

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 951

24

HF 001 600

AUTHOR Gumperz, Ellen McDonald
TITLE Internationalizing American Higher Education:
Innovation and Structural Change. Project Title:
Curriculum and Organization: Asian and African
Studies.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and
Development in Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Cooperative Research Program.
BUREAU NO BR-5-0248
PUB DATE 70
GRANT OEG-6-10-106
NOTE 272p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$1.25 HC-\$13.70
DESCRIPTORS *African History, *Asian History, Curriculum,
Curriculum Development, *Curriculum Research,
*Educational Research, *Higher Education, Research

ABSTRACT

This study considers the programs of "foreign area studies" in American higher education as a case of curricular innovation and seeks to determine their impact upon the educational system. The report (1) assesses the impact of international programs by analyzing the relationships between programs and their institutional settings; (2) compares changes produced by innovation in the institutions studied; and (3) discusses reasons for various impacts of programs on the national level. The 15 page conclusion summarizes the report with emphasis on 4 significant variables: (1) the degree to which the institution has preconceptions governing its curricula; (2) the position of the originators of the foreign areas program within the institution; (3) the structure of decision making about curricular matters within the institution and (4) the character of scholarly traditions governing the study of particular world regions. (Author/NF)

CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

*T*he Center for Research and Development in Higher Education is engaged in research designed to assist individuals and organizations responsible for American higher education to improve the quality, efficiency, and availability of education beyond the high school. In the pursuit of these objectives, the Center conducts studies which: 1) use the theories and methodologies of the behavioral sciences; 2) seek to discover and to disseminate new perspectives on educational issues and new solutions to educational problems; 3) seek to add substantially to the descriptive and analytical literature on colleges and universities; 4) contribute to the systematic knowledge of several of the behavioral sciences, notably psychology, sociology, economics, and political science; and 5) provide models of research and development activities for colleges and universities planning and pursuing their own programs in institutional research.

The research reported herein was supported by Grant No. OE-6-10-106, Project No. 5-0248-2-7, with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, under the provision of the Cooperative Research Program. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Report Series

ED038951

BR-5-0248
PA-24

Internationalizing American Higher Education: Innovation and Structural Change

Project Title

Curriculum and Organization:
Asian and African Studies

ELLEN McDONALD GUMPERZ

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

1970

HE 001 600

Acknowledgements

My debts to many of the individuals and institutions mentioned in the following pages are large. Many organizations were more than generous in opening their archives to me and furnishing me with documentary information; many faculty members and officers of educational ancillary organizations cheerfully allowed me to take up their time. Among the latter I am particularly grateful to Dr. Rowland Mitchell and other staff associates of the Social Science Research Council; Mr. Melvin Fox of the Ford Foundation; Professors Jane Harbaugh and Michael Mahar of the Committee on Undergraduate Education, Association for Asian Studies; Mrs. Victoria G. Spang of that Association; and Dr. D. Lee Hamilton and members of the Institutional Assistance Section, Bureau of Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education.

At the colleges and universities I visited, I am especially indebted to the following individuals: Professors D. G. Mandelbaum, J. J. Gumperz, and Ralph Retzlaff, and Mrs. Cleo Stoker, University of California; Mr. James Kantor of University Archives, University of California; Professors Milton Singer, McKim Marriott, and Bernard S. Cohn of the University of Chicago; Professors A. T. Embree, and J. Mason Gentzler, formerly of Columbia University; Professor Lewis Hoskins and Mrs. Darlene Greenman of Earlham College; Professor Margaret Bates of the Four College Asian-African Committee; Dean

Mary Woods Bennett and Professor Edward LeFevour of Mills College; and Professors Peter Wright and John Lin of the State University College at New Paltz, New York. Professor Singer's special aid in letting me see an early draft of his article in Donald N. Bigelow and Lyman Legters, The Non-Western World in Higher Education, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, v. 356 (1964) is here gratefully acknowledged. Numerous other individuals at each campus also contributed to this study. I wish I could list them all.

Many individuals here at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education have also contributed substantially to this monograph. Research for Chapter 2 was done by Gail M. Omvedt, Ruth Soltanoff Jacobs, and A. A. Albers, as well as by the author. Bibliography for this report was compiled by Jan Brukman, William Boyd, and A. A. Albers.

This report bears tangible evidence of my debts to my colleagues at the Centers, from whose sustaining dialogue and criticism I have received a continuing education. For their particular help, I am especially grateful to T. F. Lunsford, Joseph Axelrod, Harlan Bloland, and Jerry Gaff.

I am, of course, solely responsible for the views expressed here and for any shortcomings in this report.

Ellen McDonald Gumperz

Contents

Introduction	
Foreign Area Studies as Educational Innovation	vii
PART I. The National Level	1
1. Development from 1870 to 1950	7
2. Development from 1950 to 1966	28
PART II. The Institutional Level	77
3. Case Studies: Colleges	93
4. Case Studies: Universities	168
Conclusion	
Foreign Area Studies and Educational Change	221
References	237

Introduction

Foreign Area Studies as Educational Innovation

As the quickening pace of general social change emphasizes the need for change in educational forms and practices, educational research has turned enthusiastically to the study of educational innovation. One writer goes so far as to predict that the 1960's will be known to future historians as the "Decade of Innovation [Gaff, 1968, p. 17]." The rapid rate and variety of the changes, however, have raised difficulties of definition and delimitation which appear upon even a casual inspection of the literature on educational innovation. Thus, under the rubric of educational innovation varied topics have been discussed: the introduction of new educational techniques and media; the development of new forms of organizational cooperation, such as consortia; state planning for educational development; the improvement or establishment of educational institutions for minorities, handicapped persons, and other special groups not explicitly served by established educational systems; the planning of utopian experimental colleges better able to achieve the goals of informing and changing student minds, personalities, and characters; and change in the content of instruction imparted through educational systems.

It is with the last of these types of educational innovation that this report deals. The chapters which follow will consider

~~vii~~

v

programs of "foreign area studies" in American higher education as a case of curricular innovation and seek to determine their impact upon American higher education. The purpose is twofold. One aim is to improve understanding of the contribution of foreign area studies, an innovation motivated originally by considerations of national policy, to the modernizing of liberal arts education in mid-twentieth century America. In the field of educational research, hopefully this study will contribute to a new and growing literature which systematically analyzes change processes in educational systems. A brief exploration of the social-psychological and structural approaches to educational innovation will help to define an analytical framework for the research.

THE SOCIAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

Social-psychological research centers upon the definition of predictable properties of the change process (Pellegrin, 1966; Miles, 1964a). It looks for inspiration to the fields of applied anthropology (diffusion of innovations in medicine and agriculture) (E. M. Rogers, 1962) and business administration (theory of planned change) (Bennis, 1966; Bennis, Benne, & Chin, 1961). The emphasis is two-pronged. Common characteristics of the processes by which new practices are diffused through educational systems, and across different kinds of educational systems, are sought (Guba, 1968). Also, particular attention is devoted to social-psychological

aspects of the innovation process, for example, the role of the innovator and the psychological impact of innovations (Newcomb, et al., 1967; Evans, 1968). Thus, this research tradition tends to focus primarily upon cultural processes and individual roles (Carlson, 1964; Chesler, 1963; Mead, 1964; Pellegrin, 1966), with less explicit attention to social structure. It is hoped, according to Miles (1964a), that through the study of educational innovation, "there is a very real possibility that our theoretical understanding of social change can be...refined [p. 127]."

In fact, because of the inadequately developed state of theories of social change (Bennis, 1966), the relationship between theoretical writings on educational innovation and the theory of social change has developed quite differently. Lacking general theories of social change into which to fit the study of educational innovation, theorists have tended to classify elements of the innovation process, rather than to analyze the process by specifying the rules through which the interaction of elements produces predictable outcomes. Nowhere is this classificatory bent more apparent than in the study of curricular change. Using a large number of descriptions of curricular changes in elementary and secondary schools secured by his students, Mackenzie (1964) identified six components of curricular change: teachers, students, subject matter, methods, materials and facilities, and time. He observed,

ix

vii

These six components were so consistently present... that it is reasonable to conclude that to change the curriculum is to change one or more of these six components [p. 402].

Such classifications tend to fragment the concept of innovation without ever really defining it, but this is not a concern of the classifiers since the purpose of such research is a practical one: to increase control over change processes in education, to identify and bring about desired changes. An important consequence of this approach, however, is that interest in the innovation apparently ceases at the point of introduction of the desired change. Little attention in this body of research has been directed to the subsequent fate of an innovation in the unit to which it is introduced. This gap in research appears to result from the assumption that innovations are accepted in a social group or unit, such as a school system, because they are believed to fit the needs and desires of the group better than present practice. As Miles (1964a) has phrased this point of view, "It seems useful to define an innovation as a deliberate, novel, specific change, which is thought to be more efficacious in accomplishing the goals of a system [p. 147]." Thus, in the ideal case, an innovation has no subsequent history, for it merely improves the existing system.

From the social-psychological perspective, human behavior and, therefore, the behavior of systems made up of groups of human beings, is goal-oriented, consisting of the perception of needs and wants

x

-1

on the part of the individual or system, followed by activity to satisfy those needs and wants. Acceptance of an innovation by a system, in this view, is activity to satisfy better the perceived needs of the system, while rejection of the innovation, or opposition to it, can be explained as failure to perceive the relationship of the innovation to the needs.

This view of innovation is common among students of educational innovation, not merely because many of the researchers have been social psychologists but because it is consistent with the widespread view that the purpose or goal of the educational enterprise is to improve the human beings who pass through the system. Assuming that the ultimate purpose of all educational innovations is to improve educators' ability to improve the human product, why, then, do some innovations encounter opposition, meet rejection, or fail to achieve what is expected of them when accepted? And how applicable to the study of curricular change is this view of innovation?

A researcher initially faces difficulty in attempting to create a research design based upon a conception of educational innovation as goal-oriented behavior within a goal-oriented educational system. The view implies that the boundaries of the system can be ascertained, that it is one system, and that it has an overriding goal which can be defined and to which all members of the system assent. Clearly the concept of system is essential to any analysis (Bloland, 1969; Griffiths, 1965; Wayland, 1964). Yet, early in the research reported

here it became clear that proponents of foreign area studies were basing their arguments upon its hoped-for benefits to several different systems: government (foreign area studies would be a patriotic service to the American government), the country at large (foreign area studies would make college graduates into better world citizens capable of understanding America's responsibilities in the modern world), and liberal education (foreign area studies would modernize liberal education which had too long concerned itself exclusively with the western European cultural tradition). In addition, some argued that foreign area studies would benefit knowledge itself--by enlarging it.

These differences emphasized the familiar fact that higher education in America is only conceptually isolable as a bounded system; each college and university answers to, and is interpenetrated by, its separate publics, and higher education in general answers many purposes. The result of multiple publics and multiple purposes is multiple goals. Even at the level of the individual institution, where the concept of system would seem easiest to apply, subunits with varying purposes exist--departments of instruction and research centers, graduate professional and undergraduate general education. Diversity in goals is impossible to avoid. These difficulties suggest that goal-directed behavior can best be defined by reference to the structure of the system to which the goals relate and that structural analysis must precede the study

of innovation as goal realization.

THE STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS APPROACH

The importance of institutional structure in studying curricular innovation is underlined by the fact that, except in very small institutions (I. L. Rogers, 1964), such change seldom subsumes all possible subunits of the institution. Curricular change may produce profound reorganization in the arrangements for teaching, as in team teaching in elementary schools or an interdepartmental program in a college or university. However, while the arrangements for the innovation will undoubtedly require the time and attention of the budget officer, it is unlikely to require the reorganization of the budget office. Structural analysis permits us to define the relevant universe of analysis and turns our attention in an organized fashion to other important facts. Not everyone in the system being studied, for example, will instantly favor a proposed change, since it will be seen to affect their position within the institution in some fashion. Thus, various individuals and groups of individuals will have specific interests determined partially by facts of institutional organization and, because innovations are the objects of decision-making and political processes, these system-related interests will come into play before and after the innovation's acceptance. As Wayland (1964) has bluntly observed,

Understanding of the structure of American education--
both the structure of local units and the relationships
between these units--is essential as a background for

understanding educational innovations....If, in fact, one's assumptions about the structure are erroneous, the content of proposed innovations may be open to serious question, and explanations of success or failure will be inadequate [p. 588].

Systemic, or structured, behavior is considered to consist of those regularities in the behavior of human groups which persist despite changes in the membership of groups. A system consists of the principles of behavior governing these regularities which may be abstracted from observation of group behavior. Thus, we cannot determine the amount of change any new procedure produces in a system solely by reference to the origin of the innovation and the developmental stages through which it travels. We must also consider the implementation of the new procedure after its acceptance. "To say whether or not a norm is institutionalized is to say whether or not structural arrangements support it [Goodman, 1962, p. 37]."

The study of structural alterations made to accommodate new practices permits us to assess the changes wrought by new practices.

To illustrate the differences between these approaches, suppose that a faculty group wishes to introduce a study program concerning oriental civilization and philosophy into a college whose entire curriculum has previously been devoted to studies drawn from Graeco-Roman tradition and from the historical experience of European and modern North American civilization. The group seeks support from the entire faculty for the new program with a series of arguments: The proposed program will make the student a better

world citizen. It will help him to understand or direct today's world better. It will provide a fuller and better means of achieving the college's traditional goals of liberal education.

The social-psychological approach would focus on the activities of various parties in bringing about acceptance of the innovation (E. M. Rogers, 1962). Who was the originator of the idea? To whom did he (they) turn in attempting to get the innovation accepted? What strategies were used to secure approval? What were the characteristics of those who accepted the innovation earliest, and those who opposed it?

The social-structural approach considers these questions but also examines how the college institutionalizes the program after it has been approved by the relevant authorities. Is the new program an optional elective course satisfying no breadth, major, or minor requirements for the graduation of students? If so, the institution will have altered its arrangements primarily in name. Or will the program be made a requirement for graduation? How much of the students' time will be devoted to the new program? How much of the institution's financial resources will be devoted to the program? How will the disbursements be made? Who will be responsible for each aspect of the program? What changes will the program make in the regular activities of members of the institution? Such questions are directed to the innovation's impact on the institution considered as a system with defined patterns of

interaction among groups within the system.

Innovations may be studied by focusing upon changes in the regular interactions of groups at any level of generality where such interactions occur. Thus, for example, a "national" level of generality may be defined by the existence of organizations with established staffs which provide a setting for the occasional interactions of members of the group in their annual meetings and for more frequent interactions of the elected officers and paid staff executing the organization's business. A regional and a local level may be defined in a similar fashion. In each instance, the boundaries of the interacting groups must be defined before changes in interactions within those boundaries can be examined. Then it can be demonstrated whether the new practice has altered the regular interactions of persons in the environment.

It is important to notice that while systemic analysis is based upon observed behavior, the analysis is an abstraction drawn from empirical events and interactions. It is merely a simplification of reality for convenience in understanding processes. Moreover, there are certain limitations upon the research methods appropriate to systemic analysis. Observation of behavior is carried out most efficiently in small groups and by techniques such as participant observation. Thus, while systemic analysis is a valuable aid to understanding the behavior of large groups, probably the analysis of large group behavior will be based on observation

of a relatively smaller proportion of that behavior than in the case of small groups. Almost the only convenient substitute for observation, in this case, is the study of documents.

FOREIGN AREA STUDIES AS CURRICULAR INNOVATION

The chapters that follow attempt a social-structural analysis, without extensive quantification, of the effect on American higher education of the educational innovation termed, most generally, "international education." Considerable confusion surrounds the term international education (Fraser, 1967; Anthony, 1967). In fact, it is a convenient rubric under which three quite separate kinds of educational activities have been classed. They include: 1) participation of American universities and colleges in government- and foundation-sponsored programs for technical development abroad, in which the diffusion of American skills in engineering, agricultural science, and other technical fields in host countries is attempted; 2) teaching and research, carried on largely in university schools of education, concerning foreign educational systems ("international/comparative education"); 3) teaching and research programs on foreign societies, programs that have grown up within the humanities and social sciences on American college and university campuses, including institutionally sponsored programs of student foreign travel and study. These last programs are usually termed international or foreign area studies, accordingly

47

as they focus upon the external relations or internal characteristics of foreign societies.

All three kinds of activities evolved largely in the wake of World War II and assumed a characteristic form and content during the 1950's and early 1960's. It is not too much to say that changes in international society and in America's international position have been responsible for their appearance. Until now, however, they have been separate aspects of university and college operations, often coordinated only loosely (Hart, 1968; Butts, 1967).

Of the three types of international educational programs, foreign area study programs in undergraduate and graduate liberal arts curricula affect the oldest and most traditional functions of educational institutions. These programs also absorb the majority of the regularly budgeted funds of universities and four-year general colleges. Because foreign area studies programs have attempted to change the substance of general education at the collegiate level and also participate in the general trend toward a closer relationship between the federal government and higher education, the following chapters focus primarily upon these aspects of international education, using the tools and approach of the historian tracing change over time. Because international education is a product of historical processes affecting the relationship of higher education and society in many ways, this innovation is analyzed here at two different systemic levels: the level at which higher education

and society interact (designated in this study as the national level) and the level at which international education becomes effective as a curriculum change (designated as the institutional level).

Part I attempts to depict changes that have taken place at the national level in the relationship between higher education and society, in response to the increased emphasis on international studies. The case of international studies suggests that curriculum change at the institutional level does not leave other levels unaffected; accompanying institutional change has been development, at the national level, of a structure of representation for the "international interest" in higher education and in the interaction of government and higher education. It is not altogether a history of new organizations, although new organizations are a marked feature of the scene. Among the most important contributors to the development of an international interest are preexisting organizations that define, guide, and legitimize substantive innovations in the social sciences, such as the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies. The new ancillary organizations representing various fields of international or foreign area studies also do not, in themselves, represent any startling new organizational principle. They do, however, provide previously unavailable opportunities for regular contact between specialists in these fields and between specialists and others who

Y'V

deal with international programs of various kinds in government and elsewhere.

Changes also are apparent within government itself. Organizations overseeing technical aid operations abroad have evolved as a new branch of government since the 1940's. Organizational reforms have come about within the U.S. Office of Education, resulting from the wide extension since 1958, of federal activities in international education. Part I attempts to delineate this context, suggesting the direction of change and the character of structural response at the national level.

An analysis of the internationalizing of higher education which stopped at the national level, however, would fail to deal with more than half the subject--the educational effect in institutions of higher education. This is the subject of Part II of this report. A common factor in institutional experience is that on-campus programs of teaching and research on foreign areas in the humanities and social sciences often combine topics previously apportioned to separate teaching units. Prime examples are language and area programs and courses in the civilizations of various world regions. New organizational units, termed centers, committees, programs, or even "groups," have often been created to operate such programs, but their organization and relation to other units within the institution has been determined as much by the preexisting organization as by the content of the curricular programs with which they are associated.

Within the institutions, then, innovative practices are to some degree artifacts of the preexisting organizational context. Each curricular foreign area program is, thus, to some degree unique.

In Part II, an attempt has been made to determine common organizational effects amid individual differences at the institutional level through case studies of foreign area programs in institutions of various types. The institutions included represent both privately and publicly supported universities, a state college, four institutions in a consortium, a small women's college, and a private denominational college. In all the institutions, the programs studied had been reported in the literature. All have been in effect for at least five years, and some for as many as ten, providing a long enough period of study to permit some conclusions about the degree of institutionalization achieved.

The case studies are offered to illustrate how the development of foreign area programs is affected both by the institutions' preexisting organizational pattern and by the educational traditions from which the foreign area studies grew. This was done by selecting for study institutions with foreign area programs concerning two quite different regions. One of these regions is the Far East and South Asia, an area of study which originally developed in America during the late nineteenth century and which exhibits some assumptions about content and methods derived from an earlier era. The second region is Africa, an area on which study first commenced in American

higher education in the 1920's and has been in force only since the 1950's. Interest in this region is much more dependent on recent developments in the social sciences than is the study of the Far East.

