees of SSRC/ACLS have small amounts of money to dispense for marginal, supplemental research support for faculty, but not on the scale to make a major research trip possible. Some scholars fit into the general faculty research category of the Fulbright-Hays program administered by USIA, but these are relatively few (716 for the whole world in 1984); more than half of them (392 in 1984) are for Western Europe, where language and area studies tends not to be well represented; they have to cover the entire research community, not just area specialists; and often there is a preference for first-time visits rather than the repeated-visit pattern more characteristic of area specialists.

Also like students, established specialists have needs not met by academic-year-long grants tied to a specific research project. Even more than the students, they need flexible funds to be spent on short-term visits to sustain contacts with scholars in the host country, to rehone language skills, and, particularly in the social sciences, to keep up to date with current events. Very few funding programs allow for such necessary functions.

While programs serving academic specialists are sparse and unintegrated, there are none, or almost none, serving nonacademic specialists. Theoretically, a number of programs admit nonacademic participants, but in fact their orientations and screening procedures make nonacademic applicants very unlikely, and those actually winning awards even less common. If a program is to serve nonacademics, it must do so deliberately.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should provide funds for overseas visits by established professionals specializing on other countries. Special programs should be developed for key nonacademic groups. All fellowships should be flexible as to purpose and duration, and should be funded at a level so that high-quality candidates could participate without immense personal sacrifice. The allocation and administration of the individual fellowships should be carried out by organizations already established in the field, organizations that are accustomed to the management of overseas fellowship programs; but the general planning, distribution, fiscal control, and monitoring functions of the program would be the responsibility of the Foundation.*

OVERSEAS RESEARCH FOR THE DISCIPLINES AND PROFESSIONS

While the needs for overseas visits of area specialists are both pressing and obvious, there is a broader intrinsic need of American scholars in general for overseas research opportunities. It is self-evident that American scholarship as a whole would be severely hampered were it not for the opportunity for overseas research. This fact is clearest when we consider those academic disciplines and specialties that exist, or largely exist, only because they take as their subject matter phenomena that do not occur, or only partially occur, within our national boundaries. Many scientific disciplines expand the knowledge base for which they are responsible in direct relation to their access to materials and sites not located in the United States: anthropology, archaeology, botany, entomology, geology, linguistics, natural products chemistry, primatology, and zoology, to name some obvious examples. Were specialists in these fields limited to the United States, the sciences for which they are responsible would be severely limited in scope and importance. To this list can be added many other specialties in both the humanities and the social sciences that describe themselves as "comparative," as in comparative economics or comparative literature. Thus the leading rationale for overseas scholarship is that whole disciplines and specialties would disappear, or nearly so, in its absence.

Closely related to this category of internationally oriented disciplines are those that take as their research matter phenomena having to do with relations among nations. Scholars in these disciplines would be adversely affected by a diminution of overseas research opportunities. A case in point is research on international economics—trade and tariffs, the international monetary system, the transnational flow of capital and labor. There are also the investigation of international law and politics and, of course, international security. Then there are topics that spill across international boundaries. Human migration, infectious diseases, Islamic fundamentalism, and transnational science are all obvious examples. In these instances, then, we discover other aspects of science that draw their subject matter not from a single culture or nation, but from the facts of intercultural and international life. To conduct research in these specialties requires opportunities to travel and study abroad.

There is a third category of disciplines that may not be crossnational or international in focus, but that advance in part through sharing with colleagues abroad, disciplines including such long-established fields as mathematics and physics, and such newer specialties as computer science and cognitive science. A significant "international science structure" has been put in place since the end of World War II in order to realize the substantial advantages of scientific sharing and collegiality.[7] As we noted earlier in the case of business and technological development, scientific and scholarly research has become increasingly multicentric. If we do not permit our scientists and scholars to "go where the action is," as a nation we will slip behind and become largely irrelevant to the cutting edge of knowledge.

Because the need for interaction between scientists in the physical and health sciences has been so obvious, elaborate structures, both governmental and private, have been erected to make that interaction possible. Some problems limiting the mobility of scientists remain: conflicting national tax policies, national restrictions on the issuance of work permits, making provision for dual-career families, and home institution sabbatical and promotion policies.[8] But programs supporting American participation in international aspects of the natural and health sciences are substantial. They include such extensive programs as NSF's Cooperative Science Program, which in 1984 supported 1,287 American scientists, and Projects Related to Biological Diversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management. In adddition, there are numerous bilateral arrangements such as the Indo-U.S. Science and Technology Initiative. The National Institutes of Health administer a number of international fellowships through the Fogarty International Center, which include grants by foreign governments (Great Britain, France, Sweden, Switzerland, Germany, the USSR, Romania) to American scientists. The Department of Energy spends about $100 million a year on international scientific exchanges involving nuclear and fossil energy, including the management of internationally owned scientific equipment. An elaborate program of scientific cooperation to which the United States contributes both funds and personnel is maintained by NATO as well.

In addition to the government-funded international programs, in the physical and health sciences there is an extensive network of private and semipublic organizations that provide a

[7]For a discussion of the issues relating to the internationalization of science, see *International Mobility of Scientists and Engineers* (Washington DC: National Research Council, 1981).

