Section 2　North America

Hiroshi Ota

Universities in the Pacific Rim are developing international education programs and offices to attract more international students. There is fierce competition among institutions for the increasing number of international students. The worldwide increase of international students in the 1990's included a modest 10 percent gain for Canada. However, it fades when comparing to an about 150 percent increase in Australia (CBIE, 2002). The U.S. used to account for more than 40 percent of the total number of international students in the world. But after the 9.11 event, many prospective international students have chosen Australia and the U.K. as a destination of study abroad because the U.S. government tightened up its immigration policy towards international students and those two countries have deployed their well-organized recruiting campaign throughout the world. Under the severe competition, some researchers criticize that many English speaking countries commodify higher education programs and degrees at their institutions maximizing the advantage of English as both a native language and a lingua franca in the name of "internationalization."

In the following sections, the context of internationalization in North America (mainly in the U.S.) will be explored in consideration of historical backgrounds and rationales.

1. Definitions of Internationalization of Higher Education in North America

How is the internationalization of higher education defined by researchers in the U.S.? Some scholars defines internationalization is the process of making more campuses internationally-oriented (Pickert & Turlington, l992; Hanson & Meyerson, l995; Harari, l989). It can be conceptually shared with Japanese counterparts under the "internationalization at home (campus)." Others argue it as the process of integrating international education into the curriculum, and this is the core of organizational change as pervasive for the entire institution, not peripheral in nature (Mestenhauser, l996; Lambert, l989; Harari, l992, l989; Klasek, l992). Furthermore, some researchers' perspectives on internationalization include increasing the numbers of programs and opportunities for studying international affairs and infusing the whole curriculum with international viewpoints (Tonkin & Edwards, l98l).

In North America, internationalization of universities is generally focused on education, not research. Advocates of internationalization state education, especially

curriculum, should be central to internationalizing campus since research is international in nature from their point of view. This argument also has the implications of historical and political rationales regarding the internationalization of higher education in the U.S. as well as of internationalization of the study fields along with globalization which is one of the most powerful forces everywhere in the world, most notably the economy, information and communication technology, and national security. Throughout the U.S. there is evidence of "a pervasive and increasing internationalization of the disciplines[1]" (Groennings & Wiley, l990, p. 27). Moreover, from the viewpoint of that internationalization should reflect a change in learning outcome, the concern on the whole is "to produce graduates who are well suited to the blend of international cooperation and competition which is likely to prevail in most fields in the decade ahead" (AIEA, l996, p. 7).

The concepts of internationalization often refer to not only curriculum but also people in the campus community. Harari (1992) equates creating an international ethos on campus as integral for the curriculum and campus personnel (including faculty, students, and staff). Based on the premise of this argument, he describes what makes an institution truly international. "It is faculty with an international commitment striving to internationalize its own course offerings. It is the presence of an obvious institution-wide positive attitude toward understanding better other cultures and societies" (Harari, l992, p. 75). Association of International Education Administrators (1990) presents the definition of internationalization putting public service as a significant role of university. Internationalization is "the incorporation of international contents, materials, activities, and understanding in the teaching, research, and public service functions of universities to enhance the relevance in an interdependent world" (p. 2). International educators like members of NAFSA: Association of International Educators advocate systemic international infusion by weaving international perspectives into every discipline, every major and minor requirement, faculty hiring decision, and mission statement for universities. From the afore-mentioned definitions and concepts, there are various phases and aspects for internationalizing higher education.

In the meantime, how is the internationalization of higher education defined by Canadian researchers? Knight (2004) defines "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of

---

[1] Internationalization of education and curriculum is not a central issue in Japan because one of the main roles of Japanese universities has been to import western knowledge and technology and teach them to students since the beginning of Meiji era. Thus, it is said that the advocacy of internationalizing education and curriculum is weak in Japan since the contents and material of courses are highly westernized and internationalized (in a narrow sense).

post-secondary education" (p. 11). The term "process" is often found concerning the definition of internationalization. It is used to "convey that internationalization is an ongoing and continuing effort. The term *process* denotes an evolutionary or developmental quality to the concept" (p. 11). Process is also thought of a tripartite model of education, i.e. input, process, and output. Then, why are not the other two words used to conceptualize internationalization? Knight (2004) explains, "If internationalization is defined in terms of inputs, outputs or benefits, it becomes less generic, as it must reflect the particular priorities of a country, an institution, or a specific group of stakeholders" (p. 11).

2. Characteristics of U.S. Higher Education and Their Implications for Internationalization

Considering the environmental characteristics in which higher education operates in the U.S. in its effect on internationalization, EI-Khawas (1994) mentions four key points:

    a. There is no national, governmental policy that guides campus action.

    b. The main sources of advice and guidance for campus action are private.

    c. The actions of each college and university with respect to international activity depend, to a substamial extent, on the decisions of institutional leaders.

    d. International activities, by and large, must depend on self-financing mechanisms (p. 90).