The Conclusion assesses the impact of international programs upon American higher education by analyzing the changing interrelationships between the national and institutional levels discussed in Parts I and II and compares the changes produced by the innovation in the institutions studied.

PART I

The National Level

International studies in American higher education are at least as much a product of twentieth century political developments as of internal evolution in American education. They are a product, in higher education, of major societal change, and as such they have a national history. A large part of this history has been made by groups sometimes termed educational ancillary organizations. These organized groups contribute to the operation of educational institutions but are not in themselves educational institutions nor do they have formal, legal regulatory powers over educational institutions. Yet, because of our decentralized public educational systems, with our many local school systems and numerous private institutions of higher education, these ancillary organizations are extraordinarily important in providing a supralocal and supraregional structure to American higher education (Bloland, 1969; Wayland, 1964; Miles, 1964b).

Several kinds of educational ancillary organizations have also played pivotal roles in establishing networks of communication about international studies and in securing financial allocations to international curricular programs. They include voluntary associations of several kinds, philanthropic foundations concerned with education, and temporary commissions and committees of qualified citizens. In fact, changes in the kinds of ancillary groups that have concerned themselves with international studies,

and in kinds of activities in which the groups engaged, mark several well-defined stages in the diffusion of international studies throughout American higher education.

Three periods may be seen in the national development of international studies, differing markedly in the number and character of educational ancillary organizations dealing with international education, and in the strategies employed by the ancillary groups. Chapter 1 traces the first two periods. The first period, from about 1875 to the middle 1920's, really precedes the attempt to deal with this problem by organizations but remains important for its residual effect upon later developments. In the second period, from the later 1920's until about 1950, the main organizations to grapple with the problem of internationalizing American higher education were the three councils which deal primarily with the humanities, social sciences, and education--the American Council of Learned Societies, the Social Science Research Council, and (late in the period) the American Council on Education.

The outbreak of World War II, in the latter part of the second period, gave considerable political leverage to those attempting to introduce international studies into American higher education. The national emergency more or less forced universities into cooperation with the military authorities to provide short term, on-campus training courses concerning foreign areas designed es-

pecially for military personnel. The ACLS, of the various ancillary associations, was the most influential in shaping these wartime programs, while the ACE played a major role in assessing the postwar educational relevance of the military programs and in formulating the "national need" for international studies.

The third period, covered in Chapter 2, dates from about 1950. It may be characterized as one of regularization of the innovation. Since the early 1950's, international programs have become a common feature of undergraduate curricula in leading universities and a desideratum for other four-year institutions. Much teaching concerning foreign areas is carried on in temporary programs, such as summer institutes. However, they, too, have become familiar and regularized components of the teaching structure. In many cases, summer institutes are organized by multi-institutional consortia set up for the purpose so that international programs generate further change in the very process of institutionalization.

A comparable broadening in the kinds of ancillary associations dealing with international educational matters has developed in the third period. Several new multidisciplinary learned societies devoted to particular world regions appeared after World War II and seem to have become a stable feature of the scene. Some of the larger disciplinary societies, such as the American Historical Association, regularly include panels and symposia dealing with the "non-Western" regions at their annual meetings. After a

false start at the end of World War II, the ACE has maintained since 1954 a standing Commission on International Education, representing the interests of educational institutions in contract negotiations with technical aid agencies of the federal government. Finally, various other kinds of ancillary groups have appeared, including those specializing in the preparation of college and university teaching materials on the underdeveloped areas and a new "clearing house," which was the outcome of a high level committee report on international studies. Thus, the channels of representation for international studies in ancillary groups have diversified very greatly during this third period.

Underlying both the regularization of international studies in the curriculum and the diversification of representation since 1950 have been radical changes in the funding of international studies. From the beginning, international studies have generally been introduced into colleges and universities through outside support. For a very long period, this burden of support was carried by the philanthropic foundations--Rockefeller and Carnegie before 1950 and, after 1951, the Ford Foundation, with substantially enlarged contributions to international programs.

Since 1957, however, the major burden of financial support for international studies has shifted from the foundations to the federal government. In this period, federal aid to education has changed from a congeries of particularistic, program-related measures

to a broad platform of across-the-board support for education at many levels. International studies in higher education have been a major beneficiary of this change, being represented in the most important transitional piece of legislation, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and also in the International Education Act of 1966, which promised across-the-board support for this field. This significant reorientation in legislative thinking and enactment resulted in new attitudes and new activities on the part of academic ancillary organizations, both generally and in the international field. Ancillary organizations have been much more active in securing resources from the federal government for international studies than in dealing with the philanthropic foundations in this field. In more recent years, as federal legislation has underwritten these curricular offerings to some degree, a third type of voluntary association in higher education has mobilized to offer support: the institutionally tied group, consisting primarily of associations of high level administrators representing educational institutions as wholes, and such classes of institutions as land-grant universities (classification based on Bloland 1969, pp. 63-115). Of these, the most important has been the American Council on Education.

This changing pattern of support for international education by the educational ancillary associations reflects a change in the appraisal of international education within higher education

itself: an increasing acceptance of, and commitment to, these programs on the part of educational institutions. It is the structural representation of changing values about the content of liberal arts education in the academic community at large. The changing roles of philanthropic foundations, voluntary academic associations, and the federal government in the period 1950 through 1965 is traced in Chapter 2.

Development from 1870 to 1950

ORIENTALISM AND PILOT PROGRAMS

In America as in western Europe, a certain degree of scholarly investigation was expended upon the great civilizations of Asia during the late nineteenth century. These investigations were carried on along lines of textual analysis laid down by the German exponents of the philological method of the earlier nineteenth century. The model scholar in this field was a kind of oriental classicist, in whom all the humanistic disciplines of history, art history, philosophy, and linguistic skills were united for the analysis of some high (and preferably dead) Asian civilization. A counterpart of the Greek and Roman classicist, this kind of scholar was sometimes found in an institution's classics department and sometimes constituted a one-man department. Ironically, this model of the oriental classicist developed in the United States at a time when the concept of the single humanistic scholar studying Western civilizations was in full retreat before the development of the humanistic and social science disciplines of history, anthropology, and political economy, with their research tools applicable to old and new societies alike. But since these disciplines were developed primarily through the study of Western societies, a bifurcation developed in American scholarship of the late nineteenth century in which the European world and its

derivative societies became the province of the disciplines, while the Middle and Far East were left to the care of the oriental classicists. Africa and Latin America were altogether outside the map of the world communicated to students through the university and college curriculum of that day; India was vaguely visible on the peripheries.

As a result, by the beginning of the twentieth century oriental classicism had become the scholarly tradition governing the study of non-European civilizations in America. The only discipline competing with this tradition was history, whose practitioners dealt largely with modern diplomatic and political history, often upon the basis of actual diplomatic experience in the foreign service of the United States government.

Even the oriental classicists' approach to the study of foreign societies depended considerably upon the state of American society's contemporary business and political relations with them. As early as 1876, the University of California at Berkeley received a gift of 50 acres of land from Senator Edward Tompkins. Proceeds from this sale were to endow a chair of oriental languages. The purpose was to aid West Coast business with the Orient by equipping Americans with facility in Chinese. Columbia University acquired a chair in Chinese studies in 1901, through the generosity of General Horace W. Carpentier in memory of his Chinese servant. The endowment became the nucleus of an eventual department devoted

to oriental studies, while Carpentier's personal library provided the basis for a research library. Harvard-Yenching Institute was the gift of an aluminum magnate, Charles M. Hall, and Cornell University's impetus to establish research into Southeast Asia was provided by the gift of the personal library of a Toronto businessman, Edward M. Wason. Apparently, it was considered appropriate for universities located in cities with considerable commercial relations with the Far East to devote certain of their faculty resources to the study of such areas, as a reflection of their social milieu.

The only other field of regional studies to develop in American higher education in this period was Latin American studies, which showed similar characteristics. Products of early twentieth century Pan-Americanism, most Latin American programs were found in institutions located in the Southern United States. The loss of interest in these programs after World War I was concurrent with the increasing importance of political developments in the Far East during the late 1920's and early 1930's, making classical orientalism the focus for the further internationalization of college and university curriculum. Thus, orientalism has helped shape the foreign areas programs through which most American students now study other societies.

The initiating agency in the attempt to create more modern programs of study on the Far East in the interwar period was

the American Council of Learned Societies Devoted to Humanistic Studies, financed by the Rockefeller Foundation. Itself a new development, the ACLS set a pattern for the introduction of new substantive fields in higher education which has persisted until the present. According to this pattern, academic ancillary associations are approached for a statement of the academic respectability of the proposed innovation; outside, generally foundation, funds are secured for testing the innovation in small-scale, non-regular programs, arranged either outside the regular academic scheduling or away from the usual academic settings, or both; and a combination of outside funds and individual voluntary action provide for further acceptance of the innovation.

From its inception, the ACLS was concerned with educational innovations bridging the humanistic and social science fields. At its organization in 1920, by representatives of some eleven learned societies, the president of the American Political Science Association proposed a discussion of methods of instruction and research in Chinese studies, but this proposal was not implemented until the ACLS established a permanent secretariat and executive offices in 1927. This step presented an opportunity "for extending the Council's activities effectively into those fields, such as Far-Oriental studies, which do not come immediately within the purview of any of its constituent societies or whose exploitation requires the collaboration of a number of them American Council of

Learned Societies, 1929, p. 47." Since the constituent societies included the professional organizations of the major social science and humanistic disciplines, it was clear that the ACLS' manifesto on the promotion of Chinese studies represented interest in this field from within the disciplines.

The first steps included a survey of the state of research on the Far East and a conference on China studies, the first of its kind to be held in America, on October 6, 1928. This meeting recommended a number of measures, including the issuing of a directory of world Sinologists, the compilation of bibliographies, the allocation of money for scholarships and fellowships, the dissemination of propaganda about the importance of Chinese studies, and the formation of the Committee on Chinese Studies of the ACLS (which became a reality in early 1929).

Meanwhile, the Institute of Pacific Relations, an agency maintaining liaison between the educational world and the realm of international diplomatic and political relations, had asked Edward C. Carter of the University of Chicago to conduct a survey of courses on China and Japan in college and university curricula. The report of Carter's survey, which appeared in 1929, is the first example of a type of fact-finding literature (which has become ever more abundant) concerning foreign area studies programs sponsored by outside agencies. Carter asked 546 accredited institutions to list the courses with "major emphasis" on China and/or

Japan which appeared in their catalogs, although he apparently did not ascertain whether they were actually regularly taught. Of the 443 institutions which responded, 111 (just under 22 percent of the total 546) reported only one course listed in their catalogs, while only five reported more than ten courses.

Spurred by Carter's work and its own report (Griffin, 1931; C. S. Gardner, 1935), the ACLS sponsored a summer seminar in Far Eastern studies on the Harvard campus in 1932, for faculty members of any accredited institution. The seminar was a one-time offering outside both the regular academic schedule of collegiate institutions and the regular academic training period of the participants. To the astonishment of the planners, one hundred applications flooded in; only forty could be accepted. The course content was far from experimental, concentrating upon familiar humanistic fields of general history, history of oriental philosophy, and oriental art. Voluntary courses in Chinese and Japanese language were offered, along with an experimental course in "fundamentals of Oriental Languages," a rudimentary linguistics course. A second summer seminar on the same pattern followed under the same auspices on the Berkeley campus in 1934, while Harvard in the same summer offered through ACLS support what was apparently an early intensive course in Russian for faculty members.

One important functional differentiation, however, distinguishes these early pilot programs from contemporary teaching on

the Orient: Language teaching was strictly separated from the study of literary style and cultural content, both of which usually accompanied foreign language study of the day. This first step toward partitioning the holistic approach was the result of ACLS' support for the infant discipline of scientific linguistics, then being rapidly developed in America. Nevertheless, the ideal of classical orientalism was preserved--that the proper study of unfamiliar societies incorporates both knowledge of their languages and understanding of their cultures. Neither, by itself, has since been considered adequate. On the other hand, the innovative character of the methods adopted by the ACLS should not be overlooked. Summer institutes, faculty foreign area "retraining," and intensive language courses relating to the languages of "non-Western" areas have become so common a feature of the higher educational scene since the middle 1950's that their relatively recent genesis is often forgotten. But in the middle 1930's, they were a truly radical invention--reported to the profession (Graves, 1934) under the title, "Two Experiments in Education."

Ten years after China had engaged the attention of the ACLS, it turned to the study of India. In 1930 the ACLS had taken over from the American Oriental Society a committee on Indic and Iranian studies, a group composed entirely of Sanskritists whose concern was not to modernize the field of Indic studies but to organize teams for archaeological studies in India and Iran. Lack of

support forced the cancellation of this project after one season and apparently led to the committee's 1939 survey of Indic studies in America.

Indic studies were even more esoteric than China studies at this time. China by then had become a major focus in world politics; it had for some time been an important field for both American business and American missionary effort, stimulating public interest directly, rather than indirectly through the universities. Moreover, close association between high-level diplomatic service and scholarship on China characterized China specialists in the 1920's (Latourette, 1955). India, on the other hand, was outside both the reading public's political interests and the commercial public's trading interests. As Brown in the 1939 ACLS Bulletin on Indic Studies in America admitted,

At present, only the sheerest accident brings India into the purview of the American college student. Eight universities (Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Princeton, Johns Hopkins, Pennsylvania, Chicago and California) have chairs of Indology or Sanskrit, but India is virtually unrepresented in departments of history, philosophy, fine arts, political science, sociology, or any of the other departments of intellectual experience in which. . . India has made great contributions [p. 22].

The writer, now the oldest active South Asia specialist in the United States, called for a program of joint training by Indologists and the disciplines, with placement of the students so prepared in disciplinary departments, as the only strategy likely to improve the situation.

SECOND PERIOD: WARTIME REASSESSMENT

What progress had been made in acquainting the academic public with the state of development of foreign studies was due to the generosity of the Rockefeller Foundation, which had channeled nearly \$1 million into international studies through the ACLS (Beckmann, 1964). The tactics of the 1930's were abruptly superseded with the onset of World War II. The tentative steps embodied in summer institutes and fact-finding missions accelerated before the request of the American government that universities assume responsibility for staffing short term intensive programs upon their own campuses to train American servicemen in language and area knowledge for military government duty in soon-to-be occupied countries. Utilizing standard curricula for the various foreign regions, the programs were to be evolved by academics consulting with the Departments of Army, Navy, and War. Within nine months after the entrance of the United States into the war, eighteen colleges and universities had organized programs expected to handle a projected 2,000 servicemen. By the end of 1944, some 15,000 servicemen had passed through programs in some fifty-seven institutions, in one of the most remarkable short term experiments in the history of American higher education and one that had manifold repercussions for the development of international studies.

The goals of these programs were to give trainees facility in the spoken, not written, languages of the countries of destination

and general cultural information which could not be acquired by studying an area's high literary culture. The presence of a national emergency precluded argument about whether these were legitimate aims of teaching on college campuses. Consequently, the principal features of these programs were a cooperative attempt by scholars of various social science disciplines to instruct military personnel in different phases of the contemporary life of the territories they were to occupy, combined with intensive spoken language instruction carried out, not by philologists, but by specialists in techniques of structural linguistics worked out mainly upon unwritten languages, during the 1930's.

Responsibility for the introduction of techniques of structural linguistics into military language training rests at the door of Mortimer Graves, executive secretary of the ACLS, to whom, with his generous Rockefeller backing, the army planners turned for guidance on the language training aspects of the program (Fenton, 1947; pp. vii-xi). With the aid of the Linguistic Society of America (founded in 1924), an intensive spoken language training program was constructed which became the hallmark of the military training programs and remains a distant grandparent of most of the postwar courses in the "neglected languages" found in American colleges and universities today.

The teaching materials and aids required were quickly produced with the help of generous Rockefeller funds channeled into

planning the intensive language courses. Rockefeller expenditures for these purposes between 1942 and 1945 are said to have exceeded the total Rockefeller grants to language and foreign area studies programs in the preceding ten years (Beckmann, 1964, p. 14). No such support was available to the cultural studies included in the military curricula, however, and this aspect of the military programs was less well developed.

Most important in creating interest in international studies was the vast scale on which these experiments were conducted. World War II provided international studies with the benefit of actual temporary trials on university campuses. The army language and area programs were the largest single advanced training field offered by that branch of the military, and the number of army personnel exposed to advanced language and area programs was exceeded only by the output of the combined army engineering programs (Matthew, 1947). No other educational innovation was so directly the product of an external political crisis until Sputnik in 1957. These circumstances made a major postwar reassessment of the role of international studies in higher education a virtual certainty as early as 1943 and 1944.

Meanwhile, preparation was made for a transition from military area training programs to peacetime university teaching which would retain some of the principles of the integrated wartime programs. Again, Graves of the ACLS was the moving figure. His

instrument was the Ethnogeographic Board, a temporary wartime group engaged in "clearing regional information" for military agencies, and composed of representatives of the National Research Council, the ACLS, the SSRC, and the Smithsonian Institution. Graves proposed that the Ethnogeographic Board assume responsibility for assessment of the military area study programs on the various campuses, apparently with the aim of securing an improvement in standards. Although the survey had commenced very late in the life of the wartime programs, in December 1943, reports on individual institutional programs written between June 1944 and June 1945 were fed back to the campuses of origin, where in several instances planning committees were already constituted to "consider the continuation of area studies [Fenton, 1947, pp. x-xi]."

In the spring of 1945, the American Council on Education, recognizing the importance to the educational world of the issues raised by the various wartime educational programs, obtained \$150,000 from the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller General Education Board for a full scale study on their implications. Two of the ten resulting studies dealt with language and area studies (Fenton, 1947; Matthew, 1947) and both endorsed the concept of integrated area study, although with different degrees of enthusiasm. According to Matthew (1947),

Area studies should be of interest on a scale of priorities deriving from their importance in education and in international relations so far as can be predicted. . . A possible priorities arrangement might include the following in the

order given: the Slavs, the Far East, the Arabic world, the Indic world, Southeastern Asia, Central Asia, Central Africa, and other areas [pp. 150-151].

Fact-finding studies of academic foreign area programs conducted under SSRC auspices in the following years confirmed that general agreement about these priorities existed on university campuses.

In the second of the ACE studies, Fenton (1947) raised two major questions which became basic issues in the great debate about fitting foreign area studies into general education, a debate that engaged many social scientists and humanists between 1943 and 1950. The issues raised by the ACE study were: the legitimacy of area studies as a division of the universe of knowledge, and their usefulness as a corrective to the organizational fragmentation of the curriculum among many contending disciplinary departments.

Three committees of the SSRC in the years 1941 to 1951 gave extended consideration to these issues. The Committee on World Regions, which had been organized late in 1941 "in view of the probability that academic work will in the future be organized in some part on a regional basis," considered various strategies for furthering area studies: to change some institutions by planning for regional institutes at selected sites; to change people by planning to turn out Ph.D.'s with an area competence; or to think in terms of changing programs of training. Coloring the discussion

of all of these strategies was the underlying fear that acceptance of the principle of regional studies would distract attention from the pursuit of the general rules and principles of social organization which was taken to be the goal of social science (Social Science Research Council, February 25, 1943).

Two committee publications aired these concerns and eventually secured a consensus on the part of those associated with the SSRC: E. J. Hamilton's (1943) "World Regions in the Social Sciences" and Redfield's (1944) "Area Programs in Education and Research." Hamilton called for the establishment of university centers for research and graduate instruction as the first step in establishing regional studies on a sound footing in American higher education, recognizing, however, that "the benefits of regional instruction must permeate our entire educational system" eventually [p. 6]. Redfield, on the other hand, urged further consideration of area studies in undergraduate education, asserting that area programs offered "an opportunity to devise a fresh plan for a general education [p. 589]." He suggested that a general education program organized about regional studies might achieve more integration than a conventional general education program of requirements and electives, while also having the great advantage of communicating something of the manner of thought of other peoples. Nevertheless, he agreed with Hamilton that "sound and fruitful teaching in regional terms waits upon research in the societies"

of foreign areas. The first need was a sound basis of information; the required scholarship, Redfield predicted, "is of course the work of generations [p. 589]."