[8]Ibid, pp. 5-6.

durable scaffolding to international science. For instance, the national academies of science, including our own, have international divisions that mediate scientific contact across national boundaries. So do the various professional associations for the scientific disciplines. These organizations and their functions are so extensive that they are gathered together into an International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU), which provides a place for constant liaison across national boundaries.

Although the same transformation toward multicentric research that characterized the physical sciences after World War II is now taking place in the social sciences and humanities, the apparatus for scientific communication and collaboration is very weak in those disciplines. To some extent, the limited amount of transnational activity in the social sciences and the humanities is a reflection of the nature of those disciplines themselves. For instance, the social sciences and humanities are not so politically neutral as many of the natural sciences. Social scientists in particular as well as some humanists can quickly venture into areas with a high political content, and there is no structure of agreed-on methods and theoretical style with which to surmount the particularities of national perspectives.

But this only makes the task more difficult, not less urgent. The current support system for scholarly transnational interaction is weak and getting weaker. NSF's collaborative science program, which devotes $25 million per year to the promotion of America's role in international science, spends a minuscule amount of that money on the social sciences, even though those sciences fall within NSF's mandate. At the outset, Vannevar Bush, the organization's founder was opposed to including the social sciences in the NSF, and they fit uncomfortably there to this day. In the promotion of international social science, they play almost no role. The NEH, meanwhile, has a strong bias in favor of activities that take place within the United States; finding NEH funding for Americans to host a humanistic conference somewhere outside the United States is an uphill battle.

Some of the efforts to bridge the social sciences internationally resided in weak organizations such as the International Social Science Council, which tried to play for the social sciences the role that the ICSU played for the natural sciences. Other segmental organizations, such as the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis in Vienna, that attempt to bridge scholarship between the countries in the East and the West are weakly rooted. Moreover, these plus a number of humanistically oriented transnational organizations were heavily dependent for funding on the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The twin processes of the diversion of UNESCO to the development needs of the third world and the withdrawal of the United States from funding that organization made our participation in even these weak efforts minimal.

In addition to these organizational weaknesses in the development of international social science and the humanities, in country after country the efforts of individual American scholars to conduct social science and humanistic research in their territory is becoming more and more circumscribed. As it was put in the report of a conference on the topic held on November 18-19, 1985:

> U.S. scholars long had the freedom to pursue their research interests in regions of the world that were either colonies of western nations or economically and politically subservient to the West. However, since World War II, the situation has changed dramatically. Many of the new nations which have emerged in the past 40 years do not allow foreign scholars unrestricted access to visit and pursue their studies. The post-war emergence of the Soviet Union and the United States as antagonistic superpowers has complicated the issue further. Among the other barriers that have been erected worldwide are the withholding of visas, close scrutiny of proposed projects, and the negotiation of reciprocal flows of scholars and scholarship.[9]

The extent of and reasons for this increasingly crippling state of affairs differ from country to country, as do the steps necessary to work in the new environment. Essentially, there is no problem with respect to the countries of Western Europe and Japan. In the case of the Soviet Union and other politically adverse countries, strict reciprocity across the range of exchanges in detailed

[9]Report on the Research Access Conference, November 18-19, 1985 (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution, 1986, mimeo).

bilateral agreements is necessary. In others, the problem is the limited size and competencies of local scholarly elites, and until the social science and humanistic scholarly community grows stronger, relationships with American scholars will continue to be difficult. Sometimes the problem is the increasing expansion of the state into control of international research access, accompanied by increasingly dense bureaucratization and the multiplication of veto groups. The long-term answer is the careful development of durable scholarly networks to nourish the transnational norms of scholarship that can withstand the creeping trend toward constraint.

This role of promoter of international social science and humanities, a role imperfectly carried out and now dropped by UNESCO, is one the Foundation could play. To do so, it should be able to speak as coordinator of the full range of exchange and training programs funded by the U.S. government. Linking such programs together rather than watching the eddies of international politics divert them one by one is a necessary step.

The participation of Americans in the international social sciences and humanities is a delicate and complex task. It is now the responsibility of no central body. There are, however, organizations in existence focusing on particular countries. IREX, for instance, manages these matters with respect to the Soviet bloc countries. There are a series of broker organizations—the American Academy in Rome, the American Institute of Yemeni Studies, the American Institute of Indian Studies, the American Institute of Iranian Studies, the American Insitute of Pakistan Studies, the American Research Center in Egypt—that now serve as mediators between the American and the foreign social science and humanities scholarly communities. Although they are organized into a formal Council of Scholarly Research Abroad under the aegis of the Smithsonian Institution, the resources available for their important task are very, very small. Some of the SSRC/ACLS joint committees appoint foreign scholars to their membership, providing foreign input into the planning and peer review process. These and similar activities can be part of a multifaceted strategy to build durable linkages across national boundaries in the social sciences and the humanities. The cost of continuing with the present system is increasing parochialism and isolation.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should take responsibility for the promotion of international cooperation in the social sciences and the humanities in much the same fashion as this task is now carried out for the natural sciences. It should play both a direct funding role, like NSF's role in the Cooperative Science Program, and an indirect role in strengthening the intermediate-level institutions currently engaged in creating and sustaining transnational linkages.*

Chapter 8

International Education for the Successor Generation

Most of the discussion of the role of the proposed National Foundation for International Studies so far has concentrated on the training and informational roles of international affairs specialists, whether in academic or nonacademic employment. There is, however, the much broader issue of the cosmopolitanization of the American public as part of its general education. In a democratic society such as ours, it is foolish to build a scaffolding of limited elites who alone possess the skills to deal effectively in the interdependent world without attending to the knowledge and understanding of international affairs in the general populace.