In addition, referring to the above traits, there is a direct relationship between the circumstances that EI-Khawas (1994) describes, the unorganized approach to international education, the dominance of political rationales, and the overall character of U.S. higher education, for instance, the federal government cannot effectively coordinate mass higher education. Kerr (1994) mentions, American universities and colleges "have always been subject to some pressures and constraints from their surrounding societies" (p. 9). At the same time, U.S. higher education has been "a world of comparative institutional autonomy and comparative individual academic freedom" (p. 9).

In the 20th century (especially after the 1920's), U.S. higher education has become dominant. Until the turn of the 20th century, American universities were subject to and heavily depended on European universities. One of the primary roles of the American universities was to import advanced knowledge, science and technology from European institutions through American faculty and disseminated them in the U.S. However, since the turn of the century, the academic relationship between the U.S and Europe had been

turned upside down gradually. Currently, U.S. higher education is described as not only the largest national system and the most widely acclaimed system, but also has many unique features and its diversity. However, at the same time, it is criticized for the isolated and insular character (the combination of parochialism and arrogance) of the system (Clark, 1994). This negative description is not only for higher education, but a feeling of cultural parochialism prevails in American society and people who are highly educated. "Americans frequently tell themselves and are told by others that they are a parochial lot, ignorant of world geography, people, and events," according to Lambert (1994, p. 12). Harani (1992) also point out the fact that "it is unfortunately clear that at the national level we remain somewhat parochial arid monolingual, if not monocultural" (p.56). This a reason why international education in the U.S. places a emphasis on overcoming parochialism and has been mainly an undergraduate issue, particularly study abroad, as a part of the general education that students have to receive in preparation for specialized education at the graduate level and for their future careers (de Wit, 2002).

The fragmented development of a great number of not directly related international activities, projects, and programs (study abroad, international students, international and area studies, and technical assistance, in general brought together under the umbrella name of "international education"), "and the prevalence of political rationales (foreign policy, national security, peace and mutual understanding) over other rationales determine the international dimension of higher education in the United States between the beginning of the twentieth century and the end of the Cold War" (de Wit, 2002).

In the context of marginal federal policy for and commitment to higher education in the U.S., the driving force for internationalizing universities has to be derived from other factors and motivations, both outside higher education sector and from inside the institutions (de Wit, 2002). In consideration of the development of international education, both trends and rationales are clear. "Foreign policy and national security on the one hand and a strong emphasis on personal development, peace, and mutual understanding and multicultural exposure on the other dominate among the rationales" (de Wit, p. 37). In that sense what Halpern (1969) generalizes international education in the U.S., "Confronted, as it was, with the demands of patriotism and internationalism it chose the former while espousing the latter" (p. 90). Economic rationales and academic rationales, which are dominant in both Australia and the U.K. regarding internationalization, have only recently begun to get more attention in the U.S. The above-mentioned context explains "the strong ethos approach in American international education, present at both the institutional level and the intermediate level between the

federal government and the higher education sector, as well as the relatively strong presence of private foundations and organizations in international education and the strong advocacy culture" (de Wit, p. 38).

3. Internationalization of Canadian Higher Education

Due to limitations of space, the current situation and problems are only described regarding internationalization of Canadian higher education. Research on internationalization of universities in Canada has strengthened its presence in academia since numerous scholars refer to Knight's developing definitions of internationalization. Furthermore, Canada's efforts to both make its society truly multicultural and enhance a spirit of tolerance towards different cultures have established reputation well. Nevertheless, some problems are point out concerning internationalization. International education is not yet a significant part of curriculum, teaching and learning in Canadian universities, because curriculum has traditionally been mono-ethnic and change is slow as faculty members tend to teach the way they were taught (Knight, 2000). Because of transition to knowledge based society, faculty members are increasingly under pressure to cover "core" content material at the expense of international education and social issues (Knight 2000). As a consequence, despite calls for global and multicultural perspectives, international education remains at the periphery of teacher education programs (Bennett, 1992).

4. Concluding Remarks

"Internationalization is the process of integrating an international perspective into a college or university system. It is an ongoing, future-oriented, interdisciplinary, leadership-driven vision that involves top administrators creating an institutional vision and motivating people in both academic affairs and student affairs units to change an entire system to think globally, comparatively, and collaboratively while reacting to multi-dimensional environmental changes in global political, economic, social, and cultural arenas. It is the way an institution adapts to an ever-changing, diverse external environment that is becoming more globally-focused (Ellingboe, l996a)".