Redfield's scholarly prestige on the side of regional studies helped to convince many, both within and outside the council. The SSRC meeting in full council early in 1944 admitted that while it "has not ordinarily thought of regional studies as an effective way of advancing research in the social sciences," it now acknowledged that the regional or area studies movement "will affect the future of social science [Social Science Research Council, April 1-2, 1944]."

Thus, Fenton's vision of integrated area programs as an organizational corrective combined with SSRC's endorsement of regional studies as a principle of organization for research and teaching to produce a general postwar definition of international studies, integrated foreign area studies. Under such a definition, the major social science and humanistic disciplines combined forces to produce an understanding of the regions studies which would not merely be superior to that gained through any single discipline but would also benefit knowledge generally and social science in particular.

This definition did not immediately prevail, however. A Joint Exploratory Committee of the SSRC, the ACLS, and the National Research Council appointed in 1945, with Mortimer Graves as

executive secretary, failed to achieve agreement on further action. The majority called for delay and reflection before implementing a program of action in support of regional studies. Consequently, the SSRC appointed a Committee on World Area Research under the chairmanship of Robert B. Hall, who had already been retained by the original World Area group to make a survey of existing regional centers in American higher education. The new committee was certainly the most influential locus of interest in regional and foreign area studies in the immediate postwar period.

The picture revealed by Hall's investigations was far from bright. On many campuses, integrated foreign area programs were seen as both a political and economic threat to the interests of existing departments. Opponents of integrated programs feared that the cross-college cooperation required to focus instruction in several fields of knowledge upon a particular world region would weaken the authority of the units concerned while strengthening the power of the central administration at their expense. Alternatively--and this was a very widespread concern--regular budgeting by collegiate institutions for expanding area studies programs was seen as a threat to the claims of that disciplinary departments could properly make upon the financial resources of the institution. Finally, the innovation was identified with poor quality, opponents arguing that such programs would provide a refuge for incompetents who could not make a success of scholar-

ship in a discipline proper (Hall, 1947).

The possible utility of foreign area study programs in spearheading organizational reforms was also shown to be severely limited by actual campus conditions in Hall's 1947 survey. Hall visited twenty-four universities during the academic year 1946-47, where he found planned or in operation fifty-two undergraduate area programs, thirty-seven graduate area programs, and twenty-five research programs. But forty-seven of the fifty-two undergraduate programs, twenty-nine of the thirty-seven graduate programs, and ten of the twenty-five research programs dealt with Latin America, the Far East, Russia, and American studies, of which only the Russian studies programs could be considered almost entirely a result of wartime programs. Non-Slavic regions of Europe, the Near East, Africa, India, and Southeast Asia, Hall found, were virtually ignored, though some planning activity was observed.

Most of the programs Hall saw in operation were in fact pre-war programs attempting to recover from the disruption of wartime. It was evident that the feebleness of older, primarily voluntary and unformalized, programs was in part a result of the "lack of authority" vested in them. Hall warned (1947),

Under present organizational conditions it seems unlikely that area studies will be able to avoid omitting most of the sins which it is hoped they would offset. If post-war area programs are to fare better, they must have greater legislative and budgetary rights than they have generally had heretofore. . .Area studies like any other academic enterprise must have support if they are to persist and thrive [p. 19].

But Hall's personal unwillingness to consider regional studies a viable alternative to the disciplines boded ill for the acceptance of regional studies as a true alternative organizational principle. He insisted that area competence "in the vast majority of cases should be regarded as an additional competence rather than an alternative one" to the disciplines and felt that graduate study beyond the M.A. level should be reserved to the disciplines [p. 41].

But this did not mean that foreign area programs would not grow. On the contrary, a second SSRC survey of programs conducted in 1950 by Bennett, using criteria considerably more stringent than Hall's, indicated some growth in programs covering neglected areas of the world. Excluding North American studies altogether, Bennett in 1950 found twenty-nine operative integrated area programs at twenty-eight universities. Almost all of the newer programs, such as the Columbia University Russian Institute (founded 1948, the first of the postwar regional institutes) were functioning with the support of philanthropic foundations (primarily Carnegie and Rockefeller). Real growth was indicated by a comparison of Bennett's findings with Hall's (Bennett, 1951, pp. 10-11):

Regional focus	Number of programs	
	Hall (1946-47)	Bennett (1950)
Far East	4	8
Latin America	6	6
Russia	3	5
Europe	0	4
Southeast Asia	0	2
Near East	0	2
South Asia	0	1
Africa	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
	13	29

Nevertheless, barely a start had been made in the regions of South and Southeast Asia, the Near East, and Africa; development was needed on Africa and the contemporary study of regions, until then the locus of classical orientalism in American scholarship. Coverage of these regions in the disciplines relying on written evidence, such as history, literature, and philosophy, was minimal.

Bennett (1951) also took the opportunity to argue for federal support to regional programs in terms of "national need." "Ultimately," he warned, "the federal government must furnish financial support for the type of training that its activities demand [p. 41]."

This was an early recognition of the structural principle that "allocating federal money. . .for the purpose of meeting national needs [which] has been central to the legitimation of all govern-

ment participation in higher education programs [Bloland, 1969, p. 157]."

But this argument raised opposition in many academic quarters. Some feared that such programs could easily become "the chambermaids of politics," providing an opportunity for "bending science" to "motives that are extrascientific and even anti-scientific in character [Cahnman, 1948, p. 234]." A less intense but more widespread fear was that foreign area studies would confine themselves, with government support, to the study of current events without lasting benefit to liberal education. As a leading student of Oriental civilization has recently remarked,

In 1950 one had to argue the point with proponents of so-called 'non-Western studies' that broadening of the curriculum should be considered in the context of liberal education as a whole, and not simply offered as a response to the shift in the world power balance [DeBary, 1964, p. 437].

But the time for government support of foreign area studies had not yet arrived. Early in 1951, the World Area Research Committee (formerly the Committee on World Regions), concerned over the need for Far East specialists created by the Korean War, carried to the State Department a proposal for federal financing to train some 1,000 area specialists in the following three years. The trainees, in return, would agree to make their services available to government. But the proposal foundered over the need for enabling legislation, which was not feasible in the contemporary political climate (Social Science Research Council, February 10,

March 31-April 1, 1951, no date). A ten-year development plan published in 1951 by the Joint Committee on Southern Asia of the ACLS and the SSRC and implying government support went unheeded. Federal support for education remained confined to limited programs, either of capital expansion, or of obvious relevance to the business community, such as vocational education.

2.

Development from 1950 to 1966

It is likely that the failure of proponents of foreign area studies to obtain federal support in the early fifties was related not merely to an inhospitable climate of public opinion, but to the absence of a strong organizational structure representing international interests within education that could mobilize political support and attract government attention to the problem. In 1950 representation for the interests of area studies programs was found only in the four councils (the ACE, the SSRC, the ACLS, and the National Research Council) and one learned society, the Association of American Geographers. The interests of these groups were quite differently distributed. Only the SSRC maintained committees dealing generally with world area research and area research training fellowships. The ACLS continued to maintain its Committee on the Language Program, while the NRC appeared to speak primarily for the interests of geographers and anthropologists through its Committees on Opportunities for Foreign Geographic Research; Asian, African, and Latin American Anthropology; and Latin American Geography. As for individual world regions, the ACLS and the SSRC jointly supported committees on the Slavic and Southern Asia regions. Each council had a committee on the Near East, and the ACLS also maintained a committee on the Far East. The interests of the American Council on Education were restricted to its

participation in a four-council Joint Committee on the International Exchange of Persons. The single learned society articulating an interest in world regions, the geographers, maintained committees on Soviet and Asian Studies.

FOUNDATION SUPPORT FOR CURRICULAR PROGRAMS

The philanthropic foundations filled the financial gap with substantial grants to individual programs during the first half of the 1950's. The foremost source of funds during this period was the Ford Foundation, reorganized in 1951 as a national philanthropy. Between 1952 and 1964 it is said to have allocated some \$138,000,000 for grants "designed to improve American competence to deal with international problems," of which about half, or nearly \$70 million, was used to strengthen academic programs dealing with non-Western areas in the social sciences and humanities. Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations, until now the primary support of this educational innovation, also contributed; Rockefeller gave some \$5 million and Carnegie \$4 million in grants between 1952 and 1964, the latter generally in support of curricular innovations (Beckmann, 1964, p. 15).

It is unlikely that ancillary associations played a major facilitative role in obtaining this foundation support; the amount of foundation funds passing through the hands of ancillary groups was minor compared to the amounts expended by the foundations in direct support of regional institutes at particular universities.

Thus, the characteristic feature of the 1950's was a procession of individual professors to foundation doors seeking support for curricular and research programs focused on particular world regions. An aura of power began to cling to those who were successful in these efforts; the programs that resulted were often located in a few preeminent institutions, and both the teaching and research ventures which resulted sometimes resembled private fiefs of the founders. The three strategies for implanting foreign area studies in American higher education proposed during the war--changing a few institutions by establishing regional institutes, changing people by turning out Ph.D.'s with some area competence, and changing programs of training by establishing guidelines for graduate area training--became the responsibility of different groups and had very different degrees of success. Individual faculty entrepreneurs appealed to the foundations, often very successfully, for "venture capital" to change institutions by establishing regional institutes [Beckmann, 1964, p. 13]. Their effectiveness as curricular innovators was often measured by their ability to obtain such outside resources. The SSRC, on the other hand, followed the route of changing individuals, receiving foundation funds to finance fieldwork in foreign areas for promising graduate students in the social sciences. Its first area training grants, awarded early in 1949, went to individuals who are now, by and large, distinguished leaders in the social scientific study of the foreign

regions in which they studied then. But these efforts were fairly modest in scale; the SSRC's first area research grants went to no more than twenty-six individuals and continued at that number or fewer in the following years.

The role of changing programs of training fell to no group. As a result, agreements about approaches to teaching, substantive content of coursework, and standards of achievement were made at the institutional level, where they became artifacts of the culture of each campus on which programs were established. As a result, several schools of thought concerning curricular approaches became associated with particular university research centers, such as Columbia and Chicago. The majority of rewards, measured in terms of success in obtaining Foundation funds, went to what can only be called direct entrepreneurial efforts by individual professors in a few leading institutions. The organization of regional studies in the midfifties, thus, reflected the decentralized and competitive organization of American higher education itself in this period. Even more important, foreign area studies were established as a faculty-sponsored innovation in the major centers.

FEDERAL COOPERATION WITH HIGHER EDUCATION

As the development of regional studies in the social sciences took on the appearance of a competitive scramble between scholars at a few leading institutions for limited foundation funds, two factors radically altered the picture by bringing the federal

government into ever closer cooperation with the universities and colleges in the field of international studies. Both developments were extraneous to regional studies, although one (the reform of the field of modern language teaching) was closely associated, by its wartime genesis, with international studies. The major external factor in the change, however, was the federal government's venture into technical assistance in areas ravaged by the Second World War, creating a need for trained personnel, for whom the government turned to higher education. The invention of the university-government contract for technical assistance abroad in 1951 was the prologue to greatly increased association between the federal government and higher education in the entire international field during the next fifteen years. Directly associated with increased cooperation was a growth in the role of ancillary associations regarding international studies.

International cooperation between the American government and others for the purpose of the further social and economic development of one of the partners is the product of diplomatic relations with Latin America, and the Second World War (Glick, 1957; Weidner, 1962). Commencing in 1940, the American government created two organizations concerned with technical assistance to Latin America. The first of these, organized during 1939-40, was the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation, formed to coordinate the work of more than twenty-five government bureaus

receiving requests for assistance, mainly in the fields of agriculture, public health, and education, from Latin American governments.

Somewhat different were the programs of the second organization, the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. In 1942 the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, Nelson Rockefeller (appointed 1940), chartered the institute as a public corporation to conduct cooperative programs with Latin American governments in the fields of public health and agricultural development. In 1944 a similar corporation was formed, called the Inter-American Educational Foundation, to provide similar cooperation in elementary and vocational education. One of the first outside contractors to undertake development work in the educational field for this office and the foundation was the American Council on Education, whose report on teaching materials for Latin American studies was the most thorough of its several reports on teaching materials concerning international areas (American Council on Education, 1944). From 1944 to 1947 the ACE undertook to assess school programs operated by the foundation in Latin America. These early experiences of the ACE strongly directed the organization's attention to problems of university-government cooperation in foreign technical assistance programs after 1951. It also directed the attention of the ancillary organizations representing colleges and universities as a whole almost exclusively to this aspect of international education.

Government-sponsored international technical assistance was extended to underdeveloped and war-ravaged areas following World War II in the Point Four program (Act for International Development of 1950). Two policies for providing competent staff for the programs were carried over from the Latin American experience: that the technical personnel should be regular employees of various government bureaus, as in the work of the Interdepartmental Committee, or that the government could borrow temporarily the services of technical experts in relevant fields, with the government providing administrative supervision, as in some programs of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. Because the institute's method of subcontracting with specialists from other organizations promised less in the way of long term regular expense to government and because the institute had also successfully pioneered a device for government-to-government cooperation in technical assistance, known as the servicio, the new Technical Cooperation Agency chose the precedents provided by the institute (Reining, 1959; Atwood, 1959).

In 1951 the university contract to provide technical assistance in foreign countries was invented by Henry G. Bennett, first director of the TCA and former president of Oklahoma State University. His model was based on the agricultural extension bureaus of the land-grant colleges and universities. Since the majority of the first programs dealt with agriculture, the majority of the early university contractors were land-grant colleges and universities (Reining, 1959).

The number of universities involved increased rapidly until

1954, leveling off through the later fifties, although the number of contracts increased throughout the period. By 1967, 101 institutions held 144 contracts for technical assistance abroad, involving approximately \$197.2 million in federal expenditure. An additional sum of just under \$30 million was committed in 166 contracts to 128 institutions for training, research, and technical services to the Agency for International Development in the United States (U.S. Department of State, 1967). This was by any standards a large source of income to educational institutions.

ANCILLARY GROUPS AND GOVERNMENT-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

As they increased in number, university contracts also changed in character. The earliest type of contract simply borrowed expert individuals into government service for limited periods of time. Soon, however, the universities were asked to assume responsibility for the administration of a "distinctly defined" segment of a technical assistance program, and so much fundamental conflict subsequently arose between the objectives of the contracting parties--the universities and a succession of government aid agencies--that "there was reason to doubt that any rapprochement satisfactory to the parties and consistent with program objectives would emerge [Caldwell, 1967, p. 287]."

Two points were at issue: the extent of government obligation to higher education for support of curricular programs of instruction

on foreign areas and the extent of higher education's obligation to aid government and, indeed, world society in the fields of economic development and social welfare. The latter question was tackled by the Ford Foundation and the largest of the institutionally tied ancillary associations in higher education, the American Council on Education and the then American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities (Humphreys, 1967). Their persistent attempts to mediate between government and the universities throughout the 1950's ultimately enlarged their interest in international education and led them to support increased federal support for curricular foreign area studies. The Ford Foundation supported both their mediation efforts and a series of high-level temporary groups which hammered out an acceptable definition of the responsibilities of higher education to society in this important new area of interaction between the two.

Principal among these temporary groups was the Committee on the University and World Affairs, under the chairmanship of J. L. Morrill, retired president of the University of Minnesota. The committee's report, issued in December 1960 with foundation support, provided an influential statement of the value of studying foreign areas in on-campus education at home and described the potential contribution which American higher education could make to the development of higher education in the foreign areas. The report urged the technical assistance agency to limit its demands upon

universities, utilizing them primarily for educational development in the host countries (Committee on the University and World Affairs, 1960). A more specific policy governing the mutual obligations of the universities and the technical assistance agency was spelled out by the J. W. Gardner report (1964) with the aid of staff provided by the ACE and Education and World Affairs, a newly formed special task group whose purpose was to help articulate government-university relations in all aspects of international education.

The Morrill and Gardner reports defined a role for general federal support to curricular foreign area programs in return for university services in government aid programs abroad. The Morrill committee called for a planned response on the part of American universities to "heavy new demands" for "direct service" to international society in the 1960's [Committee on the University and World Affairs, 1960, p. 27]. There must be a "lifting of sights that will transcend. . .the limited aims of 'technical assistance' and 'national defense'" on the part of both government and the universities [p. 3]. There must be "higher priority for world affairs in education" on the part of the universities, accompanied by "improved organization and cooperation" under the "highest auspices" on the campus for "direct international service [p. 34]." The subsequent Gardner report spelled out government's obligation as well: The government must "strengthen and enlarge university resources for their aid tasks" by support to

8

university programs which could provide orientation and language training to university faculty departing for foreign areas, and by support for ongoing university research in those areas [Caldwell, 1967, pp. 50-51].

The Ford Foundation responded to the Morrill committee's recommendations by informing certain major universities in the same year that it was willing to consider making large-scale, long term grants for various phases of international research and education if the universities would undertake the responsibility for scrutiny and review of the projects funded under such grants. This announcement was followed by the appearance of offices of international studies and international programs (usually termed institutes) in numerous universities, reporting either to the president or to some officer close to him, in order to indicate to the foundation their preparedness and ability to administer new programs (Education and World Affairs, 1965).

The foundation's application of funds in this instance was clearly intended to force the major universities to accept international studies as a universitywide responsibility. The organizational changes it entailed helped to bring academic foreign area studies to the attention of institutionally tied ancillary associations. The changed status of foreign area instruction--from suspicious innovation to a standard part of the social science-humanities curriculum in the major universities--is reflected in the fact that

these associations publicly supported federal aid to academic foreign area instruction only in 1965, in the hearings concerning the International Education Act. Until that point, however, the attempt to gain federal support for these programs had been carried out through very different ancillary organizations.

While foundation aid was providing essential support for college and university instructional programs on foreign areas in the humanities and social sciences during the first half of the 1950's, the Modern Language Association was preparing to seek federal support for curricular programs dealing with foreign areas and languages at all instructional levels. This influential learned society represented not merely college and university language and literature faculty but also large numbers of high school English and foreign language teachers and many state and regional organizations.

The MLA had not always in its long history interested itself in influencing the direction of general policy affecting education at both university and nonuniversity levels. Organized in 1884, its first goal was "the advancement of the study of the modern languages and literatures" regardless of educational level. The organization's interest in secondary education and pedagogy declined markedly in the first quarter of the twentieth century before the growing prestige of graduate studies and the influence of German scientific method upon the humanities. A 1927 revision of the

MLA constitution redefined the organization's goal as "the advancement of research in the modern languages and literatures" and turned its interests to issues raised in graduate literary research (Keniston, 1953).

Meanwhile, World War I eoked an isolationist attitude toward foreign language study throughout the U.S. By 1922 twenty-two secondary schools had completely dropped foreign language instruction. Between 1915 and 1918 the percentage of secondary school students studying modern foreign languages dropped from 40.6 to 28. The decline continued more slowly through the middle 1930's, with some 24.4 percent of secondary students enrolled in modern foreign language classes in 1934 (Parker, 1954). Educational theory current then seemed also to challenge the "claim of any kind of foreign language study, ancient or modern, to an essential or even important place in the secondary school curriculum, now decreasingly regarded as a preparation for college (Parker, 1954, p. 78)."

These developments eventually penetrated the MLA's concentration upon research, attracting enough concern for the diminishing prestige of foreign languages to lead the MLA's executive council to create in 1939 a Commission on Trends in Education to examine the sources of criticism of foreign language learning and to make remedial recommendations. But before the commission could conclude its deliberations, World War II intervened with dramatic effect upon the teaching of modern foreign languages to adults. During 1944

the commission sponsored a survey of Army Services Training Program foreign language programs at the suggestion, and with the support, of the American Council of Learned Societies, to ascertain its relevance to postwar civilian language training (Modern Language Association, 1944). However, the commission seems to have played little part in active postwar discussions of issues raised by the wartime experience for language teaching.