It seems clear that repeated efforts to address this broader problem have been of limited effectiveness because of the enormity of the problem, the immense dispersion of the educational system, and the lack of agreement on just what the content of that knowledge and understanding should be and to whom it should be given, when, where, and how. Moreover, it is not clear just what a central body at the national level such as the proposed Foundation could accomplish in this area. Decisions as to curriculum and text materials are the choices of colleges or individual professors, and at the precollegiate level are matters for state and local decisions. The federal government's few forays into this area have been painful and largely ineffective. The cost multiplier of trying to deal with the United States' 15,200 or so school districts and over 3,000 institutions of postsecondary education is enormous and the echo effect of pilot programs quite limited.

However, the widespread recognition of the need for introducing an international perspective into our general educational system and the very fact that decision making is widely dispersed have led to a remarkable upwelling of activity. A mini social movement is afoot to promote what is loosely referred to as international education. There are literally hundreds of national and regional nongovernmental organizations devoted solely to this purpose. Almost every one of the national institutional membership groups and teachers' organizations has a division specializing in international education. At the state level, there are standing committees of governors and of chief state school officers concerned with international education, and within states there are often special commissions or committees that have this as their primary charge. Recently, some of our major metropolises, in seeking to become "international cities," have been promoting international education in their areas.

At the same, time many universities and an even greater number of liberal arts colleges have separate administrators and special programs for dealing with the international aspects of their curriculum, and there are numerous consortia of postsecondary institutions, often combining the full range of institutional levels, that help to reinforce individual campus initiatives and to sustain interinstitutional collaborative efforts. Scattered throughout the country there is a very active system of academic alliances that bring together secondary school teachers and administrators with their counterparts at the college and university levels to jointly plan international, mainly language-related, teaching strategies. Citizen groups in organizations such as world affairs councils, United Nations associations, and the like act to extend international education to the general public.

In terms of national-level support, almost every major private foundation has invested in at least one, and usually several, promising pilot programs in international education. The federal government's response has been ambivalent and halting. In spite of the heavy emphasis on general education in several specially commissioned reports—for instance, the presidential commission report, chaired by James Perkins and entitled *Strength* *through Wisdom*,[1] and one commissioned by the secretary of education, chaired by James Holderman and entitled *Critical Needs in International Education*[2]—the government has not agreed to take on this task. Several times, however, it has come close.[3]

The most expansive statement of federal intent came from Lyndon Johnson; it was first formally introduced in a speech at the Smithsonian Institution's bicentennial celebration in September 1965, and was reiterated in his special message to Congress on February 2, 1966, in support of Congressman John Brademas and Senator Wayne Morse's International Education Act. Johnson wrote: "No child should grow to manhood in America without realizing the promise and the peril of the world beyond our borders. Progress in teaching about world affairs must not lag behind progress made in other areas of education."[4] He urged the establishment of regional educational laboratories to stimulate new programs in international education at the elementary and secondary levels, the growth of school-to-school partnerships to be administered by the Peace Corps, the creation of an American Education Placement Service to find placement for American professors and teachers overseas, an enhanced program of international conferences of leaders, and an increase in the international flow of books and educational materials.

The International Education Act of 1966 was somewhat more limited than Johnson's broader vision, and shifted the primary focus from a more diffuse thrust at changing the full range of our educational system to a concentration on post-secondary institutions. That act's primary purpose, however, was still to internationalize the education of a substantial

[1]*Strength through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability*, Report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies, James A. Perkins, chairman (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1979).

[2]*Critical Needs in International Education: Recommendations for Action*, Report to the Secretary of Education by the National Advisory Board on International Education Programs, James B. Holderman, chairman (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1983).

[3]For a thorough review of the history of federal support for this aspect of international education, see Rose L. Hayden, *Federal Support for International Education: Assessing the Options* (New York: National Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies, 1985).

[4]Quoted in ibid., p. 17.

portion of the general populace by strengthening international education programs at the undergraduate level. It included making grants "for comprehensive programs to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies." These included funds to support faculty planning, training of faculty members abroad, expansion of foreign language courses, international studies components of the social sciences and humanities, student work-study programs abroad, and bringing foreign teachers and scholars to campuses. Although the International Education Act was actually passed, and even renewed once by Congress, funds for it were never appropriated.