It has been a combination of parochialism and arrogance that determined since the second quarter of the 20th century and motivation for the international dimension commonly referred to as international education in the U.S. The international dimension of higher education in the U.S. became more organized and structured after World War II (under the Cold War). This dimension was stimulated by a combination of a call for peace and mutual understanding and in particular by diplomatic policy. In the

post-World War II years, the Cold War drove American governments to stimulate international exchange and cooperation for reasons of defense, public diplomacy, and national security (de Wit, 2002). Even after the Cold War these have continued to be the main rationales for the support of the federal government, although the competitiveness of research and education in American universities as well as acquiring highly potential human resources (international students) from abroad in order to keep developing cutting-edge science and technology with the business motivation are increasingly entering the arguments for the rationales of internationalization.

American higher education has been developing a wide-range of activities, programs, and projects in international education, mainly at the undergraduate level, for instance, international curriculum development, area studies, foreign language training, study abroad, international student exchanges, international student recruitment and advising, and development cooperation and assistance. And these have been established more professionally than any other countries (de Wit, 2002). At the same time, however, most universities do not have an internationalization strategy for the whole of the institution. As Mestenhauser (1998) describes that international education in the U.S. is unintegrated and fragmented. This can be explained through the characteristics and unique features (decentralized system) of American higher education and the role of the federal government as well as private foundations and associations with respect to higher education.

〈**References**〉

Association of International Education Administrators Working Group (l996). *A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States.* Recommendations based on August l0-11, l995 Meeting, B. Burn and R. Smuckler, co-chairs. Pullman, WA: AIEA Secretariat, Washington State University.

Bennett, C. (1992). Strengthening Multicultural and Global Perspectives in the Curriculum. In K. Moodley (Ed.), Beyond Multicultural Education* International Perspectives. Calgary, Alberta: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.

CBIE. (2002). *The National Report on International Students in Canada 2000/01*. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.

Clark, B. R. (1994). The Insulated Americans: Five Lessons from Abroad. In P. G. Albach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), Higher Education in American Society. New York: Prometheus Books.

De Wit, H. (2002). Internationalisation of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe: a historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis, Greenwood Studies in Higher Education, Connecticut: Greenwood Pres.

El-Khawas, E. (1994). Towards a Global University: Status and Outlook in the United States. *Higher Education Management, 6*, 90-98.

Ellingboe, B.J. (l996). *Divisional Strategies on Internationalizing the Curriculum: A Comparative Five-College Case Study of Deans' and Faculty Perspectives at the University of Minnesota.* Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis, June 27, l996.

Groennings, S. & Wiley, J. (l990). *Group Portrait: Internationalizing the Disciplines.* New York: The American Forum for Global Education.

Halpern, S. (1969). *The Institute of International Education: A History.* Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University.

Hanson, K.H. and Meyerson, J. (eds.) (l995). *International Challenges to American Colleges and Universities: Looking Ahead.* Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and The Oryx Press.

Harari, M. (1992). The Internationalization of the Curriculum. In C. B. Klasek (Ed.), *Bridges to the Future: Strategies for Internationalizing Higher Education.* Carbondale: Association of International Education Administrators.

Harari, M. (l989) *Internationalization of Higher Education: Effecting Institutional Change in the Curriculum and Campus Ethos. Occasional Report Series on the Internationalization of Higher Education, Report #1.* Long Beach, CA: California State University, Center for International Education.

Kerr, C. (1994). *Higher Education Cannot Escape History: Issues for the Twenty-First Century.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Klasek, C.B. (l992) In Hanson, K.H. and Meyerson, J. (Eds.) *International Challenges to American Colleges and Universities: Looking Ahead.* Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and The Oryx Press.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization Remodeled: Definition, Approaches, and   Rationales, *Journal of Studies in International Education, 8(1)*, 5-31.

Knight, J (2000). *Progress and Promise: The 2000 AUCC Report on Internationalization at Canadian Universities*, Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.

Lambert, R. D. (1994). Parsing the Concept of Global Competence. In R. D. Lambert (Ed.), *Educational Exchange and Global Competence.* New York: Council on International Educational Exchange.

Lambert, R.D. (l989) *International Studies and the Undergraduate.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Mestenhauser, J.A. (1996) Portraits of International Curriculum: An Uncommon Multi- dimensional Perspective. *Seminar Paper for the Spring l996 Faculty/Student Seminar: "Internationalization of the Curriculum" and a Working Paper in the Institute of International Studies and Programs' Series on Semester Conversion and Internationalization.*

Mestenhauser, J. A.(1998). *Reforming the Higher Education Curriculum: Internationalizing the Campus,* Phoenix: American Council on Education and The Oryx Press.

Pickert, S. and Turlington, B. (l992). *Internationalizing the Undergraduate Curriculum: A Handbook for Campus Leaders*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Tonkin, H. & Edwards, J. (l98l). *The World in the Curriculum: Curricular Strategies for the Twenty-first Century.* New York: Change Magazine Press.