During 1945-46, the columns of the Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors were filled with discussion of the linguistic approach to modern language teaching. Should teachers of modern languages, it was asked, turn from the traditional focus upon the literatures of these languages to the technical task of inculcating facility in speaking these languages? The outcome was a cautiously phrased recommendation:

It may be that the study of literature should be preceded by mastery of the language, if there can be time to do it. . . .If academic foreign language departments find it feasible to give instruction in language before they give instruction in literature, the Army may indeed have worked a minor revolution in the teaching of the humanities [Diekhoff, 1945, pp. 619-620].

Significantly postwar discussions on the desirability of adopting Army language teaching methods in higher education differed very greatly from the postwar discussions on military foreign area studies. Discussions of language mastery revealed little fear of possible threat to the existing organization of instruction.

The postwar concern with improving modern language pedagogy was

soon reflected in the Modern Language Association, whose Commission on Trends in Education held its first conference since 1944 in of March 1950. Under new leadership, and using funds provided by the Rockefeller Foundation, the commission recommended that the MLA shift its emphasis from research in modern languages to renewed interest in matters of pedagogy. This recommendation, "To promote study, criticism and research in the modern languages and their literatures," was passed at the 1951 annual meeting (Keniston, 1953) as a constitutional amendment. To implement this amendment, the executive council authorized its executive secretary, William Riley Parker, to seek funds for a study of the role of foreign language study in American education and of the relevance of foreign language study to the U.S. national interest. By June of 1952, some \$120,000 had been secured from the Rockefeller Foundation, to be expended in a three-year period on the MLA's Foreign Language Program directed by Parker.

Evidently, the MLA leadership considered the Foreign Language Program no mere academic venture. As Parker has recently recalled,

As I look back, I honestly do not know of any organization other than the MLA that could have mounted a combined foreign language study and action program with strong foundation support. . . . There existed, in other words, no national membership association for teachers of all foreign languages at all levels. The MLA was not such an organization either, but it came nearest to being such, and it was the only organization in the language field with a full-time, competent staff and with physical headquarters adequate for conferences and promotional activities [1966, p. 3].

The "action" Parker contemplated was nothing less than federal support for increased modern foreign language instruction at secondary

and higher levels of education. To achieve this, it was necessary to develop the MLA from a learned society with a relatively narrow membership base to something approaching a professional interest group. That this was achieved is shown by the group's growing membership (about 5,000 in 1950, 10,000 in 1959, and more than 20,000 in 1965).

Much of the burden of developing the MLA was assumed by the Foreign Language Program. With a fulltime staff of four in MLA national headquarters in New York, and the occasional aid of six others as needed, the Foreign Language Program embarked on a vigorous action program. Parker and his staff attended conferences, set up a communications network with language teachers on all levels, and sought advice from social scientists on the role of foreign language instruction in the study of foreign cultures. Rarely has a more explicit description of the activities of a political interest group been recorded than in Parker's words:

This staff sees to it that pertinent information is constantly gathered, that inquiries are answered, that projects are started, that committees are set up and furnished with facts, that informed opinions are solicited, that conferences with influential people are held, that successful experiments in foreign language teaching are publicized, that good ideas are encouraged, that morale in local groups is strengthened, that basic issues are clarified, that arguments are sharpened and attacks answered, that speakers are sent well-fortified to strategic meetings, and that other foreign language organizations are kept informed of developments by means of liaison committees [1953, p. 125].

Meanwhile, experimental interdisciplinary seminars sponsored by the Foreign Language Program on language and culture produced recommendations to the U.S. Office of Education on the value of integrated language and foreign area centers which were to be featured in Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. In 1954 Parker and his staff composed for UNESCO's annual theme of "Foreign Languages for International Understanding" a volume entitled The National Interest and Foreign Languages, which was to prove extremely influential four years later on Capitol Hill in the debate preceding passage of the National Defense Education Act. This volume emphasized the importance of World War II military instructional programs on foreign regions, and of the innovations in language teaching methods there adopted. In it Parker also supported the wartime concept of integrated language and area study and included, by way of glaring contrast, a history of language teaching in the United States and a description of contemporary language teaching in schools and colleges.

In October 1954 the Foreign Language Program received further Rockefeller funding for a second three-year period of operation (1955 to 1958). Its program of action now began to bear fruit; at the 1955 annual meeting of the Central States Modern Language Association, U.S. Commissioner of Education Samuel Brownell (1955) acknowledged the need for Americans able to speak and read foreign language in international cooperative activities. And in 1956,

Parker joined the staff of U.S. Commissioner of Education Lawrence Derthick to help draft legislation providing federal aid to foreign language teaching.

THE POLITICAL AND LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT

The links forged by the Modern Language Association to the U.S. Office of Education and other agencies in its quest to improve the position of foreign language teaching in American education assume their proper significance in the context of the contemporary federal posture toward education. As Sufrin (1963) has pointed out, although the American Congress has always supported education to some degree, congressional interest since the beginning of this century has focused primarily upon vocational education and well-defined special categories of vocational education such as agriculture, home economics, and nursing. This support, furthermore, was to be administered through state departments of education. Despite criticisms that categorical vocational education was too narrow in scope and rigid in character, the Congress until 1958 directed most educational aid to vocational education, and the last of five major congressional enactments formed part of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The public and state and federal governments have come to accept the idea of assistance to specific, well-defined practical educational programs. Under the political circumstances prevailing

in the middle 1950's, public acceptance of this tradition of federal aid to education was essential in securing the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Dwight Eisenhower had been elected to office in 1952 on a party platform that flatly opposed federal aid to education. President Eisenhower initially felt that no action of any kind should be taken until after the newly appointed (Kestnbaum) Commission on Intergovernmental Relations had submitted its report and until the White House Conference on Education, scheduled for 1954, had met. Unexpectedly, a majority of the White House Conference participants favored some federal aid, and a large majority favored aid for school construction (Quattlebaum, 1960b).

Following this surprise victory for the friends of federal aid, President Eisenhower proposed early in 1955 a complicated school construction program which received criticism from the National Education Association and other educational ancillary organizations on the grounds that it provided too little federal assistance in return for too many conditions. Accordingly, the midfifties witnessed a series of annual struggles among the supporters of different kinds of school construction bills (Munger & Fenno, 1962).

In 1956-57, a second issue was raised by the appointment of a Committee on Education beyond the High School under the chairmanship of Devereux C. Josephs to consider the need for more financial

support to students. The committee opposed general federal aid to education and stressed such noneconomic barriers to higher education as the lack of information and motivation and inadequate guidance programs in the secondary schools. It called for more scholarships but looked to nonfederal sources to provide them. The presentation of the committee's report on August 10, 1957, was followed by the organization of a task force within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to implement proposals for change, and, significantly, to identify needs overlooked by the committee (Rivlin, 1961).

A third major educational issue was raised in 1956 by a report of the Joint Atomic Energy Commission pointing to severe constriction in facilities for the education of engineers and scientists and warning that the United States was wasting 80 percent of its potential scientific and engineering manpower through the failure of qualified high school graduates to continue to college and failure of college students to complete their education.

Government agencies and government-created nonpartisan committees were not the only groups to try their hands at policy-making in the field of government-education relations in the middle fifties. Groups more related to education, such as the American Association of Universities' Committee on Financing Higher Education, and the National Citizens Committee for the Public

Schools, also put forth reports. Although each report isolated particular educational problems, common to all of them was a reluctance to endorse across-the-board federal aid to education.

Thus, there was considerable awareness of major educational needs in national circles in the midfifties but little action in the face of an administration reluctant to support federal aid to education on grounds of political philosophy. Decreasing administration enthusiasm for school construction bills had even been apparent in 1957 and had helped to explain the defeat of that year's bill. When President Eisenhower was accused by both Democrats and Republicans of ignoring an opportunity to gain bipartisan backing to get the administration bill through the House, the President responded, "[I] am getting to the point where I can't be too enthusiastic about something that I think is likely to fasten a sort of albatross. . . around the neck of the Federal Government. . . . Federal Role, 1965, p. 257."

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

The launching of the Soviet satellite, Sputnik, on October 4, 1957, produced public alarm and an abrupt change of attitude on the part of the administration. On November 8, President Eisenhower confessed "our failure to give high enough priority to science education," and it became known that the administration was preparing remedial legislation. On November 21, the U.S. Office of Education released a draft entitled, "Federal Aid to

Improve Scientific and Technical Teaching Facilities," a step followed by the submission of opinions from various educational ancillary groups during the next two months. Most influential among them seems to have been the American Association for the Advancement of Science which, on December 17, submitted a memorandum to the Office of Education containing the major proposals of most previous reports on the subject of federal aid to education.

Undergraduate scholarships, the testing and identification of students with superior ability, and special support to language teaching were included.

According to the detailed legislative history traced by C. E. Wilson (1960, pp. 65-157), on December 27, 1957, the administration released its legislative plans, which called for: 10,000 undergraduate scholarships at \$750 to \$800 apiece; 1,000 graduate fellowships; grants of up to \$125,000 per educational institution for improvements in graduate education; and other grants to institutions of higher education for language study. Substantial grants were to be made to the National Science Foundation for the improvement of science education. Also included were funds for the expansion of counseling and guidance and for indirect increases in teachers' salaries, but no funds for school construction. On January 7, 1958, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare circulated a prototype bill of five titles, which included: Title I - Guidance Counseling; Title II - Assistance to Primary and Secondary

School Science and Mathematics Programs, To Be Distributed through State Agencies; Title III - Support for Foreign Language Learning; Title IV - Assistance for Higher Education, Including Scholarship and Fellowship Support; and Title V - A General Enabling title.

On January 27, Representatives Carroll D. Kearns and Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., submitted HR 10278 and HR 10279, taken directly from the HEW prototype bill. On the same day, Senator Lister Hill and Representative Carl Elliot (both of Alabama) introduced a somewhat more comprehensive bill, HR 10381, which, through lengthy hearings during the following eight months and many compromises bringing the Hill-Elliot bill closer to the Administration's position, eventually became the National Defense Education Act of 1958. In addition to the programs proposed by the administration, the Hill-Elliot bill included college student scholarships and loans, provisions for work-study programs, increased funds for vocational education, a title dealing with science and language laboratory facilities for the schools, provision for research in new educational media, and a science information service. Thus, the Hill-Elliot bill satisfied the claims of the vocational education lobby and incorporated more of the recommendations of expert committees than did the administration bill.

From March through August, a series of hearings on the proposals took place each month, and some hearings had already preceded the introduction of the various bills. In the mass of

accumulated testimony, two facts stand out: first, the appearance of the foreign language title in the administration bill and in the private members' bill, and second, the conspicuous silence of most of the testimony on this title of the proposed bill.

In the House, only five persons devoted more than a line or two of their testimony to the need for federal aid to foreign language study. They included Marion Folsom, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Lawrence Derthick, U.S. Commissioner of Education; and Kenneth Mildenberger, director of the MLA Foreign Language Program. Fewer than twenty pages of Derthick's 144-page testimony dealt with language study, and all but three pages of that consist of materials drawn from Parker's book on foreign languages and the national interest. Most of Mildenberger's testimony was devoted to the presentation of a prepared statement from the MLA (U.S. House of Representatives, August 12, 1957-April 3, 1958).

Secretary Folsom, Commissioner Derthick, and Mildenberger again testified before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to much the same effect. Early language study, foreign language summer institutes for teachers, and support for improvement in audio-visual aids were also urged before the Senate Committee by the president of the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Association. Support for aid to foreign language instruction was also expressed by Frederick Burckhardt,

president of the American Council of Learned Societies (U.S. Senate, January 21-March 13, 1958).

The sum total of public support from educational ancillary groups to international studies included in the foreign language title proceeded from two organizations, the Modern Language Association and one of its federated organizations, and the American Council of Learned Societies. Of the two, the MLA was certainly by far the more effective in influencing the legislative process: Commissioner Derthick, in explaining the legislative history of the foreign language title of the act to the MLA's 1958 annual meeting, stressed the effect of Parker's book and of the "private talks of MLA men on Capitol Hill" in insuring the safe passage of these provisions [Derthick, 1959, p. 48].

The provisions of the act which raised the strongest objections were those providing undergraduate scholarships at public expense. Stripped of its scholarship provisions, but with a much enlarged loan provision, the act was signed into law by President Eisenhower on September 2, 1958, as Public Law 85-864. The President stressed the temporary character of the federal aid to education embodied in this bill.

Provisions of the NDEA relating to international studies included (under Title VI) direct federal subvention for administrative units termed "language and area centers," which were to be located in institutions of higher education. Federal support was not to

exceed 50 percent of the cost of items later specified as language and area instruction, institutional overhead, library acquisitions and processing, administration, faculty travel to foreign areas, and special lectures and conferences (Bigelow & Legters, 1964a, p. 45). Also authorized in the same title were research studies to develop more effective methods of teaching modern foreign languages and to prepare urgently needed teaching materials in many of the "critical languages," and fellowships for students of the supported languages, to provide the new centers with a clientele. On the advice of the ACLS, Commissioner of Education Derthick released a bulletin in 1959 listing Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Hindustani, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish as languages most needed for business and diplomatic relations. Of these languages, French, German, Italian, and Spanish were excluded from support because adequate teaching facilities already existed. Within a year, most of the major world languages which could be classified as national and official languages and "important unofficial languages" were covered by provisions of the act. (During 1960 Spanish was added when the Alliance for Progress was announced.)

One of the reasons for the lack of interest in Title VI was that the financial outlay involved was relatively modest compared to that of other provisions of the act. Only about \$32 million of the estimated total \$840 million allocated for the first four years

under the act was to be expended under Title VI and, of the \$30 million, only about \$6 million was for direct support to administrative units.

Despite the original modest outlay, NDEA centers have grown far beyond what was envisaged in the original legislation. Of the one hundred applicants for support under Title VI received by May 1959, the Office of Education selected nineteen for academic year 1959-60, with a total outlay of just under \$500,000. The following year, twenty-seven new centers were added and \$1,575,000 allocated. The Office of Education began academic year 1961-62 by adding one new center in Russian studies at a Southern university, partly to strengthen the regional distribution of centers. Five new centers for Latin American studies, four of them in the South, were added in February 1962 through an advance allocation of \$100,000 from the next year's funds.

At this point the \$8 million ceiling on annual expenditures was reached, and the available federal funds were fully committed. Annual support to Title VI continued at the \$8 million level through 1964-65, while language and area centers grew to a total of fifty-five at thirty-four institutions of higher education. Following hearings in 1964, Public Law 88-665 was passed, broadening the 1958 act and increasing funding for a three-year period. Under this new act, support to Title VI was increased to \$13 million for 1965-66 and was raised gradually to \$18 million in fiscal year 1968

(Mildenberger, 1964). This large increase in federal funding was reflected in an increase in centers, which in 1967-68 numbered ninety-eight at sixty-two institutions.

As NDEA language and area centers have increased in number, certain principles of selection have become evident in the choice of institutions which receive new centers. The U.S. Office of Education's first procedure was to award centers to institutions which had already established substantial coursework and programs of good quality in areas falling within the "most critical languages" provision. This meant that the first centers went primarily to the major universities with well established programs of study at the graduate level. This development also related to the stripping of undergraduate scholarships from the act during its passage.

But objections were soon heard from academic groups which felt themselves excluded from federal largesse. In hearings on the bill in 1959, testimony on Title VI came from familiar sources--the office of the Commissioner of Education (in the person of William Parker), the MLA, and representatives of the ACLS. However, an anomalous note was provided at the 1961 hearings by a group calling itself the National Committee on Undergraduate Training in Oriental Studies. Its spokesman cited academic opposition to the introduction of "languages such as Swahili, Chinese and Japanese," but this opposition evidently arose from their prohibitive expense as

curriculum offerings in undergraduate institutions. This organization's purpose, in fact, was not to end federal aid to foreign language and area programs but to extend support to smaller colleges and undergraduate institutions (U.S. House of Representatives, June 1961).

Some deference to this pressure is evident in the most recent list of NDEA language and area centers (U.S. Office of Education, 1968). Six of the ninety-eight are located in private and church-related colleges, and two in a state college. But the main beneficiaries of centers have been private and state universities: twenty-seven private universities hold contracts for fifty centers, and twenty-eight state university campuses house forty-eight centers. Twenty-three Eastern institutions, nineteen Midwestern institutions, ten Western, and nine Southern institutions maintain centers.

On balance, the results of this experience for area studies up to now have been happy ones. NDEA administrators point with pride to the assertion of Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education, that federal aid has not brought federal control in its wake, and to his comment that "rarely has a small amount of money been so well and productively invested [Taylor, 1964, p. 77]." Taylor, writing in The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, reports flatly that "this act has been administered with scrupulous respect for the independence and dignity of the academic profession [Taylor, 1964, p. 77]."

Title VI administrators in the U.S. Office of Education, however, claim much more than this for their stewardship. They have contended that although foundation funds available in the fifties for the development of language and area programs served to abate fears that area studies programs would drain financial support away from more traditional departments, actually such funding left area programs in a "financially precarious position" because area programs did not develop any strong claims to regular institutional support (Bigelow & Legters, 1964a, pp. 9-10).

Federal matching fund requirements, according to Bigelow and Legters in NDEA Language and Area Centers: The First Five Years, forced universities to undertake regular budgeting for these programs, although they argue that university willingness to underwrite the centers signified general acceptance within universities for the language and area center concept.

It is not easy to define just what kind of unit the universities and colleges had agreed to support. Despite claims that language and area centers were "a new and pervasive force in American higher education," in fact "the center concept was [never] formally delineated [Axelrod & Bigelow, 1962, pp. 1-2]." At the core of the concept stood "the idea that it was desirable to supplant the single scholar in a non-Western civilization by a group of specialists"; but beyond this, "the Language Development Section in no way prescribed the direction of growth which a center was to

take. . .The doctrine of 'local option'--the center's right to self-determination--prevailed from the beginning [Axelrod & Bigelow, 1962, pp. 3, 13-14]."

As a result, centers were located wherever convenience dictated--in a language department; in a department or department-like unit whose work was interdisciplinary in nature, such as a Russian or Far Eastern studies department; or as a tight or loose interdepartmental enterprise (sometimes because centers were not welcome in departments). In most cases, the centers "encourage and coordinate" teaching and research programs, rather than assume responsibility for actual teaching, so that communication, cooperation, and coordination are their main functions.

A former administrator of the language and area centers provisions in the U.S. Office, comparing the NDEA center to a European institute, noted that a successful center constitutes more than the sum of its parts: faculty in several disciplines, research undertakings, an adequate library, stiff language requirements, and students. He considered the relevant factor to be

. . .the concept of integration, which most observers of American foreign area studies programs have used to differentiate a genuine program from a mere collection of courses related to each other only by geographic coincidence. . .Integration refers to an inner logic and a set of working relationships among constituent disciplines that combine to produce coherence and cross-disciplinary stimulation [Legters, 1967, p. 2].

If this is in fact the case, then NDEA centers have indeed preserved and developed an educational concept having roots in

classical orientalism but transfigured by modern developments in the organization of knowledge.

Equally important, the language and area provisions of the NDEA have generated direct contact between the U.S. Office of Education and faculty who administer the NDEA centers, and the close association of educators and government administrators in this field has softened boundaries between the parties. Both Parker and Mildenberger moved into the U.S. Office of Education to help administer the new structures they had done so much to create. And early administrators of Title VI in the U.S. Office have now moved back into the universities, where several of them direct language and area centers under the act.

Direct dealings between the U.S. Office of Education and the universities in foreign language and area studies have been confined to those major state and private universities and a few colleges successful in obtaining NDEA centers. Smaller colleges have had to express their views on foreign area studies through participation in ancillary associations. Two small volumes of collected papers on the teaching of Asian subjects published by the Association of American Colleges in 1959 and 1961 [Boardman, 1959; Morehouse, 1961] were among the earliest indicators of its interest in the colleges and international education.