However, there were federal programs aimed at providing international education to a broad range of students at various levels of the educational system, and in and out of the classroom. For instance, in the old National Defense Education Act (NDEA) Title VI, a Citizens' Education Amendment (section 603, later Part N) was aimed at precisely the general educational goal. Its purpose was to "stimulate educational programs to increase the understanding of students and the public in the United States about the cultures, actions and interconnections of nations and peoples in order better to evaluate the international and domestic impact of major national policies." Grants could be given to any public or private organization. Priority was given to teacher retraining, post-study-abroad workshops, and summer programs for teachers, but it also included citizens' awareness forums, foreign student programs, and television, radio, and other audiovisual programs. The Citizens' Education grant program actually ran for a brief period of time, dispensing funds to organizations like the American Federation of Teachers, the Constitutional Rights Foundation, WETA-TV, the World Education Center, and the Experiment in International Living, plus a substantial number of local school systems, state departments of public instruction, and colleges and universities.

The Citizens' Education program, however, was lost in what can best be described as a fit of congressional absentmindedness. When Title VI was reincarnated as part of the Higher Education Act (HEA) in 1980, items having to do with primary and secondary education were transferred to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In the process, the Citizens' Education portion of Title VI that was supposed to reside in that act was deleted. In the following year when the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act was being written, there was some discussion of including the provisions of the Citizens' Education Amendment along with 40 other programs in the block grants provided by the federal government to state education agencies. It was not so listed, and although states are entitled to spend block grant monies for the promotion of international education, given the reduction in the general funding level and other demands for educational funds at the state level, in fact a minuscule amount of the block grant monies were spent for international education.

There have been several bills introduced, aimed particularly at foreign language teaching, that have proposed either to provide per capita funds to school districts to upgrade foreign language instruction or, at the other extreme, to provide a direct per capita subsidy to parents to encourage their children to study a foreign language.[5] Only one of these bills has made it through the complete process of enactment and appropriation, and it was for demonstration projects.

And yet the federal government does support some of these general international education purposes through parts of programs and pieces of legislation. After all, the primary rationale for the student Fulbright program, even though the selection process is heavily focused on the presumed value of the research product students promise to produce, is the general international education of an influential portion of the populace. In addition, there are teacher-exchange programs managed by the U.S. Information Agency, and foreign experience for teachers is supported by the Department of Education under its Summer Seminars program and its Group Projects Abroad.

Similarly, in the current HEA Title VI program, as much as 75% of the federally supported activities of the language and area studies centers actually take place at the undergraduate level, and each center has had a responsibility to expend 15% of the monies it receives under HEA Title VI on what is called "outreach," a catchall phrase for exactly the kinds of activities we are referring to. There are also nine centers chosen specifically as undergraduate language and area studies centers. In addition,

[5]See, for instance, the bills introduced by Paul Simon and Leon Panetta, S. 1631 and H.R. 3048.

there is a $3 million per year program under HEA Title VI to fund innovative experiments in international education, generally at liberal arts colleges. Moreover, a substantial portion of the HEA Title VI, Part B, monies allocated for linking international business and higher education is in fact given to the liberal arts and community colleges. In the future this emphasis on undergraduate education is likely to expand even further in HEA Title VI. In the proposed reauthorization of that act, there will be a separate section as well as a distinctive set of criteria just for undergraduate-oriented centers.

The federal government's reluctance to take on the mammoth task of cosmopolitanizing the national educational system is wise. Part of the problem of the earlier proposals, such as the International Education Act, was that they proposed that the federal government take on a substantial responsibility for cosmopolitanizing all of American education, intervening at many points and in many places in the educational process. Consequently, the potential cost to the federal government was immense. Rose L. Hayden reports that "all in all, the price tag attached to President Johnson's programs in international education and health was $524 million [in 1966], roughly $1.5 billion in constant 1985 dollars."[6] It is highly unlikely that the former sum, let alone the latter, would be allocated for that purpose in these days of fiscal restraint. Even the proposed Citizens' Education Amendment which would have expanded the federal mandate, was limited to $2 million annually for seed money and venture captital.

A case can be made, however, for a more modest, more pointed federal program keyed to activities whose main base of support is elsewhere, or to a limited set of initiatives that only a national program can accomplish. We have selected four kinds of activity that the proposed Foundation might engage in, each one representing a widening of the clientele to be served in the successor generation. Paralleling the expansion of the clienteles, our recommendations call for decreases in the proportion of responsibility that rests with the federal government and increases in collaboration among federal, state, and local governments as well as private funders. We have also chosen these four

[6]Hayden, *Federal Support for International Education*, p. 18.

points of leverage because they have a high multiplier effect, providing the maximal cosmopolitanizing impact on the dispersed educational system for the lowest level of federal investment.

We are proposing the establishment of Foundation programs to (1) provide international experience for gifted students of demonstrated high foreign language competency and knowledge of another society; (2) assist in the internationalization of undergraduate general education programs; (3) upgrade the foreign language competency of secondary school teachers; and (4) provide for coordination, sharing, and resource development in substantive international studies at the precollegiate level. The goal of all of these programs would be to help internationalize the education of the successor generation.

THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT

We start with the program that is most narrowly focused and for which the responsibility should be almost entirely at the national level. The purpose of the program would be to create both a dramatic point of recruitment and a reward system for high-achievement students seeking an internationally oriented career. We propose the creation of two highly competitive fellowship programs providing for sojourns abroad, one aimed at the period between the end of high school and entrance into college, and the other at the equivalent period between undergraduate and graduate training. These fellowships might, but need not, require enrollment in an educational institution abroad. The prototype for them is a highly successful German fellowship program that provides for just such an exposure at the end of secondary school training, and permits the recipients to immerse themselves in a variety of educational experiences abroad.

The periods between high school and college and between college and graduate school are the points of greatest flexibility in students' career choices, and the points at which substantial overseas experience can most effectively enrich their perspective in their subsequent education. Our educational system provides a constant narrowing of focus as students move from general education through advanced degrees. At the Ph.D. dissertation level, the scope has narrowed to a pinpoint. Interrupting this relentless march toward specialization with a relatively unstructured international experience at these key points of transition would allow students to broaden their occupational choices to include international careers. These are also the times when an individual, living at a student standard of living, is most likely to get a full immersion in the country in which he or she lives. By the time that midcareer business executives, for instance, are contemplating a move overseas, for most of them it is too late and their occupational role too restrictive for an immersion in another culture.

Like the Rhodes Scholarships, the fellowships must be given sufficient prestige and support that they can serve not only as pivotal training experiences for the individual student but also as motivation and reward for high attainment in the earlier education experience. To qualify, students would have to demonstrate a very high level of foreign language fluency as measured by the common metric we proposed earlier, and a fundamental knowledge of the foreign country in which they choose to reside. Both these screening tasks should be carried out in the manner of, and perhaps through, the Educational Testing Service's advanced placement examinations or the National Merit Scholarships. The selection process should deliberately provide for the inclusion of candidates specializing in the natural sciences or some of the other disciplines that tend to be underrepresented in international studies, such as economics, psychology, and the visual and performing arts.

The fellowships should also allow for second visits rather than reflect the Fulbright program's emphasis on first visits. It is often on the second visit, after the tourist phase is over, that the most fruitful exposure to another country takes place. Further, the fellowships should cover the full costs of the overseas sojourn so that even the least affluent students could afford to participate.

While this fellowship program is proposed here as a national competition, some of the states with highly developed international studies interests might want to initiate their own programs, particularly those that are establishing centralized educational institutions with an international focus, such as the governor's schools for international studies that a number of states have established.

The expected national payoffs from such a fellowship system would be both the recruitment of students who might become international affairs experts in various fields and disciplines, and the cosmopolitanization of high-achievement members of the successor generation who, even if they did not become experts, would bring to their future occupations an international perspective that they would otherwise not have. At the end of a suitable period of time, the postgraduation experience of those who had held these fellowships should be examined to see whether the desired effect had been achieved.

The creation and funding of such fellowships on an experimental basis could be undertaken by the proposed Foundation. Its long-term management could be handled through a nongovernment organization or through the Fulbright program administration.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should establish highly competitive fellowship programs for post-high-school and post-collegiate periods of foreign sojourn. Some of the fellowships should be earmarked for disciplines and professional groups not well represented in international studies. Selection should be based upon high performance in a foreign language, a clear study, and deep knowledge of the country to be visited.*

COLLEGIATE LEVEL

The second point of leverage for cosmopolitanizing the education of the successor generation is in the general education portion of collegiate education (that is, courses taken outside the major). While a focus on postsecondary education does not reach all of our future citizens, it reaches a substantial portion of those who will provide leadership in our society, and it does so at a level of education sophisticated enough to prepare them to deal with the complexities of our international environment. As we will note, a focus on higher education with its 3,000 or so institutions provides a more limited, more effective point for introducing international studies into the general educational system than a focus on the 15,200 school districts in the United States. And within higher education, particular points of leverage are the liberal arts colleges, whose primary purpose is to provide a broad education for their students. A federal program aimed specifically at undergraduate international education could have a major impact in preparing the general public of the future to cope in the international environment.

There is already a great deal of developmental activity under way, much of it supported by funds from private foundations and the federal government. As was noted earlier, the HEA Title VI program alone—even leaving aside the investment in undergraduate international education that takes place in the comprehensive language and area studies programs—has been investing some $3 million per year directly in general international education at the undergraduate level. The newly reauthorized HEA Title VI will have a new category of grants aimed at funding undergraduate international education over the long term rather than just providing short-term seed money for new programs, as Title VI does now. In addition, Part B of Title VI, which provides federal support for the creation of linkages between business and higher educational institutions, provides the majority of that support to undergraduate institutions.

The bane of undergraduate program maintenance is the prevailing pattern of external funding that provides a sudden infusion of monies to enable an institution to start a new program or to make a quantum jump in the scale of existing programs. The one exception to this is the undergraduate language and area studies programs supported under HEA Title VI that receive grants on the same three-year renewable cycle as graduate programs. In practice such programs constitute the lower end—in some world area groups, the middle range—of the size continuum of the language and area studies centers, and their specifically undergraduate orientation is at best problematic. For other undergraduate programs, the common practice is that the institution receives a seed money grant, then the same intrainstitutional economics take over that made it difficult to sustain international programs in the first place. The consequences of this boom-and-bust strategy are shallow roots and a high mortality rate for undergraduate international studies programs. Clearly, a strategy is needed for the provision of durable external support for longer-term institutionalization.