International studies developed differently in the universities and in the colleges: In the universities, curricular foreign area

studies were the creations of faculty, who convinced their administrations to support them. The only aspect of international studies to engage the interest of administrators, and therefore of ancillary groups representing universities, was the problem of technical assistance contracting. Concern with academic programs in the humanities and social sciences had been left to the faculties and their learned societies. In the colleges in the 1960's, however, the issue of international studies was seen both as a substantive issue of curriculum revision in the humanities and social sciences and as a problem demanding the attention of--indeed introduced by--the colleges' major institutionally tied ancillary association, the Association of American Colleges, according to a 1964 survey of collegiate curricula on non-Western areas (Association of American Colleges, 1964).

Concurrently with the AAC survey, Education and World Affairs assembled, with funds provided by the Edward W. Hazen Foundation, an autonomous committee to develop a report on the colleges similar to that of the Committee on the University and World Affairs. The parallel was made explicit by the deliberate choice of The College and World Affairs as a title (1964). This committee's report called upon the colleges to carry out "a revolution in education," which it deemed "essential to survival and implicit in the nature of liberal learning [Education and World Affairs, 1964, p. 657]." Both reports urged the colleges to adopt usable

features of the leading universities' approaches to international education (Association of American Colleges, 1964; Education and World Affairs, 1964).

What these reports in fact portended was the development, in American higher education, of an undergraduate interest in international studies, as distinct from a graduate interest in international studies. The claims of undergraduate international studies had first been publicly voiced by Professor Stanley Spector, representing the National Committee on Undergraduate Training in Oriental Studies, in 1961 hearings on the NDEA. Immediately after testifying in May and June 1961, Spector sought an alliance for his group with the Association for Asian Studies, the leading learned society representing foreign area interests in undergraduate and graduate education (with a 1967 membership of 3,100 it is the largest learned society with a regional focus). The association in 1962 deputized Professor Charles Hucker, then of the University of Arizona, to act as a liaison committee of one with Spector's group. After circularizing among one hundred members of the association with a principal interest in undergraduate teaching, Hucker recommended to the board of directors the creation of a Standing Committee on Asian Studies in Undergraduate Education. Hucker cited various factors, perhaps the most important of which was the increasing number of association members primarily engaged in undergraduate teaching. He concluded that the association

should formally recognize a responsibility to help facilitate, coordinate, and provide expert advice for further developments in undergraduate Asian studies. The committee's function was defined as one of service to the teaching profession in this field and it was explicitly stated that the proposed committee "should not be authorized to operate as an accrediting agency or as a special interest lobby in either the academic or the political arena [Hucker, 1962, pp. 1-2]."

Nevertheless, the committee almost from its start was urged to perform this function and by spring 1964 the committee itself had come to the conclusion that some of the members should act as an ad hoc committee "to present the case for undergraduate education" to NDEA administrators and the foundations (Association for Asian Studies, January 10-11, March 21, 1964). Members of the committee were also present at the first Princeton Conference on Foreign Area Studies in Undergraduate Education in October of that year, sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education with NDEA funds, at which it was announced that some NDEA centers would be located in undergraduate institutions.

In fact, the committee's special interest pleading may well have been more effective than its service functions, for although the Association for Asian Studies Board of Directors refused financial support to many of the services the committee proposed to provide (Association for Asian Studies, April 1, 1965), officers

of the committee were invited by the U.S. Office of Education to prepare a background paper on the International Education Act of 1966 and to participate in discussions concerning the proposed legislation between U.S. Office staff members and academics. Formal representation for undergraduate interests within the AAS, thus, proved unexpectedly useful in providing contacts with government and the foundations for those concerned with undergraduate foreign area instruction.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

By 1965, pressures for adjustment were clearly apparent within higher education. However, the nature of the adjustment to be made was unclear until late in the year.

In a speech at the Smithsonian Institution on September 16, President Lyndon Johnson announced the appointment of a Task Force of the House Committee on Education and Labor, chaired by Representative John Brademas of Indiana, to recommend "a broad and long-range plan of worldwide educational endeavor." This announcement was followed by a special message to Congress on February 2, 1966, in which the President outlined a twenty-point program of improvement in American educational assistance and disease prevention programs abroad, combined with broad federal support to international education at home, as a "long-term commitment in the national interest." The aspects of this program which involved foreign aid were to be

accomplished by Executive Order or by amending existing legislation. Those parts of the program affecting American higher education, however, required new legislation.

Simultaneously, bills were introduced in the House by Representatives Adam Clayton Powell and John Brademas of the House Committee on Education and Labor (HR 12451 and 12452) (1966) and in the Senate by Wayne Morse (S2874) (1966). In form, the bills were simple. They declared that "a knowledge of other countries is of the utmost importance in promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between nations," and that furthermore, "strong American educational resources are a necessary base for strengthening our relations with other countries."

The bills contained only two titles in their original form. Title I contained the major innovative provisions of the bill. Under this title, Section 101 authorized the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make outright grants to single institutions of higher education or to consortia of institutions to establish and strengthen postgraduate centers for research and training in international studies. Grants could be made for ongoing centers as well as for new programs. House hearings resulted in additional authorizations for support of "the international aspects of professional and other" fields of study in such centers, and for grants to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations, such as the Institute of International Education.

Grants to professional and scholarly associations were specifically enabled. House additions also resulted in the specific authorization of facilities for foreign travel for faculty and students of such centers.

Section 102 of this title paralleled the first section but applied exclusively to undergraduate education. It authorized grants to single institutions or consortia to develop and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies. The section also specified the form and manner of application for such funds and stated various procedural safeguards in accounting and fiscal controls. In addition, this section specifically stated, as that on graduate centers does not, that grants are to be allocated "in such manner and according to such plan as will most nearly provide an equitable distribution of the grants throughout the States." Section 105 of this title, after alterations during passage, authorized \$1 million in funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; \$40 million for the fiscal year ending in June 1968; and \$90 million for the fiscal year ending in June 1969.

Finally, Section 106 of Title I authorized the establishment of a National Advisory Committee on International Studies within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, consisting of high-level representatives of the Department, "a broad representation of higher education in the United States," and competent non-specialists. In major Senate additions to this section, this group was also given the responsibility for preparing "specific recommendations for carrying out the provisions" of Title I.

The National Advisory Committee, in short, was to adjudicate the distribution of funds between graduate interests represented in Section 101 and undergraduate interests represented in Section 102. In addition, an administrative order of President Johnson called for the establishment within Health, Education, and Welfare of a Center for Educational Cooperation to administer the act.

Title II, also part of the original bills, provided amendments broadening Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. It removed the 50 percent ceiling on federal contributions to language and area centers and permitted the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to, as well as contracts with, such centers--the obvious recipients of funds under Section 101 of the proposed act. It also authorized considerable funds for international affairs institutes for secondary school teachers and made amendments to the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. Titles III and IV were added from the Senate floor; the former called for a Departmental study of the drain of skilled manpower from underdeveloped countries, while the latter was a rider irrelevant to the purposes of the act.

The House task force, with staff provided from the educational world, commenced hearings in March 1966. Consultant to the task force was Herman B. Wells, chancellor of Indiana University, first president of the National Education Association's Department of Higher Education, and president of both the National Association

of State Universities and the State Universities Association. Peter Gillingham, executive associate of Education and World Affairs, provided counsel to the task force, before which passed the most impressive array of institutional representatives and representatives of educational ancillary organizations ever to be concerned with legislation on international studies.

In striking contrast to the NDEA experience, the majority of ancillary representation was provided by the American Council on Education, the land-grant colleges, etc. Although no representatives of undergraduate institutions per se appeared, the American Association of Junior Colleges contributed a letter of support, and the Association for College and Research Libraries represented primarily undergraduate libraries in small institutions. Undergraduate area studies interests were represented by Ward Morehouse of the New York State Education Department, University of the State of New York, an active member of the Committee on Undergraduate Education of the Association for Asian Studies.

The most important witness to testify before the task force was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner. Much of his testimony was devoted to clarifying the domestic nature of the aid to education proposed by the bill. The bill was not a disguised foreign aid measure, as was suspected in some Congressional quarters during passage. Instead, said the Secretary, it was "based on a new premise--the premise that international

education at home and educational relations with other nations are permanent and important aspects of our national interest [U.S. House of Representatives, March 30-31, April 1, 4-6,7, 1966]."

The bill was addressed to the problem of developing and strengthening domestic institutions of higher education to carry on the tasks of educational and technical assistance abroad in fields such as tropical medicine, arid land agriculture, and economics of underdeveloped countries. These were functions which, in the Secretary's opinion, required new legislation, not merely an extension of the National Defense Education Act. Moreover, as Francis Keppel, the Assistant Secretary for Education, pointed out, the NDEA would not cover the provisions of the act establishing international studies programs at the undergraduate level.

It is clear from this testimony that in the minds of the drafters, the proposed legislation was designed to provide the necessary general support for university foreign technical assistance programs demanded by the Gardner report of the early 1960's. The act also recognized the claims on federal support of smaller universities and collegiate institutions that had not benefited under the National Defense Education Act.

The bill, then, attempted to combine the principle of equitable distribution of funds to institutions, regardless of the substantive character of their programs, and the principle of educational excellence. The bill evidently proposed graduate centers upon the

criterion of educational excellence, and undergraduate programs upon the basis of equal distribution. The critical question in adjusting the claims of graduate and undergraduate institutions was: What proportion of available funds would be devoted to the support of each principle (Proceedings of a Pennsylvania, March 27-28, 1967)?

This question was never answered, for the remainder of the story of the International Education Act is quickly told. On October 29, 1966, during a visit to Chulalongkorn University in Thailand, the President signed the International Education Act into law. The following January, he submitted to Congress a request for \$350,000 to launch the bill. On April 28, 1967, the House Appropriations Committee eliminated this provision from the budget. Efforts to restore some of the funds in the Senate failed to move the House Appropriations Committee, and eventually no funds at all were provided to administer the act. Thus, the NDEA remains the major federal legislation concerning international educational matters.

This ignominious demise suggests the limited ability even of institutionally tied ancillary groups to compel allocations for educational programs in a hostile sociopolitical climate. Educational groups played an important part in determining the form of the bill through informal contacts with the U.S. Office of Education during its drafting and in giving public support to the

proposed legislation during its passage. It had the support of a Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who was exceptionally prestigious in the educational world and also a longtime supporter of international education. The passage of the bill brought representatives of the federal government and the educational world into agreement on the expanded service functions of higher education in the arena of foreign technical and educational assistance. Yet, between passage of the IEA and its administration, a gap developed, and the bill now appears likely to remain a dead letter.

The failure of Congress to fund the International Education Act has created great apprehension in the major centers for foreign area studies. The last of the direct Ford Foundation grants to major institutions for international studies expires in 1970, and faculty of centers and institutes of international studies are facing an uncertain future.

Two results of the crisis are already evident. First, institutionally focused institutes for the general study of international matters are receding and interuniversity consortia of regional centers dealing with specific areas are appearing. Interuniversity consortia for China studies and Southeast Asian studies have already developed, and more such efforts are in progress. Where institutionally based international studies institutes had the effect of sharpening institutional competition for scarce personnel in the international field, the consortia may abate this competition in

the face of a common threat of straitened funds. Equally important, these developments indicate the great tenacity of the concept of integrated regional study, which seemed to disappear during the 1950's and 1960's under the combined impact of institutionally based international studies institutes and the increased theoretical sophistication of the social sciences, derived partly from the incorporation of comparative international materials into these disciplines.

Second, paradoxically, reduced finances may force increased integration of the service functions of higher educational institutes in foreign areas with their on-campus curricular programs concerning the same areas, which the IEA sought to achieve with increased funds. Outside agencies may now be in a better position to force reluctant applied scientists and area specialists to cooperate in pursuit of the limited available funds. This subject has already received considerable attention in the area centers.

The relationship between social scientists and humanists giving on-campus instruction and technical specialists participating in technical assistance remains unclear. Richard M. Morse, in a thoughtful talk to the 1965 Princeton Conference on Foreign Language and Area Studies in Colleges and High Schools, drew attention to the existence of forces which seem to render universities "almost defenseless" before requests from groups such as the Morrill Committee that they perform such "probably incompatible

tasks" as furthering American policy goals, giving Americans better understanding of other peoples, helping other nations "emerge," and helping other nations emerge along nontotalitarian lines [Morse, 1966, p. 238]. He urged institutions to make educational reform their first priority. Even so devoted an adherent of international service as Stephen K. Bailey has questioned whether there may be "something fundamentally anomalous about the concept of advanced university education for. . .international service," and he concedes that many institutions are "living fretfully on the horns" of this dilemma [S. K. Bailey, 1966, p. 6]. The reduction in funds will not make university resistance to outside demands any easier, or the dilemma less painful.

Questions are also raised by the apparent effect of broad general legislative aid upon international studies. Where categorical federal support to education produced competition for funds among unrelated interest groups in widely separate educational fields, across-the-board support has produced a new and rather ominous differentiation of interests between graduate- and undergraduate-level research and instruction within the single field of international studies. This differentiation of interests is reflected in competition for shares of general support. Broad general support, thus, raises the interesting new question of how such differences of interest within single educational fields are to be adjusted. Are essentially political agreements to divide

the spoils to be written into enabling legislation? Are decisions to be made by administrative enactment within the federal government? Or are some other decision-making processes to be evolved between representatives of education and the federal government? And if so, what will be the effect upon the politically relevant activities of ancillary organizations?

Finally, it may be asked, what have been the effects of more than twenty years of postwar development on the study of various world regions? As late as 1968, reliable quantitative data bearing on this question are scattered through government, foundations, and other sources in various locations. The U.S. Office of Education publishes statistics concerning the ninety-eight NDEA centers it supports, and the newsletters of the regional associations list new programs, but only one regional association, the African studies group, attempts a regular listing of all programs in American institutions of higher education concerning the relevant region. The U.S. Department of State's external research unit has, from time to time, published lists of language and area studies facilities in the United States, of which the most recent is dated 1964. No comprehensive single compilation of programs under both private and public funding is available. Information on faculty manpower concerning the various world regions remains in a similar condition, pending the completion of several studies now underway.

Of this scattered information, the most nearly comprehensive in scope is the data furnished by the U.S. Office of Education on its ninety-eight language and area centers. Statistics covering 1965-66 show that in fall of that year, enrollments in modern language, linguistics, and literature courses in the ninety-eight centers totaled 34,625, while enrollments in area courses exceeded 37,000. By world area, the largest share went to Latin America (40 percent of approximately 72,200 total enrollments) and Soviet Russia and East Europe and East Asia (19 percent each). Sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia constituted a middle group of enrollments, each claiming between 5 percent and 8 percent of total enrollments, while enrollments of 1,100 or under were reported for northwest Europe, Southeast Asia, and Inner Asia.

Of a total reported faculty strength of 1,975 in the ninety-eight centers, 28 percent (547) were reported in Latin American centers, with approximately 20 percent (410) in centers dealing with East Asia and 18 percent (367) in centers concerned with Soviet and eastern European studies. Middle Eastern studies centers claimed 250 faculty members (13 percent), South Asia, 165 (8 percent), and Sub-Saharan Africa, 149 (7 percent). Southeast Asian centers reported forty-two faculty members, while inner Asian and northwestern European centers had fewer than twenty-five each (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1967).

If the relative strengths of NDEA centers are a reliable index of the relative strengths of the various fields of regional study generally, it is apparent that two of the three numerically strongest fields, Latin American and East Asian studies, are also the oldest fields of regional study in American higher education, dating from the beginning of the twentieth century. Complaints of the paucity of scholars of modern China, however, suggest that many East Asia scholars are concerned more with studies of the past than with analysis of present trends--a legacy of classical orientalism. The third large field of regional study, Soviet studies, is accounted for by the political importance of the subject. Of the three moderately developed world areas (South Asia, Middle East, and Sub-Saharan Africa), the strongest in numbers is also a traditional field of classical orientalism in America--the Middle East.

Thus, the traditions of research and study continue to play an influential role in directing manpower to particular fields of regional study. Long term international political forces provide another axis along which intellectual interests in particular world regions rise and fall. There is little doubt that both factors will coincide to strengthen some regional studies programs in the future. As of this writing, however, both world and internal political forces are likely to darken the future of regional and international studies. Now that these programs are in national

competition for federal funds, they must suffer the fortunes of the national market economy so created in higher education.

The Institutional Level

The ideal of integrated instruction on foreign areas has been enunciated nationally through various professional associations and supported by the commitment of federal funds and foundation resources to academic programs embodying this ideal. This ideal, however, has been translated into practice on the collegiate level by men acting in specific institutional settings, which must accommodate innovation. In accommodating the innovation, members of the institutions--primarily faculty and administrators in this case--must evaluate the ideal of integrated foreign area instruction relative to other educational objectives and priorities that reflect underlying beliefs and values about the nature of higher education.

QUESTIONS FOR RESEARCH

In the research reported here, curricular innovations were considered not merely as variables dependent upon other factors, such as the nature of the decision-making process preceding acceptance of the new practice, the psychosocial characteristics of early and late innovators, or the organizational pattern of the institution. Rather the research explored the possibility that curricular innovations, such as foreign area studies, are themselves causal agents, or independent variables, producing changes in the institutions where they have been introduced. For this

purpose the study examined seven institutions with instructional programs on Asia and/or Africa as cases studies, focusing upon the history of the once-innovational programs after introduction to the institution. None of the programs could be considered a recent innovation; some have a history as long as ten years.

This focus on the history of innovation after introduction, it is hoped, will broaden the existing tradition of research on curricular change in higher education. Unlike research on change in elementary and secondary education, which has emphasized topics such as teaching procedures and materials and the cognitive processes involved in learning (Jones, 1962; Mackenzie, 1962, 1964; Goodlad, 1962; Klohr & Frymier, 1963), the study of curricular change in postsecondary education has tended to identify curriculum change with institutional change (I. L. Rogers, 1964). Study of curricular change, thus, focuses on decision-making processes employed by members of the institution in introducing curricular innovation, identifying changes in decision-making patterns with change in the institution's size, funding, resources, clientele, and relation to its environment.

The reasons for this emphasis are apparent enough. The classroom, in undergraduate liberal education, is largely outside administrative jurisdiction in prestige institutions. An ethic of faculty independence usually leaves the mode of instruction to be determined by the private preference of each instructor. Evaluation

of a teacher's classroom behavior is often made upon hearsay evidence provided by students, who in this way--and by failing to elect certain courses in large numbers--exercise some power upon professional behavior.

Two consequences follow from arrangements of this kind. Institutions that attempt to control staff members' classroom behavior by prescribing the textbooks to be used in certain classes, or by in-class observation of instructors, are often regarded as undesirable employment choices by potential staff members. And, more important, the pattern of decision-making consensus by a community of scholars in prestige institutions is emulated by other colleges and universities.

Reality, however, is not so simple. While the patterns of decision-making within institutions of higher education remain a poorly researched field, several studies (I. L. Rogers, 1964; Goodman, 1962) found considerable variation from the ideal of consensus. One kind of variation arises from differences in the kinds of recurring decisions made in educational institutions. Decision-making procedures which are appropriate in drawing up the institution's annual budget may have no place in setting up major fields of study for students at the institution or in developing the institution's overall program of course offerings.

Another kind of variation from the ideal of consensus is seen in the different leadership roles taken by those in formal positions

of authority in colleges and universities. In some institutions, presidents and deans have a strong and continuing voice in decisions about what shall be taught and how it shall be taught; in others, these decisions are made mainly by the faculty in consultation with the students and the administration. Institutional size is clearly a relevant variable. In the institution studied by Goodman (1962), change in size produced change in decision-making patterns as an unintended consequence. At the outset of the study, the institution was a small state-supported teachers' college, in which the president exercised direct control over the curriculum. When the college was incorporated into a young and expanding state university system and its enrollment was increased, the president found it necessary to give increasing control of curricular matters to the faculty to allow himself adequate time to deal with complex new problems created by a building program and a changed institutional relation to the state and other educational institutions in it. Here the institution seemed to be evolving slowly toward a form of decision-by-faculty-consensus where curriculum was concerned.