This strategy, however, if it is to be effective, must be based upon a firmer determination of where the national interest lies in the promotion of collegiate international studies. If the federal government and the private foundations are going to continue, and to expand, their support for international studies at the undergraduate level, some hard questions have to be asked about the service of such programs to the general national purpose, as well as about the realization of strictly intrainstitutional goals. For some three decades, individual institutions and consortia of institutions have been developing their international studies programs, but we have very little information on the collective effects of such programs and courses on the internationalization of students' outlooks. Nor has there been an examination of what the intellectual content of such courses and programs is, let alone what it should be. A prerequisite to providing national-level support for undergraduate international studies should be the adoption of an empirical frame of mind, one that would weigh alternative schemes for cosmopolitanizing the outlook of students against some standard of demonstrated effectiveness and service to the national purpose.

The usual undergraduate international education program is a mixture of several different components. Normally, they are (1) work-study-abroad programs for students; (2) faculty enrichment through professional experience overseas; (3) individual courses with a substantial international content; (4) organized internationally oriented majors and minors; and (5) the promotion of an international ambience through the importation of foreign professors and students. In making decisions as to where to focus national support for undergraduate international education and which institutions should be the beneficiaries of public support, each of these program segments—and for an instituion, all of them collectively—must be weighed against overall national objectives.

From the national perspective, there are two basic purposes of undergraduate international studies programs against which their success can be measured: (1) providing the largest possible number and variety of students with a substantial informational and empathetic base in international affairs; and (2) providing the start-up training for students who will become international affairs specialists. The former calls for reaching out to all students with some international training, the latter for rationalized course concentrations including the early stages of language training for students who will go on to specialist training at the graduate level.

It will be noted that overall program goals specify outcomes in terms of student benefits rather than characteristics of the programs per se. Hence, measures of achievement of any of the individual program segments and their collective impact must be expressed in terms of student accomplishments. This leads to such criteria of success as the following: Is the full range of students in an institution being served by study-abroad programs and specialized courses or majors, or just the foreign language, history, or political science majors? From the perspective of graduate education or later occupational placement, is there any evidence that the programs bring an appreciable number of students into internationally oriented careers? Does faculty enrichment really result in any clear spinoffs in student training? What is the relative cost-effectiveness of each of these components in contributing to either or both of the two goals—general education for most students, and serving as a feeder into the pipeline of specialization?

The general point to be made is that before a strategy for sustained national support for undergraduate education can be launched, a thorough examination of program goals and accomplishments must be undertaken. The highly idiosyncratic, spasmodic growth that now characterizes the field should be fitted into a more deliberate national strategy, with clear criteria both for selection of the campus programs worthy of support and for retrospective evaluation of the effectiveness of those programs. We cannot afford to expand our investment in undergraduate international education until some of the nebulous aspects are made more concrete and the desirable outcomes specified.

Accordingly, the Foundation could make an essential contribution by assisting in the development of student-outcome-focused criteria for success in undergraduate international studies programs. The many experiments in curriculum, course content, and program mix that have developed on many different campuses over the past several decades need to be examined and the most effective of them given support. A program of national-level funding for undergraduate international studies should be directed to the consolidation and rationalization of what has been developed on the various campuses up to the present, and to the initiation of fresh experimentation to develop prototypical models appropriate for different levels and types of institutions. Its goal should be the very wide diffusion through the collegiate educational system of successful models of international studies, both in the major and especially in the general education portion of the curriculum.

Once these models have been identified and shown to be effective, and once the demand for international education at the precollegiate level matures, the models developed in undergraduate institutions should be widely diffused into the secondary and even the primary education system. In fact, in the case of comprehensive international studies centers, undergraduate programs receiving federal support should be required to spend a portion of their federal monies on what is called "outreach". It is from the outreach activities of the undergraduate programs that the stimulus for development of a secondary education strategy for substantive international studies could best be developed.

The time is ripe for a hard-headed look at the accomplishments of past efforts in international education at the collegiate level, and for providing long-range support for a set of programs demonstrating the greatest service to the national goals. Once such programs were selected on the basis of a clear set of evaluative criteria at the national level, they could serve as guideposts for other programs at the collegiate level and even for precollegiate education as well. The setting of the evaluative criteria, the funding of developmental efforts in the short term, and basic support over the long term would be natural functions for the proposed Foundation.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should fund and direct an effort to develop evaluative criteria based on the national interest for international studies programs at the undergraduate level. For the most successful programs it should provide funds for longer-term support on a five-year cycle, and it should take steps to assure that such programs serve as prototypes for similar programs at both the collegiate and the precollegiate level.*