The three small midwestern colleges studied by I. L. Rogers (1964) illustrate another pattern. All three institutions were considering major calendrical reform, requiring alteration and adjustment of the curriculum. In several of these institutions, prior to the introduction of the innovation, presidents and deans

assumed responsibility for the formation of a consensus on the part of the staff through summer retreats, committee reports to the organs of faculty governance, and other devices. Such cases have a situation which is best described as primus inter pares rather than undisguised parental autocracy.

In very large institutions, on the other hand, the faculty usually have responsibility for academic programs in the first instance, with a veto power retained by administrators, the trustees, and others. Investigations for the study reported here support a conclusion that in such institutions, academic consensus is often a residual category. New academic programs sometimes come into existence because of the additional financial resources or prestige they can bring to the institution; once begun, the programs and the responsible personnel must compete with other academic programs for institutional resources. Faculty members in most foreign area programs investigated were immediately able to point out sources of opposition to their programs within their institutions. In some cases the programs evidently were not the result of a consensus, rather members of the institution had developed loyalties to the particular programs, departments, or other units in which they found themselves placed and merely tolerated the existence of other such units.

The existence of varying patterns of decision-making, seem-

ingly correlated with the institution's size (Anderson & Warkov, 1961; Caplow, 1964; Haire, 1959; Indik, 1965; Rushing, 1966; Talachi, 1964; Thompson & Bates, 1958), resources, and relation to its environment (Griffiths, 1964), raised the following questions for the investigation reported here:

1. How have preexisting organizational patterns affected the form in which the ideal of integrated foreign area instruction was realized in each institution?
2. How have preexisting educational goals of the institution affected the ultimate form of the foreign area program in the institution?
3. How, if at all, has the foreign area program altered the organizational pattern and educational goals of the institution?
4. How has the foreign area program altered the substance of knowledge dispensed to students of the institution?

In the case studies that follow, the introduction of an instructional program on Asia and/or Africa was considered an example of influence on the institution from its environment, an influence brought to the institution by some of its members in the form of ideas. Case study institutions were regarded as organizational systems consisting of individuals but also displaying properties of boundedness, having methods of replenishing materials which they consume, of drawing financial, intellectual, and human

resources from their environment, and of eliciting the efforts of individual members, which are coordinated in some fashion (Griffiths, 1964). Because one of the major methods organizations use to mobilize the efforts of individual members is to engage their members in patterns of decision-making within the system, the study reported here investigated the interplay between two major fields of organizational effort: the incorporation of new resources from the surrounding environment and the decision-making activities by which new resources are integrated within the organization.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CASE STUDY INSTITUTIONS

The case study institutions vary in size, source and quantity of funding, institutional goals (although these varied within a narrow range), and institutional organization. These elements affected the way a new intellectual resource (the idea of integrated foreign area study) was used within the institution, and set limits on the innovation's capacity to alter the institutional structure.

The institutions included two private universities, one large and one relatively small; one large state university; one state college, formerly a teachers' college; one medium-sized private denominational college; and one small women's college. A cooperative group of four institutions in close geographical proximity was included as an example of a device that may have considerable implications for structural change on the campuses involved (Howard,

1967). Table 1 (adapted from Goodman, 1962, Chapter 2) shows the relative standing in size, wealth, physical equipment, source of funds, and composition of student body for case study institutions.

The first six institutions were studied individually, the latter four, as a group. The first three institutions were primarily oriented to graduate studies, with slightly over half to more than two-thirds of their enrollments at the graduate level. Of the remaining institutions, only the state-supported University College at New Paltz, New York, and the University of Massachusetts had graduate student enrollments exceeding 10 percent of the entire student body. Large enrollments, in these institutions, appeared to be associated with greater emphasis on graduate study. The private collegiate institutions in the study were small and overwhelmingly devoted to undergraduate instruction. Figures sometimes mislead. Thus, the Columbia figures excluded the primarily undergraduate enrollment of Barnard College, although Barnard students often receive instruction in Columbia classrooms, and the entire enrollment of Teachers' College was also excluded from these figures. Were Barnard and Teachers' College added, the strong graduate orientation of Columbia would be somewhat diluted. Nevertheless, the enrollment figures served as a rough indicator of institutional differences in size and instructional emphasis.

Figures on annual income and property value, read together, provide a rough index of institutional wealth. Here the universities with a primarily graduate orientation clearly surpassed the

TABLE 1
 Size, Wealth, Physical Equipment, and Composition of
 Student Bodies at Case Study Institutions

Institution	1967 Enrollment			Annual Income (millions)	Prop'ty value, 1962	No. of library books, 1967	Special characteristics
	T	G	UG				
Columbia U.	17,377	67	33	127 ^b	74.5	3,676,000	Private partly co-ed
U. Chicago	8,359	69	31	150.3 ^a	106	2,400,000	Private co-ed
UC-Berkeley	26,963	55	45	527 [*]	160.6	3,179,633	State co-ed
SUNYC-New Paltz	3,429	13	87	4.7 ^a	10.7	123,000	State co-ed
Earlham	1,179	5	95	3.8 ^b	6.9	135,000	Quaker co-ed
Mills	758	4	96	3.5 ^b	4.4	142,000	Private women's
- - - - -							
Smith	2,451	6	94	11.3 ^b	22	500,040	Private women's
Amherst	1,220	1	99	5.9 ^b	14	383,000	Private men's
Mt. Holyoke	1,810	2	98	6 ^b	13	300,000	Private women's
U. Mass.	10,621	13	87	27 ^b	48	295,000	State co-ed

^a Computed on basis of 1962 figures.

^b Computed on basis of 1967 figures.

* All campuses of University of California. No separate figures available for Berkeley.

Sources: American universities and colleges, 9th ed. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1964.

College blue book I, 12th ed. Los Angeles: College Planning Programs, 1968.

small, primarily undergraduate institutions in the study. They were followed by the University of Massachusetts, a rapidly growing state institution. Of the small colleges, the Massachusetts group (Smith, Amherst, Mt. Holyoke) were clearly more wealthy than the denominational college (Earlham) or the very small private women's college (Mills). The State University College at New Paltz was relatively poorly endowed in terms of both annual income and property value, although the figures here are dated. It is probably still true that this institution receives less income from tuition and fees than is true of other case study institutions.

Table 2 contains a set of ratios intended to reflect differences in academic character among the case study institutions. They are gross descriptive indices and should not be considered predictive in any way. Thus, although the percentage of foreign language teachers in the undergraduate college of the institution proved strongly correlated with both academic quality and cosmopolitanism in Goodman's study of small denominational, private and state teachers' colleges, in the present instance the statistic instead tended to correlate with the extent of the institution's interest in, and support for, the humanities as against the social and natural sciences. Only four institutions exceeded 8.5 percent of undergraduate teaching faculty in the foreign languages: Columbia, Mills, Amherst, and Mt. Holyoke. All the state-supported institutions in the sample fell at the lower end of the scale in

this respect.

The figures on student-book ratio in Table 2 were included as a convenient indicator of the institution's ability to facilitate independent scholarly research on the part of students. As expected, current figures showed the three graduate-oriented universities to eclipse all other institutions in the study in total number of books (Table 1). The two private universities also rated very high in number of books per student (Table 2) but they were equalled and even exceeded by two of the older private colleges in the Massachusetts group. In the middle range of student-book ratio were Mills, the University of California, and Earlham. This index dramatically revealed the University College at New Paltz and the University of Massachusetts as having lower student-book ratios than all other institutions in the study.

TABLE 2
Some Indicators of Academic Character
of Case Study Institutions

Institution	Annual income/ student	Student- book ratio-1967	Percentage of foreign lang. teachers/UG college-1967	Faculty- student ratio-1967
Columbia U.	7,308 ^b	1:211	15	1:8
U. Chicago	21,675 ^a	1:287	7	1:6
UC-Berkeley	*	1:117	6	**
SUNYC-New Paltz	1,751 ^a	1:35	6	**
Earlham	3,180 ^b	1:114	8	1:14
Mills	4,608 ^b	1:187	12	1:11
- - - - -				
Smith	4,607 ^b	1:204	5	1:10
Amherst	4,836 ^b	1:313	9	1:9
Mt. Holyoke	3,324 ^b	1:165	9	1:11
U. Mass.	2,542 ^b	1:27		1:15

^aComputed on basis of 1962 figures.

^bComputed on basis of 1967 figures.

* Unable to compute.

** Unavailable.

Sources: Catalogues of institutions.
American universities and colleges, 9th ed. Washington, D.C.:
American Council on Education, 1964.
College blue book I, 12 ed. Los Angeles: College Planning
Programs, 1968.

Annual income per student, in Table 2, reflected institutional wealth in terms that seemed to indicate the approximate equality of the smaller private institutions in the study, while the graduate institutions had more ample financial resources, and two state institutions--Massachusetts and New Paltz--had somewhat less and far less, respectively. The annual income per student of the University of Chicago vastly exceeded that of all other institutions in the study. This ratio, after on-campus observation, seemed to be correlated less with the physical and other facilities available to students on the campus itself than with the availability of funds for support of faculty research on the campus. In this respect, Chicago outdistanced all the other institutions.

The last column of Table 2 contains the number of students per faculty, insofar as it could be determined for each institution. As an institutionwide ratio it was perhaps not as meaningful as would be a ratio for the undergraduate unit in each institution alone. The variability it showed is not unduly great; the highest ratio was that of the University of Massachusetts, where full-time equivalent was calculated at the rate of one faculty member per fifteen students, and the lowest ratio was that of the University of Chicago, with one faculty member for every six students.

A general picture of institutional differences did emerge, however, from the various indicators considered together. The private, graduate-oriented universities had large incomes, great

wealth, large library collections both absolutely and per student, and low faculty-student ratios. The University of California at Berkeley, as a large state institution, had large income, wealth, and library books in absolute terms but moderate facilities per student. The small private colleges showed general similarity in physical facilities and wealth, both absolutely and per student head, and also medium faculty-student ratios (average 1:10). These institutions formed a middle range on these various indicators. Somewhat above them in physical facilities, wealth, and numbers in absolute terms, was the University of Massachusetts, but it ranked below all the private colleges in the three ratios of annual income per student, student-book ratio, and percentage of foreign language teachers, and had more students per faculty member (15:1). The State University College at New Paltz, although middling in enrollment, was third from lowest in annual income and property value, lowest in absolute numbers of library books, very low in annual income per student, student-book ratio, and low on percentage of foreign language teachers. As these indicators clearly differentiated small state teachers' colleges from other kinds of small colleges in Goodman's study, the results may be taken to reflect New Paltz's recent emergence from its long history as a teachers' preparatory institution.

In all the case study institutions, the existence of a course or program on Africa, Asia, or both had been reported to the

profession at large. All the programs had been in existence for three years, and some for more than ten years, a period judged lengthy enough to provide a relatively secure institutional basis for analysis. The majority of the institutions had also received substantial outside funds to develop their programs, although they had used these funds in very different ways. Finally--and this was an unforeseen aspect of the research--almost all the programs had reached important turning points in their development. In the main, these critical phases were the results of major changes in the financial resources of the programs. In one case, the critical phase was the product of rapid evolution of the institution as a whole.

RESEARCH PROCEDURE

The case studies were written as detailed histories of the institutions' experience in introducing instructional programs on Africa and Asia. The data were collected by participant observation, studying documents, and interviewing. As it was obviously not practicable to do participant observation in all ten case study institutions, as many and as lengthy visits as possible were made in the time available. Participant observation was carried out in two of the institutions. Repeated visits were made to others, combined with five to ten interviews on each campus. In one case, a single, week-long visit was made, and in the case of one program at a small institution in a somewhat isolated area,

a single visit of three days. In all cases, the author attempted to read documents concerning the foreign area programs and documents concerning the institutions generally.

Because of differences between the programs, no single interview schedule was used for the seventy or so interviews completed. At least one class in the foreign studies program was observed on each campus. Reading lists and pedagogical literature were also collected. The following cases represent a synthesis of these materials.

Case Studies: Colleges

MILLS COLLEGE

Mills College, a private liberal arts college for women located in Oakland, California, was the smallest institution in the study, with a full-time student enrollment of 757 in 1968 and a full- and part-time staff of ninety-six.

Structure and Goals

The introduction of foreign area studies here was associated with the 1959 inauguration of a new president, C. Easton Rothwell, an academic and research administrator with strong interest in comparative studies and the "policy sciences." A lifetime of research in international affairs and practical experience in international diplomacy had endowed Rothwell with a keen appreciation of the need to devote a larger proportion of the liberal arts curriculum to the study of international matters.

Rothwell did not need to build a completely new program, however. Faculty, students, and his immediate predecessor as president, Lynn Townsend White, were all keenly aware of the importance of foreign areas, especially Asia. The founders of the college, Cyrus and Susan Mills, had been educational missionaries in Ceylon and the Sandwich Islands before they took charge in 1865 of the young ladies' seminary (then located in Benicia) that ultimately

evolved into Mills College.

Since the 1920's, a small but quite steady stream of students from China and other parts of the Orient (now primarily from Japan and Taiwan) has stimulated interest in matters Asian. Despite tuition and fees standing at just under the \$3,000 mark for resident students, in 1966-67 the college had about twenty students who were nationals of foreign countries, primarily in Asia. In keeping with its strong orientation toward the humanities and the performing arts, the college introduced a course in oriental art in 1927 and courses on oriental philosophies and religions in 1939. The 1943 inaugural address of President White expressed awareness of the need to expand liberal studies to include subjects not derived from the European and North American cultural traditions. In a subsequently published book on women's education (1950), he strongly urged the inclusion of Asian studies in curricula for women.

During the 1950's, as part of the general incorporation of international studies into the social sciences throughout the country, courses were added to the Mills curriculum which dealt, at least comparatively, with foreign areas: comparative politics, government of Russia, development of economic thought, and current economic problems. A course in Spanish American literature was also offered, reflecting California's historical association with Mexico. The college was not unaware of the international dimension

of liberal education.

The question was, rather, one of fitting expanded foreign area studies into Mills' strongly humanistic program and the structure of its five divisions (fine arts, letters, natural sciences and mathematics, social sciences, and educational services), among whom personnel are distributed according to the fields the colleges wish to emphasize. Mills is particularly well known for its programs in the performing arts, especially modern dance, music, and ceramics. These curricular emphases are reflected in the relatively small proportion of teaching staff holding the Ph.D. (46 percent), in the structure of faculty ranks (only 54 percent of the faculty hold regular ranks of assistant, associate, or full professor; the large proportion holding ranks of instructor and lecturer and the low faculty-student ratio reflect the large part of the curriculum devoted to individual instruction by professional performers in music and dance), and in the strength of the various divisions (Bulletin of Mills College, 1967). Thus, in 1968 the divisions of fine arts and letters contained some 55 percent of the teaching faculty of ninety-six persons, while the social science division, after enlargement during the 1960's, claimed sixteen teaching faculty (17 percent of the faculty). While the other divisions contain clearly defined departments, the social science division acts as a single department containing various social science interests, among which history is most prominent.

As is usual in most collegiate organizations, a well-defined machinery for handling curricular change exists at Mills. Proposals for curricular change in all fields are subject to decisions by the college as a whole. Such proposals generally proceed through the divisions to the committee on educational policy and then to the faculty, meeting as a whole, for approval. The arrival of a new president in 1958 resulted in a major effort to activate this apparatus to expand study opportunities concerning foreign civilizations.

Concurrently with the arrival of Dr. Rothwell, the faculty began a curricular review. The committee on educational policy designated in 1958 an interdisciplinary ad hoc committee of five to inquire into enlarging the non-Western dimension of the curriculum. This committee, reporting in September 1960, called for "provision of the opportunity to explore with some thoroughness two or three" world areas, rather than a survey approach. It recommended building on existing offerings in languages, religion, art history, and government, calling attention to the need for enriching the fields of anthropology, the arts, economics, government, history, literature in translation, and sociology. Embarking on any instruction in "exotic languages" was discouraged because of the small size of the college (Association of American Colleges, 1964). The social science division responded by requesting the college administration in a formal resolution to give highest

priority to the appointment of an Asian historian.

Accordingly, three of the sixteen new appointments made between 1960 and 1963 helped to provide the social science division with expert competence in matters Asian: a social anthropologist, a Far Eastern historian, and a political scientist specializing on South Asia. President Rothwell also invited Harold H. Fisher, former director of the Hoover Institute and a Stanford University historian, to join Mills in 1961 as a visiting professor, teaching one undergraduate course and conducting a faculty seminar whose purpose was to plan a new interdisciplinary course on Asia.

Mills has a small array of interdisciplinary courses in various fields. Divisional courses on topics that span various fields are now given only in the divisions of fine arts and letters. In addition, there are a few interdivisional courses cutting across other units of the college. The faculty seminar of 1961-62, which sought for an intelligent pedagogical approach to teaching about the non-Western world--limited to Asia, by common consent--referred for models to the college's experience with one such interdisciplinary course, the American studies course.

The history of this course provides an interesting example of the interplay of administrative leadership and faculty consensus at Mills. To establish such courses requires the consent of the faculty committee on educational policy and, ultimately, of the faculty meeting as a whole. There is little formal faculty

opposition to proposals for curricular and other academic changes recorded at the Mills faculty meetings. The faculty prides itself on the informal consensus achieved through discussions at lunch and elsewhere. The single occasion of formal division over a proposal for curricular development came, in the memory of the present dean of the faculty, during attempts by President White to establish the American civilization course after World War II. The vote in the faculty meeting over establishing the course resulted in a tie, broken by the affirmative vote of the dean of the faculty. Only some of the opposition to the course was on grounds of educational philosophy; more important was the argument that faculty promoting the course had been employed specifically to create it and had received endowed chairs.

Nevertheless, the course did become established. Ironically, when the faculty teaching this course in the early 1960's felt that the course had served its purpose and petitioned to have it dropped from the curriculum, they were met with the objection that the course was essential! Although they were ultimately successful in terminating the course, this experience did keep the issue of interdisciplinary courses based upon major world regions before the eyes of the faculty.

Members of the faculty seminar, led by Fisher, whose work was to plan the new interdisciplinary course on Asia, were selected by the president and the dean in conference, primarily on the basis

of service to the college and interest in pedagogical issues. Professional specialization on Asia was not present in any great measure on the Mills faculty at this time. Some released time was provided by the college. Meanwhile, the president sought outside funds from the Asia Society and the Ford Foundation. The society responded with limited funds for consultants for the seminar. The application to the foundation, embodying the thoughts of both the president and the committee (Fisher, 1961), proposed the following curricular changes: (1) altering the required freshman level American civilization course to make it a comparative study of modern issues; (2) providing a range of upper division elective courses devoted in some part to other civilizations, to be taught by members of the faculty seminar; and (3) designing a faculty workshop of the new interdisciplinary course on Asia, using the concept of the "style" of a civilization as a comparative device by which to study several foreign civilizations within a single focus (Mills College, 1961).

An Annex to the proposal set forth the concept of civilizational "style" that the faculty intended to use as a comparative device, arguing,

Large institutions give their students an opportunity to gain knowledge of non-Western cultures by the establishment of . . . area courses staffed with specialists from several disciplines. Smaller institutions seek the same ends in different ways: by trying to do in a small way what the larger institutions do in a big way; by cooperative arrangements with neighboring small institutions; or . . . by adding to the faculty a specialist in some discipline in some Asian culture.

. . .(But) these are not the only ways and may not, in all cases, be the best way for a small college to give its students the opportunity to gain such knowledge of Asian cultures as a liberally educated person is entitled to have [Mills College, 1961, Annex I, p. 1].

The concept of a styles of civilizations course, then, was seen as a curricular solution to the specific problem of incorporating some universal elements into the curriculum of a small institution, such as Mills, prevented by its geographical isolation from cooperating with other small like-minded colleges. The course was to be developed by Fisher and the seven faculty members participating in the 1961-62 seminar. The syllabus would be further refined by Fisher and a research assistant during fall 1962 and given a faculty dry run during spring 1963, with members of the original seminar acting as consultants. A new faculty seminar would then "take" the course during 1963-64, with mutual benefit to the seminar members, who would be provided with materials to use in their other courses, and to the syllabus, which would benefit from extensive faculty criticism.

Infusion of non-Western materials into other courses was linked to the creation of the new interdisciplinary course in the following manner. The Mills administration foresaw that only a limited provision could be made for in-depth coverage of Asia. It was thought that the faculty seminar experience in planning the new course could be turned to good effect in creating infusion. Consequently, the Mills application to the foundation indicated

plans to give seminar members subsequent exposure to Asia by means of firsthand travel experience. Accordingly, the largest single request was for salary, subsistence, and transportation for faculty foreign travel (\$60,000 of the \$132,000 ultimately granted). About \$45,000 more was asked for faculty salaries and released time connected with the work of the faculty seminar. Some \$15,000 was requested for improved library acquisitions on foreign civilizations.

In December 1962 the foundation responded with a three-year grant to the college, subsequently extended twenty months into late 1967. The work of Fisher and his assistant and the two faculty seminars went forward during 1962 to 1964. As it was eventually defined by these working groups, the course was to be a comparison of the "styles" that two major Asian civilizations, China and India, had developed in dealing with their basic problems--economic, social, and philosophical. As the faculty member who has taught the course since its inception described it,

The students were not to be asked for a detailed description of a society's means of feeding and clothing itself, organizing power, or justifying itself in ideas. Rather they were to be asked to identify a manner or style of meeting these problems which is characteristic of the particular society, that is, to identify a distinctive manner of performing functions. . .which is recognizably Indian, or Chinese. . . .In recognizing a style, a student grasps the essential characteristics of a civilization. Here is the method, the heart, of the new course [LeFevour, 1965, p. 10].

The style with which a civilization meets its problems was to be discerned at two levels, of the village and of the nation-state. The focus was to be on modern times. The one-semester course was to be taught by one faculty member, a specialist on the Far East. The interdisciplinary character would be achieved, it was planned, by regular contributed lectures by other members of the faculty. The course was first taught in academic year 1964-65.

Meanwhile, grant funds were devoted to other uses. Twelve faculty members traveled to Asia on summer study grants. Three faculty members were also helped to attend summer workshops on Asia in the United States. Funds from the grant augmented the college's own trustee professorship funds, to bring outstanding foreign academics, including a well-known Indian anthropologist, to the campus for a short term of residence and lectures extending from two to eight weeks. Besides meeting students in regularly scheduled classes, the visitors spoke to the college generally at the weekly assemblies. A longer term visitor was Edwin Wright, a former foreign service official with extensive experience in the Middle East, who was invited to serve as a trustee professor during 1966-67. In spring 1967 he adapted the syllabus of the styles of civilization course to the Middle East in a one-time offering.

In June 1967 as a finale to the foundation grant, and on the eve of President Rothwell's retirement, the college held a week-long workshop on what it had learned in its experiment with foreign

area studies. Twenty-seven participants were invited from twenty-two West Coast institutions to join seven expert consultants and ten Mills faculty members, including the president, in assessing the experience (Hornby, 1968; Mills College Ford Foundation. . . Grant Financial Report, no date).

Impact of Curricular Change

The Ford grant and a policy of adding social science faculty with non-Western competence have brought visible changes in the social science faculty and curriculum in the last eight years. The major change is found in new offerings among elective courses in the social science division. Two of the three courses on regions of the world in anthropology concern parts of Asia. Area courses on the governments of India and USSR are available, as well as courses in international studies and comparative politics. In history, a year course on China, semester courses on India and Japan, and two courses on the history of Russia are available. Three courses on religions of Asia are given. Year-long survey courses in oriental art are also offered in the fine arts division.

The styles course developed through the Ford grant is a one-semester offering, attracting an average of about eight students. It is listed in the Mills catalog as an interdivisional course, for which funds are provided directly from the dean's office rather than through one of the divisions. It has been difficult to maintain the multidisciplinary character of the course under the original

plans, which called for frequent guest lectures contributed voluntarily by members of the faculty. No arrangement has been made to rotate faculty assignments in the course to achieve a disciplinary balance over a period of time in its instruction.

Outside the social sciences, the faculty seminars and Asian travel experiences were personally valuable to the participants and helped to involve faculty throughout the college who were not associated with specialist studies on Asia. Further expansion of foreign area offerings, however, seems unlikely. At the time of this research, Mills planned no major growth in the program in the remainder of the 1960's.

Mills recently made a major effort to ascertain the effect of its program of internationalizing the curriculum upon students. In spring of 1968 the college conducted, with the aid of student government, a simple survey of its resident students (93 percent of the student body) to learn what proportion of students received some classroom experience concerning the non-West. Some 56 percent of the questionnaires were returned. Returns from eighth-term seniors and freshmen who had completed one term indicated that 75 percent of seniors had taken one or more infusion or disciplinary courses dealing with the non-West, and 25 percent of first-term freshmen in the sample also had elected such a course. The two most frequently mentioned courses were elements of anthropology and comparative government, followed by the first semester

of oriental art and the one-semester course in the history of India. The conclusion drawn by Mills faculty and administration was that compulsion in the form of required courses was unnecessary, since electives served the purpose well.

Apparently, President Rothwell's intention of providing a larger proportion of Mills graduates with an education in which both an understanding of international political problems and an appreciation of foreign civilizations could be gained was achieved in a certain measure on the level of students' experience with the curriculum, judged by this survey. The most important factor in producing this result, however, was not the infusion of outside funds but the decision, following the 1960 report of the ad hoc committee, to devote regular college resources to increasing the number of appointments in the social sciences and to appoint faculty with non-Western competences there.

The effect of Mills' foreign area experiment on faculty-administration and faculty-faculty relations is more complex. The experiment apparently produced little change in the relations between faculty and the president's office. Rothwell's strong initiative in Mills' attempt to enrich the curriculum in Asian materials was acknowledged by all faculty member interviewees, who named the president as the source of the effort. Preparation of the application for the Ford grant was carried on exclusively in the president's office, and he appears to have selected the

visiting trustee professors in international studies. On the other hand, the faculty were associated with the effort, in committees and seminars, at every step of the way.

Temporary faculty seminars were organized under the leadership of a visiting faculty member chosen by the president to work out the new course. These seminars created intermittent interactions among the members and produced the basic format of the styles course but the seminars did not persist beyond 1964. The styles course is now taught by a person who was not a member of either seminar.

More lasting effects of the experiment, however, are found in a recent successful initiative by three faculty members to develop a new interdivisional course in human development. One of the originators was a member of a faculty seminar and received Ford funds for foreign travel; another is an anthropologist with a strong interest in India. The course is both multidisciplinary and multicultural in its approach, embodying the cultural relativism of current thinking on integrated foreign area studies. Mills faculty members spoke highly of this course.

Finally, within the college, recipients of Asian travel grants are sometimes seen as a kind of interest group in matters Asian, forming a reservoir of agreement for future extension of the curriculum on Asia. These developments suggest signs of change in the faculty consensus on the value of non-Western studies.

The use of temporary groups playing a defined innovative role and the college's evident reluctance to depart from the established relationships between courses and departments have definitely limited the possibilities for organizational change. Reliance on adding new elective courses has proved the least disruptive way of augmenting the curriculum at Mills.

EARLHAM COLLEGE

Earlham's more than 1,100 students attend their classes on a spacious wooded campus on the outskirts of Richmond, a city of approximately 50,000 located on the eastern edge of Indiana. The college, founded in 1847, is sponsored by the Society of Friends. Its denominational affiliation brings to the campus both special advantages and opportunities and a few limitations upon size, resources, and governance.

Structure and Goals

The effects of denominational affiliation are perhaps most apparent in the recruitment of students (children of families of the Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends are given first priority) and faculty (Earlham deliberately attempts to recruit well-qualified faculty who are also Friends personally known to members of the institution) and in the composition of its trustees and alumni association, both strongly Quaker groups, most of whose officers live in the immediate vicinity of the institution. A less obvious

effect of Earlham's denominational ties is the role of Quaker ideology in limiting the size of the institution, for a central tenet of the Society of Friends is the concept of a sense of community achieved through face-to-face relationships within a group limited in numbers.

Within the institution, Quaker ideology also influences both the direction of the curriculum, traditionally strong in the natural sciences, and the form of campus governance. Institutional decision-making is carried out through techniques modeled on the consensus of the Friends' meeting. Decisions are made by the faculty acting as a committee of the whole, not by formal voting but by the device of a "clerk of the meeting," an elected post rotating on a biennial basis among members of the faculty. It is the clerk's role to perceive and verbalize the "sense of meeting"--the residuum of agreement discernible after all who are moved to speak have had their say. This is a critical task whose performance demands great skill in human relations. The absence of voting and the use of the consensus method of decision-making seem related to the highly developed use of written documents concerning institutional policies and procedures on this campus.

Superimposed upon the decision-making techniques derived from the institution's denominational affiliation are organizational features common to many small colleges. The college has as its principal officers a president (since 1958, Landrum Bolling, a

former professor of political science at Earlham) and a dean of the faculty, who is also an active member of the teaching faculty. Also, faculty committees formulate statements of policy in various matters and handle routine business for the faculty as a whole. The most important regular committees are the educational policy committee; the curriculum committee, which processes course additions and deletions; and the faculty affairs committee, which deals with faculty promotions and tenure. In recent years, students have been included on all faculty committees, including the faculty affairs committee. In addition, the college had in the winter of 1967-68 an ad hoc long-range planning commission which included the president and the dean and met with the major committees and the faculty as a whole when necessary. The president takes an active role in these meetings.

There is, thus, a conscious attempt at Earlham to maximize the Friends' concept of community by reducing organizational hierarchy to a minimum, while maintaining the necessary apparatus for efficient functioning. Only a few members of the administrative staff of forty-four persons (excluding maintenance supervisors) do not also teach. Library personnel are included on faculty committees. The mores of the college encourage the use of personal names to soften the remaining status differences, and the formality of titles is deliberately avoided.

The college has gained certain advantages from its situation.

Through its Quaker affiliation Earlham has extensive relationships with Quaker service organizations elsewhere, both within America and in countries all over the world. The faculty members the college has been able to recruit for its international program, although they are fully qualified academics--55 percent hold earned Ph.D.'s (Earlham College, 1966)--are also Friends with valuable experience and connections in international public and social service. The Friends' emphasis on practical service and efficient organization to that end is explicitly echoed on the campus in the understanding that promotion is not dependent upon publication (although publication is welcome) and in the encouragement given to organizational and service activities. This tradition of practical organization and international service has served Earlham well in its attempts to establish a viable program of international study.

Earlham's denominational affiliations, however, have in no way prevented the college from experiencing problems in finance and faculty recruitment common to many smaller colleges. The college has reached the end of a decade of expansion of its educational program, with resulting increases in tuition and fees, which now stand just below the \$3,000 mark for resident students. There has been a concurrent change in social background of the students, who are now more likely to be non-Quaker and to be drawn from upper middle class families all over the eastern seaboard and

North Central states, rather than from eastern Indiana lower middle class Quaker families. As the student body has become more cosmopolitan, the faculty has also become less Quaker; approximately 40 percent are now Friends. To finance the expansion in educational program, the student body and faculty have also increased in numbers despite objections to numerical growth arising from the Quaker aims of the institution. The student body has, thus, increased from about 850 in 1962 to almost 1,200 in 1967-68, and the regular teaching staff from sixty to ninety-seven in the 1957-to-1968 period.

These trends have had important effects on Earlham's campus culture. There is a continual need to make the Friends' sense of community understood among the large numbers who are not Friends and, indeed, to preserve it. New members of the institution, both faculty and students, must constantly be socialized to the practices of the community, as well as to its beliefs and values. The extent of the problem may be judged by the fact that 42 percent of the faculty of Earlham have joined the institution within the past five years. New members of the faculty evidently also have been relatively new entrants to the teaching profession, for the structure of ranks is rather evenly balanced here (full professors 29 percent, associate professors 26 percent, assistant professors 29 percent, and other, 16 percent).

Above all, the changes of the past ten years have focused the attention of the Earlham faculty and administration on the evident

conflict between the practice of educational innovation and the maintenance of a stable community conserving what is valuable in the tradition of the past. President Bolling displayed a keen awareness of this problem in a statement on Innovation, Educational Improvement, and the Earlham Community in December 1967:

The improvement of undergraduate education is an urgent problem in contemporary colleges and universities. . . The improvement of undergraduate education at Earlham must be sought within the context of [the] small community, with due attention for those factors and forces and experiences which strengthen the working together of the community and with due caution toward those changes which may erode the community [p. 1].

The issues facing Earlham faculty in the winter of 1967-68 clearly suggested the nature of the problems the college faces. Wrote Bolling: "Historically and presently, Earlham's special strengths are in three areas: a) the natural sciences; b) international studies; c) philosophy and religion [1967, p. 3]." He argued that "a sense of special quality, of particular strengths, of unique patterns, even of institutional idiosyncrasy can and often does lead to the strengthening of a sense of community," and urged the college to continue to build upon these areas of strength [1967, p. 3]. The college then faced a decision whether to add an expensive new science building filled with scientific equipment, how to finance it, and whether and how to encourage faculty and student research in the sciences. Members of the leading faculty committees argued that this extension of Earlham's traditional strength in science education would only result in

enlarging the student body to meet the costs, and that to build upon Earlham's curricular strengths in fact was to ignore Earlham's curricular weakness in the humanities. They expressed dissatisfaction with the ad hoc state of long-range planning efforts and urged appointing someone with either half- or full-time responsibility for this matter (Earlham College, December 13, 1967).

A series of draft proposals on long-range planning followed, written by a subgroup of the long-range planning commission which included the president and dean. The president's central role in developing these proposals was evident and accorded closely with the opinion encountered on this campus that the president was the source of most educational innovations, subject to campus modification and approval by the means described above. Nevertheless, he exemplified rather more than at Mills the model of primus inter pares. The question Earlham now seems to face is how to preserve the primacy of the community in decision-making against the trend toward more elaborate formal administrative machinery and a greater formal specialization among the administrative staff.

International Program

One reason for administrative specialization arises from the development of Earlham's international program, which embodies the college's commitment to social service and displays Earlham's traditions of administrative efficiency with minimal formal organization. The program now is primarily a study experience for

periods of three months to a year in host countries for undergraduate students. It is not designed to further faculty research and travel, although outside funds have enlarged research and travel opportunities for faculty associated with the program in the past. More important, it has been successfully institutionalized on the Earlham campus by extensive use of two kinds of organizational devices: interinstitutional cooperation and extensive working through the Great Lakes College Association, the college's major institutionally tied ancillary association.

The present program has developed, primarily in the last five years, along the lines of a Meso-American study program inaugurated with the help of a special endowment fund at Earlham in 1956. From the original program, Earlham's own foreign study opportunities have expanded to include France and Switzerland, Germany-Austria, England, Spain, Italy, Greece, Eastern Europe, Scandinavia, Japan, and occasionally Russia. Groups of eighteen to twenty-five students yearly depart under the supervision of an Earlham faculty member to live and study in Japan and the major countries of western Europe for six to nine months. The Scandinavian program operates in alternate years, and the Greek, Italian, and Eastern European programs alternate triennially.

Study arrangements are made with university institutions or their foreign students' division in the countries visited. Where possible the students take regular university courses in the

countries visited, but the foreign study experience is deliberately kept as much as possible to the American model--even to the extent of regular instruction by the accompanying faculty member--for the sake of the on-campus credit students receive. The extent of this program is shown by statistics issued by Earlham. Some 70 percent of Earlham students are said to consider foreign study, with between 55 percent and 60 percent actually leaving the campus on one of the off-campus programs.

An international programs office, located in the offices of the social science division, has "grown up" to service these programs, as well as five winter term, off-campus programs in the states. It acquired a name only within the last two years. This office in 1967-68 was under the direction of Lewis Hoskins, one of the two faculty members added to the history department since 1958 to teach foreign area studies. The office receives and screens all applications, locates inexpensive transportation, and makes arrangements in the host countries. Selection of a faculty member to accompany each group abroad rotates annually among the faculty at large. The majority of students who embark on one of these programs are majors in the social sciences and humanities.

A developed principle of the international programs is that their cost to the student should not exceed the cost of attending Earlham regularly, so that all members of the student community may benefit from these opportunities. Consequently, all but

incidental costs of foreign study are covered by the regular tuition each student pays to the college. Regular Earlham tuition thus covers both expenses of foreign travel and foreign tuition.

Development of Non-Western Curriculum

While the foreign study programs were established before the present president had commenced his tenure in 1958, he is said to have contributed to the development of this program and also set in motion the processes which culminated in the addition of a considerable non-Western component to the curriculum, the foreign study program, and campus life generally. One of his first steps was to have prepared an institutional inventory of faculty, courses, and library resources in 1957-58. This survey showed that about twenty of Earlham's sixty full-time faculty taught some twenty-five courses with "substantial international or foreign content." The non-Western world was considered "to some extent" in ten of these courses. Aside from the president-elect, who had been a foreign correspondent with experience in Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and Africa, only five or six faculty had had "significant non-Western experience," two in Russian studies [Association of American Colleges, 1964, p. 93].

With the consent of the faculty, Earlham added two historians of foreign areas to its staff in 1958. They were Jackson H. Bailey, a product of the Harvard East Asian program and the beneficiary of some years of high-level administrative experience in Japan in lieu

of military service, and Hoskins, a Latin American historian with organizational experience gained in Africa and elsewhere through the American Friends Service Committee. Meanwhile, Earlham and its nearest collegiate neighbor, Antioch, were deciding to work together in expanding their non-Western offerings. Their aims were:

- (1) systematic exposure of the college community to people, ideas, and information related to the non-Western world;
- (2) providing opportunities for permanent faculty to undertake serious study of one or more non-Western areas and to develop materials of relevance to their own courses;
- (3) the development and inclusion in the curriculum of a few courses on non-Western areas [J. H. Bailey, 1961, p. 406].

The colleges saw a need for "more and better courses dealing with Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa" in political science, economics and history, but "no need for new organizational arrangements [Association of American Colleges, 1964, p. 95]." They concluded that neither surveys of contemporary world problems nor of the non-Western world would serve their purposes and elected instead to concentrate upon the one major area of East Asia. This decision was intended to obviate a need for organizational change by requiring only the addition of one qualified faculty member in the social sciences who could be fitted into an existing organizational unit or department. Infusion of non-Western materials into existing courses was also endorsed as a way of spreading the non-Western influence on the campus (Association of American Colleges, 1964). Library development of non-Western holdings was considered essential.

During the first part of 1959, the colleges sought and received a Ford Foundation grant of \$35,000, to be administered by Earlham for a period ending in June 1962. According to the final report on this grant,

The initial three-year grant was looked upon by both schools as an opportunity to experiment with ways to involve the faculty in the planning and implementation of any action that was to be taken and to increase faculty knowledge of and competence in non-Western studies [Antioch & Earlham Colleges, 1962, p. 1].

The chosen device was a faculty seminar in which some ten to fifteen faculty members from each college would study the civilizations of Asia. Faculty were recruited for these seminars "through a combination of public announcements published in the faculty news notes and individual invitations issued by the presidents to faculty members it was deemed essential to involve [Antioch & Earlham Colleges, 1962, p. 2]. Effort was made to invite both the genuinely interested and those "who could contribute most, either to the seminar itself or to the creation of a favorable atmosphere on the campus [Antioch & Earlham Colleges, 1962, p. 2]. The seminar met twice monthly on each campus for the academic year, with two or three joint meetings per year.

A second, and much larger, two-year terminal grant was received in spring 1962 to continue the Earlham-Antioch cooperation and to extend what had been learned to the recently formed Great Lakes College Association (GLCA), of which both institutions are members (Abrams, 1968). The grant accordingly contained funds for

faculty seminars, library acquisitions, and a GLCA inventory and planning conference. In addition, new functions were contemplated on the two original campuses: fellowships for faculty research and the development of experimental Japanese language instruction.