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AT THE PRECOLLEGIATE LEVEL

The broadest approach to the successor generation is to introduce an international perspective into primary and secondary education. However, as we noted earlier, responsibility for these levels of education does not lie primarily with the federal government, nor are they amenable to direct intervention from a national organization, no matter how laudable the cause. Nonetheless, there is a federal role in helping to coordinate and aggregate local effort so that it becomes more cumulative and more effective. International studies is a prime candidate for such an effort, since the benefits of cosmopolitanizing the successor generation are so obviously national rather than local, and since to the extent that such studies reach overseas, the federal government alone has the mechanisms for asssuring the necessary foreign contacts and access. At the same time, given the immensely expanded demand on resources that a full-scale effort in all 15,200 school districts would require, the national role must be selected with a careful eye on parsimony. This and the following section will show how limited federal intervention might be most effective in each of the two main components of international studies at the precollegiate level: foreign language instruction, and substantive instruction about other countries and the global society.

It is interesting to note that almost all of the discussion of state-level activity under the rubric of "foreign language and international studies," and most of the proposed federal legislation aimed at promoting such studies at the state and local level, turns out to be foreign language training and not substantive international studies. It seems that the generalized feeling that something must be done to deparochialize America has been translated almost entirely into a widespread movement to introduce or strengthen foreign language requirements. A May 1983 survey of state educational authorities by the National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies[7] found a sharp increase in the importance these authorities assigned to foreign language study between 1969 and 1980, and an even more

[7]Ibid., p. 41.

pronounced increase between 1980 and 1983. For instance, in the southern states alone, in 1969 only 36% of the state education agency representatives rated foreign language high in importance, while in 1983 67% did so. This increase in the general importance given to foreign language instruction has been accompanied by a major expansion in legislatively or administratively mandated foreign language requirements. Now 23 states require that foreign language instruction be made available in schools, and most of the rest have reported their intention to do so.[8] And more and more colleges and universities are requiring foreign language study for admission. This, of course, has an immense feedback effect on the demand for foreign language instruction in the schools.

Throughout this report we have commented at considerable length on some aspects of the problems of foreign language instruction. Almost all of the preceding recommendations, however, called for centralized activities to be carried out mainly by institutions of higher education. We still believe that much of this centralized development effort is necessary before large amounts of fresh national resources are poured into the existing system of foreign language instruction. It is clear, however, that proceeding with centralized innovation without involving and assisting the large numbers of dedicated teachers currently engaged in foreign language instruction is of limited value. Moreover, the surge in foreign language requirements is placing immense stress on the existing system, stress that is being felt acutely throughout the country. For a local school administrator or a college dean, expanded foreign language requirements translate into a need for more teachers, and there is neither the lead time nor the facilities to train large numbers of new teachers if the new requirements are to be fulfilled. The result will be the further dilution of the skill levels our students actually attain in a foreign language.

To exacerbate further the problem for many school districts, this sudden swelling of demand for foreign language teachers is

[8]For an even more current survey with a brief exposition of the nature of the requirements and recommendations, see Jamie B. Draper, Elizabeth H. Graham, and Tamara S. Johnstone, "State Initiatives and Activities in International Studies" (Washington DC: Joint National Committee on Languages, March 1986, mimeo).

taking place just when there is immense ferment and experimentation concerning the proper way to teach foreign languages. Older ways of providing instruction are becoming unsettled, and new technologies and methodologies are being dumped into the system with increasing frequency, confronting school administrators and teachers with the constant threat of obsolescence. Moreover, most of these new technologies call for costly equipment and are more labor-intensive than current instructional systems. They demand considerably higher levels of both language and teaching skills on the part of the teacher than current methods normally require. For the teachers, there is the added threat of attrition in the level and currency of their own language skills, particularly oral skills. Most teachers do not have the opportunity to hone those skills periodically to the required level of competency. Both the students and the teachers suffer from that loss.

The problems of a suddenly increased demand for language teachers and the need to upgrade the existing corps of teachers confront almost every school district. It seems foolish to have each of the 50 states inventing a solution individually. Moreover, the solution for such problems often requires taking actions that cross the boundaries of institutional levels— going from secondary to tertiary education, for instance—and across political boundaries. Fortunately, steps are being taken toward a cooperative solution. The Council of Chief State School Officers[9] has recently proposed the creation of a consultation and assistance program to help states cope with the demands raised by expanded foreign language requirements. The need for coordinated action at the state level provides an excellent opportunity for limited federal investment in internationalizing the education of the next generation. A cooperative program, initiated by the states and jointly funded by state and federal monies, would perform a very useful function at the ultimate distribution end of foreign language instruction, the individual classroom; but it would work through one or a few points of leverage, such as the chief state school officers or some other appropriate official. Such a program would

[9]"International Dimensions of Education: Position Paper and Recommendations for Action" (Washington DC: Council of Chief State School Officers, November 1985, mimeo).

provide support for fellowships to speed the training of new cohorts of teachers, and in-service training programs linked with periodic overseas sojourns to assure both currency and fluency in the skills of the existing corps of teachers. The selection of the teachers for these fellowships should require demonstrated foreign language proficiency as measured by the common metric. Indeed, the fellowhips could be linked to domestic training in new developments in foreign language pedagogy including those spelled out earlier in this report.

The federal contribution would be particularly important in the overseas part of the program, since chaos would ensue if the arrangements for teachers traveling abroad for language skill reinforcement and upgrading had to be negotiated by each of the 50 states in each of the relevant countries. Central management of such a program is essential, and only the federal government has the capacity for making effective educational arrangements in many countries abroad. The proposed Foundation would be a natural place to locate the management of the federal side of the language teacher training program.

Recommendation: *The Foundation should join with the states through the chief state school officers in supporting and managing a cooperative program to increase the supply of qualified language teachers, and to sustain and upgrade existing foreign language teachers' competencies, through the sharing of successful innovative teaching strategies, in-service training programs, and fellowships for foreign sojourns. Care should be taken that programs dealing with the wide base of the language teaching system are interrelated with the more centralized innovations and changes in language teaching recommended throughout this report.*

SUBSTANTIVE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AT THE PRECOLLEGIATE LEVEL

While we know what is meant by foreign language training at the elementary or secondary level, it is much less clear what the content of courses and the style of instruction should be to provide our future citizens with what is usually called global awareness or a global perspective. Most reports that propose such cosmopolitanization write eloquently of American students' ignorance of international matters,[10] but the reports are rather imprecise as to how that ignorance is to be corrected. In primary and secondary schools, substantive instruction in international studies takes the form of courses in world geography, world history, and comparative cultures and peoples, with perhaps a few courses on the global environment or conflict resolution. In the more progressive schools, there is also an attempt to create for the students an occasional international ambience through the presence of foreign visitors, through student exchanges and class trips abroad, and by exposing students on campus to the dress, handicrafts, and foods of other countries.

Unlike foreign language instruction, these ventures into the introduction of international education into the primary and secondary school curricula tend to reflect the interest and enthusiasm of particular teachers or the selection of a particular textbook rather than the commitment of the educational system as a whole. International studies other than foreign language instruction is given relatively low priority by the state education administrators. Only one state—Hawaii—requires by law that international studies be in school curricula, and only 12 other states through legislation or regulation recommend its inclusion in the school curriculum. The swelling movement in favor of extending substantive international education at the precollegiate level does not appear to be as strong as the drive for enhanced language requirements. Nor is international studies likely to be expanded through a change in the coverage of the textbooks. Most publishers do not view the internationalization of their textbooks as a particularly useful or economically rewarding thing to do. The parochialism of the students, the textbooks, and most of the teachers is fairly evenly matched.

The relatively primitive level of development of international studies at the primary and secondary school levels, the dispersed decision making on curricula and teaching materials, the relatively low level of competency on international affairs of

[10]See, for instance, Ernest L. Boyer, *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America* (New York: Harper & Row, 1983).

most teachers, and the weak administrative support for introducing international studies materials into the curriculum mean that the precollegiate level is probably not the place to initiate a concerted drive to cosmopolitanize the education of the successor generation. A direct attack on the content of substantive courses in precollegiate international studies will have to await the development of greater systemic support of the kind that is coming to characterize foreign language study.

There is, however, a useful role for a national Foundation even at this early stage of the development of substantive international studies at the elementary and secondary school levels. While not quite so abundant as counterpart efforts at the collegiate level, there are many scattered efforts to develop curricula and teaching materials suitable for this purpose. In addition, there have been a number of attempts to link higher education and precollegiate education so that innovations that occur in the former can be diffused and transformed to be effective in the latter. Moreover, there have been many ad hoc attempts at providing teachers with the requisite competencies to bring an international dimension into the schools—workshops, group travel abroad, special summer seminars, foreign curriculum consultants. Several dozen national organizations exist whose primary purpose is to introduce international perspectives into precollegiate education. All of the internationally oriented professional associations have special sections for which this is the primary purpose. Teachers' organizations, particularly the sections dealing with social studies, have standing committees on international education. Several of the major private foundations have funded interesting pilot projects dedicated to the same goal.

The overwhelming impression one receives from this rich undergrowth is one of diffuseness—interesting experimentation, but little accumulation. What is clearly needed at this stage of development are facilities for the sharing of experience and materials, for the accumulation, evaluation, and dissemination of promising approaches and materials. In the earlier version of NDEA Title VI there was a provision for the creation of regional international studies resource centers to play just such a role. When the elementary and secondary education items were separated from that act, that provision was lost. The usefulness of a few such centers is even more evident now than it was then. Accordingly, we recommend the establishment of a relatively few experimental education laboratories in international education to serve as facilitating, coordinating, resource mobilization, dissemination, and training centers. So that the efforts of such centers have some impact on what actually happens in the schools, they should be responsible to and partially funded by the state school system. In this way, national and local resources and programmatic experimentation could mingle to begin to develop a successful strategy for introducing an international perspective into the education of all members of the successor generation.

Recommendation: *The Foundation, in collaboration with state and local authorities through the chief state school officers, should create and sustain a few experimental international studies resource centers to help accumulate, evaluate, and disperse teaching materials and the results of curricular experimentation throughout the precollegiate educational system.*