Meanwhile, the proportion of the second grant devoted to development of international studies in GLCA institutions rapidly brought results. During the period from November 1962, the time of the GLCA inventory conference, until 1964, the association agreed to develop a coordinated but decentralized foreign study program, with specified colleges acting as agents of the association for programs in particular foreign areas. By 1964 the association provided study opportunities in Japan, Latin America, the Middle East, and Africa. "It is more than coincidence," according to the report on the second Earlham-Antioch grant, "that Earlham and Antioch are agents for the association's programs in Japan and Latin America, respectively [Antioch & Earlham Colleges, 1964, p. 27]." In 1968 limited opportunities for small numbers of students were also available through the GLCA in Scotland and Yugoslavia.

In the winter of 1963-64, the GLCA sought and received half a million dollars in Ford funds for a three-year period for faculty research, a program of visiting scholars, faculty seminars, and a program of instruction in the critical languages on several of the campuses of the twelve institutional members of the association. The association set up a committee on international education and

named Bailey of Earlham its coordinator of international programs for the first two years. Grants to two Earlham faculty members whose fields are philosophy and religion under this program resulted in a new, team-taught course on the religions of Asia at Earlham. It appears that approximately two-thirds of this grant went into seventy-five faculty fellowships, of which seven were held on the Earlham campus; about 20 percent went to support seminars, meetings, language instruction, and foreign study programs; and the remainder to visiting scholars, administrative costs, and overhead (Great Lakes Colleges Association, 1967). This grant concluded in 1966.

One further source of outside funding, and the only one still remaining to Earlham, was provided by the establishment of an NDEA language and area center for Japanese in 1964. In the 1963 expansion of NDEA centers to undergraduate institutions, Earlham was one of the first colleges to benefit. Since then, it has maintained its center and its teaching staff in Japanese by an ingenious combination of its on-campus language instruction with the college's role as agent for the GLCA foreign study program in Japan.

Because enrollments in language classes dealing with unusual or unfamiliar areas are difficult to maintain on small campuses, language study for non-Western areas is often too expensive for small institutions. This problem has been encountered on other

GLCA campuses where instruction in uncommon languages was established under the 1964-to-1967 Ford grant and is widely reported elsewhere. However, at Earlham the problem has been solved in the following manner. During 1968-69 the NDEA center supported a teaching staff of three (an assistant professor, one full-time, and one part-time instructor) in Japanese language on the Earlham campus where elementary and, since 1967, second-year Japanese have been offered. In addition, two NDEA interns, graduates in linguistics and English of Japanese colleges and universities, were located on other GLCA campuses for two quarters and on the Earlham campus during the spring. Enrollments in Japanese were maintained both from the voluntary participation of Earlham students and by requiring all students on the GLCA-sponsored Japan study tour, for which Earlham is agent, to have had elementary Japanese language instruction before commencing their tour in July. Earlham students who expect to travel to Japan receive this instruction on the Earlham campus in a three-quarter elementary Japanese sequence. The interns, stationed at Antioch (seventy miles away) and DePauw (120 miles away) conduct Japanese language study on those campuses during the fall and winter quarters for GLCA students from other campuses who expect to visit Japan the following summer. The interns return to Earlham and students from other GLCA campuses transfer to the Earlham campus for a special intensive Japanese course during the spring quarter. The considerable supervisory responsibilities

required for the success of this program are carried on with the help of the office of international programs.

The curricular results of Earlham's decision to expand its offerings in the international field and in-depth on the Far East have, thus, been as follows since 1959: six one-quarter history courses on China, Japan, and the Far East; elementary, intermediate, and advanced Japanese language instruction; and an introduction to Japanese literature. Also, an interdepartmental course on the geography of East Asia has been taught since 1965, a two-quarter sequence on the religions of Asia since 1966, and a one-quarter course in oriental art and print-making course taught by one of the recipients of a summer study grant in Japan.

Course offerings in other international fields of study are also expanding. In 1968-69, two courses on international economics and three on political problems of developing areas and international politics were given, along with courses in world literature and Japanese literature in translation. Aside from NDEA-related courses. Latin American and African history courses are offered in alternate years by Hoskins, and sociology courses on Latin America and India were being developed in 1968-69.

Most Earlham courses enroll, on an average, ten students if they are not required courses, somewhat more when the course is given irregularly. These figures suggest that a maximum of perhaps two hundred Earlham students, exclusive of those receiving Japanese

language instruction, benefit from greatly increased on-campus instruction on the non-West in a single year. It is apparent that the magnitude of curricular change stemming from the international programs would be relatively modest without the combined Earlham foreign study opportunities and Great Lakes College Association programs. Together, however, they have decisively changed the study opportunities available to Earlham students.

The course of Earlham's association with Africa has been somewhat different from that with the Far East. Earlham is one of the relatively few American colleges to have accepted an AID contract for educational development abroad. During the late 1950's, the United East African Missionary Board, a Quaker group, proposed to provide secondary vocational education in East Africa. Since AID could not contract with a sectarian group, the board approached Earlham as a likely substitute contract holder. The project was under discussion before President Bolling took office in 1957. Negotiations were concluded in 1959, and Hoskins left for Kenya in 1960. The school organized under Earlham auspices was staffed entirely by non-Earlham personnel hired for the purpose and it has now been turned over to the Kenyan Ministry of Education for operation.

Although the impact of this project on the Earlham campus was negligible, the contacts it provided and the educational needs it met suggested a new arena of expansion of Earlham's international

program which would extend logically both the instructional emphases of the on-campus and foreign study programs and the practical service aspects of the Friends' ideology. During 1967-68, four graduate veterans of the Japan study program returned to Japan to teach English in prefecture high schools, while two other Earlham graduates went to Kenya for the same purpose. It is now suggested that after two years of teaching experience in these countries, the graduates should return to the campus for a year's instruction in the education department, followed by the award of a Master of Arts in teaching. Difficulties of finance and staffing impede the formal organization of their program, however.

Library Expansion

Library expansion in non-Western holdings during 1960 to 1965 was part of a larger program of general library expansion. The new Lilly Library building opened in 1963 with a capacity of 200,000 volumes. Library holdings generally increased from about 80,000 volumes in 1957 to 135,000 volumes in 1967. The library purchase budget expanded from less than \$10,000 annually to \$32,000 annually in the period of 1957 to 1963 and has remained close to the latter figure. During 1964 and 1965, the second Ford grant assisted the college by expending about \$6,500 annually on non-Western acquisitions, for a total of about 20 percent of the acquisitions budget. Since that time with the aid of NDEA funds, library acquisitions devoted to non-Western materials have averaged about 10 percent of

the total acquisitions budget.

Earlham library personnel have been as active in organizational work as the faculty. Earlham librarians have been included on the committee on non-Western resources of their professional organization, the Association of College and Research Libraries of the American Library Association, since its inception in 1964. They have been active in many in-service training activities through their professional association and through the National Council for Foreign Area Materials, a federation of various institutionally tied ancillary associations of Eastern and Middle Western colleges whose purpose is to circulate more widely the curricular and bibliographic aids made available through the Foreign Area Materials Center of the University of the State of New York.

Impact of Curricular Change

Earlham College set out in 1958 to provide "more and better courses dealing with Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa" in the social sciences, but without new organizational arrangements. This new dimension was to be added to the curriculum by means of in-depth study of one foreign area, the Far East, by curricular infusion, and by development of library holdings.

At the level of the college as an institution consisting of interacting individuals and organizational subunits, this objective has been realized. Although the curricular enrichment has required new courses, they have been certified through existing machinery,

and although the enrichment has resulted in unanticipated additions of faculty, they have not required the formation of new departments. A difficulty has arisen, however, in fitting the Japanese language program, taught along oral-aural lines, into the existing organizational pattern. Perceptible universalization has taken place in the definition of the geographic coverage of the departments of history and sociology.

One new organizational subunit, the office of international programs, has indeed resulted. It has added a new position of administrative assistant, whose duties have been defined entirely by the energy and abilities of the first (and present) incumbent. Considering Earlham's size and organization, this is not a change of great magnitude. But this office has interrelated Earlham's on-campus curricular expansion in non-Western studies and its foreign study programs, with resulting unanticipated growth in both programs. By all testimony, the results have been beneficial to the campus culture; a trustee who is also a high administrative officer of a major university doubted that the distinguished non-Western program on his campus had as effectively suffused the campus atmosphere as it had at Earlham.

If, at the level of the classroom and the curriculum, the educational impact of these changes may be characterized as substantial but modest, the effect is far greater at the level of the student. About half the Earlham students now spend a summer, six

months, or a year in a foreign country or in off-campus study in the states. Ten years ago this was not the case.

Change has been greatest at the student level and especially in the interaction of the institution with its environment. The international programs have required approximately \$35,000 a year of outside funds since 1959. These funds have been secured by interaction with various important elements of the ancillary structure defining and circumscribing American higher education: by cooperation with another institution; then by organizing a new ancillary association of neighboring colleges; by appeals to the Ford Foundation; and by dealings with elements of the American government, such as the AID and the U.S. Office of Education. Some of these interactions have been transitory, as with the Ford Foundation and the AID, but the existence of the Great Lakes Colleges Association has provided an arena for greatly increased interactions among the member institutions.

The individuals who have been most instrumental in effecting these new institutional interactions have also been extremely active in their relevant professional associations. Through their professional and institutionally tied ancillary associations and through their face-to-face interactions with government officials, they have participated in the national educational discourse on matters affecting the international program as never before. Thus, Earlham faculty members were active on behalf of

small colleges in negotiations over the International Education Act of 1966. These are events which would have been unthinkable ten years ago. The prospect is for more such off-campus relationships in international programs.

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK COLLEGE AT NEW PALTZ

The State University College at New Paltz, New York, has experienced the rapid growth and the kind of change in formal institutional goals common to many former teachers colleges in the twentieth century. The college began as a classical high school, or academy, which served this Hudson River village of New Paltz. When the academy burned in 1884, the state legislature authorized the building of a normal school, which opened at New Paltz in 1886. Until the end of World War I, however, teacher training ordinarily did not extend one year beyond the high school diploma at the most. It was not until 1938 that the New Paltz Normal School was authorized to give a four-year course of collegiate instruction; in January 1942, it was permitted to grant the bachelor's degree in education. In the same year, the school became the State Teachers College at New Paltz.

Structure and Goals

Six years later, the State University of New York was created by act of the legislature, which incorporated into the State University all the state-supported teachers colleges, certain

professional schools supported by state funds and located on the campuses of major private universities in the state, and certain other educational institutions. Until the fall of 1961, the college remained primarily an institution for teacher training offering the bachelor's and Master of Science degrees in various teaching fields. But in 1960, the college was transformed into an institution for general undergraduate education, including the liberal arts, and became the State University College at New Paltz. Preparation for this change had already commenced in 1955, when the college began to extend its programs for preprimary and elementary school teachers to the early secondary level. After the change, full programs training secondary teachers in all the academic fields were instituted, and the college has begun to implement expanded master's degree offerings to comply with state master planning in higher education, instituted in 1961.

During the twentieth century transition, the number of students attending the college has also grown. From 846 full- and part-time students in 1951, it grew to 2,311 students in 1958 (1,385 undergraduates), with concurrent stress on full-time undergraduate study (2,673 students in 1962, of whom 2,319 were undergraduates). In spring 1967, when the Asian-African program at New Paltz was observed, enrollment stood at about 4,500 (3,652 undergraduates) and was expected to reach 5,000 by 1975. The evidence of growth in numbers is plain to see on the campus, where a major construction

program is now in progress and newly added area studies faculty share cramped quarters in a former women's dormitory.

Faculty appointments also reflect this growth and change in educational goals. Just under 80 percent of the 354 teaching faculty, administrative staff, and library personnel listed in the 1966-67 and 1967-68 college Bulletin (State University College at New Paltz, pp. 12-32) came to New Paltz within the previous five years, and 90 percent of them within the previous ten years. Of the three hundred teaching faculty, 48 percent held the rank of assistant professor, all but three of whom had joined the faculty since 1961. Fifty-four (18 percent) of the teaching faculty were full professors. Twenty of them had served more than ten years, but only ten of the fifty-two associate professors had served more than ten years. None of the thirty-five instructors (11 percent of teaching faculty) or visiting lecturers (5 percent of teaching faculty) had served more than four years in 1966. Thus, only among full professors was there perceptible continuity of experience with earlier stages of the college's evolution.

Change in goals was reflected in the changing character of faculty professional training as well. Sixty-six percent of full professors had earned the degree of Ph.D., but 34 percent held other kinds of higher degrees. Thirteen of these eighteen men were holders of the Ed.D. Among associate professors, 71 percent held the Ph.D. as their highest earned degree, and 29 percent

held other kinds of higher degrees. Thirteen of these twenty-three men held the Ed.D as the highest earned degree. Among assistant professors, however, a dramatic change is visible. Eighty-one percent held the master's degree as highest earned degree, 11 percent held the Ph.D., and only three of the fourteen holding other kinds of degrees were possessors of the Ed.D. To some degree, the professional training of the most senior faculty members, thus, represents New Paltz's earlier commitment to the education of teachers, while academic professionalism, as measured by possession of the Ph.D., is strongest among associate professors. The great majority of faculty members have not completed their professional training, but it is more likely that their goal is the Ph.D. rather than the Ed.D.

Presiding over all phases of these significant changes in the institution was, for twenty-two years, William J. Haggerty. He had taken charge at New Paltz in 1944, just after the old normal school became a state teachers college. He had seen the college become part of the state university system and had guided its transformation into a four-year liberal arts college. By all accounts, he was solely responsible for introducing the Asian-African program and the general studies program whose basic required courses on these areas permitted the hiring of a new staff with competence in these regions. On January 1, 1967, just before observation for this study commenced, he moved to Albany for duty

with the state university central administration, after having set in motion the necessary arrangements for a major review of the college's internal organization for liberal arts teaching. Observation took place, therefore, during a period of change and uncertainty, while an interim president from another part of the state university system was in charge and the college was seeking a new first officer.

Role in the University System

Since the 1960 master plan for higher education in New York State appeared, the position of the college at New Paltz has been more closely defined as to its function and in its relation to other institutions in the state university system. Along with the decision to convert the state teachers colleges into four-year colleges of general education, the master plan announced the articulation of a system of two-year community colleges within commuting reach of every student, four-year liberal arts colleges, specialized or "contract" colleges for professional education of various types, medical centers, and the establishment of four university centers in various parts of the state.

Subsequent revisions of the master plan defined the position of the system's constituent institutions more clearly. To promote diversification of tasks rather than duplication, two-year colleges were to provide a broad and comprehensive range of community services and vocational skills to eighteen year olds; four-year

colleges were to provide "sub-professional curricula" up to, and including, master's degrees in education and the liberal fields; and the university centers were to be encouraged to develop "the most advanced post-doctoral programs (1966 interim revision, 1966)." Transfer of students between institutions was to be greatly facilitated. During 1965-67 the work of defining each institution's fields of specialization continued, with the local institutions proposing major curricular programs for the trustees' approval after determining the appropriateness of proposed programs to the goals of the overall system. At the same time, much effort was expended on building three parallel systems for intercampus communication and decision-making among administrators, faculty, and students. An advisory counsel of chief administrative officers and a system of subcommittees was set up to link the central administration and the campuses, while a similar statewide student organization and a faculty representative and advisory body, with appropriate committees, were organized at the same time. The organization of these formal, intercampus interactions helped very greatly to define the university system as a somewhat broader entity than the central administration to members of the individual campuses.

Since 1961, then, educational policies have evolved on the various campuses as a product of joint decision-making by the faculty and administration of the college, on the one hand, and the setting of priorities for the system as a whole by the central administration

of the state university, on the other hand. In the future, decisions of educational policy at New Paltz must be made with reference to the development of the entire system as well as to New Paltz' own educational improvement, and through consultation with individuals off the campuses. The visible, formal limits to the college's autonomy were, thus, more apparent than at any other collegiate institution among our case studies.

Nevertheless, state master planning by the central administration is still in its infancy, regular procedures are still being established, and, most important, most of the collegiate institutions making up the system anteceded the system itself. Thus, the process of setting goals and priorities in state master planning has sometimes meant simply endorsing, and carrying to a more general level, actual practices on some of the campuses. This would seem to be true in the case of the state university's position on international studies.

The 1964 State University Master Plan outlined the principle of "deep concern. . .with the problems, needs, and aspirations of peoples throughout the world" on the part of the university as a whole (Stature and excellence, 1964). To underscore the central administration's commitment to this goal, however, the trustees proposed to establish a universitywide center for international studies at a university-owned estate near Oyster Bay, Long Island, and to appoint an executive dean in charge of this center. The

first executive dean of international studies, appointed during 1965-66, was Glenn Olds, formerly of Cornell University. Between 1964 and 1966 a detailed development plan for the following ten years was prepared, projecting several major goals: a "thoroughly internationalized curriculum throughout the University," with "appropriate sharing of opportunities and responsibilities" by the various campuses, major foreign studies programs within the university for students unable to study abroad, and institutes for comparative studies in the university centers. The center for international studies was to be developed into a university-wide service center in international matters, acting as an institute for American studies for foreign students, a conduit of university service to the public (offering opportunities for study of international matters), and seminars centered upon foreign scholars-in-residence, among other programs. Growing opportunities were to become available to students of the state university to study abroad, and for faculty to teach abroad, along with special opportunities to foreign students and scholars to become acquainted with American society through the state university (1966 interim revision, 1966, pp. VIII-3).

Implementation of these goals began in 1966-67, when representatives concerned with international studies curricula at the various campuses of the state university convened at the center to discuss "sharing of responsibilities" among the campuses. This

discussion centered upon an attempt to distribute among the campuses the rights to develop specialized programs on particular world areas. At the same time, New Paltz was actively seeking to associate itself for purposes of student and faculty exchange with individual universities in certain African and Asian countries. However, in this activity, too, the procedures of the state university system required the New Paltz faculty to coordinate action with the university center at Albany. Also during 1966-67, New Paltz faculty representatives met with representatives of the State University College at Oswego to try to work out future cooperative specialization, in which Oswego students would obtain Chinese language instruction at New Paltz, while New Paltz would direct to Oswego students interested in studying South Asian languages.

A paradox of the encapsulation of this small teachers' college into a large highly organized state university system is the parallel existence of two kinds of administrative systems. The institution itself was just emerging from a period of strong presidential leadership based on personal contacts and verbal agreements. Documentary records of internal proceedings did not seem readily available. Meanwhile, faculty and administrators of the college were being drawn into ever more intense interactions within a state university bureaucracy, relying heavily on written reports, master plans, and the collection of elaborate statistics.

Internal College Organization

Between 1963 and 1966 instruction at New Paltz was conducted through divisions containing groupings of faculty members in two or three related disciplines, and two colleges, general college and upper college, each with its own dean. The general college, under a senior faculty member, contained two divisions, general education and physical education and athletics. It controlled the general education program introduced in 1957, anticipating the college's transformation to a four-year college. Basic to the program of the general college was a set of thirteen required lecture courses designed to take approximately two-thirds of the student's available time during his first two years at New Paltz and to acquaint the student with the major academic disciplines.

By agreement between the president and the dean of the general college, each of these courses (excluding those devoted to science and mathematics) was to be "internationalized" to some degree. One Indian and one Japanese literary classic were read in literature and composition, and general education music and art contained a unit each on Japanese music and art. In addition, under the impetus of the former president, since 1957 the general education curriculum has contained two required, one-quarter area studies courses dealing specifically with Africa and the Middle East and with Asia. Students were required to take both courses before graduation, preferably during their first two years.

These required courses, like others in general education,

were regularly taught every quarter as large lectures with smaller section meetings for student discussion. Since the large enrollment required the organization of ten to thirteen section groups, staffing was a major operation in these and other general education courses. The Asia course in winter 1967 had a staff of nine, and the Africa and Middle East course a staff of seven. One faculty member was designated as coordinator of each course, lecturing in the general meetings was shared by the staff, and each instructor also assumed responsibility for one or more sections. In the Asia course, after a general introductory lecture on Asia as a whole, two weeks were devoted to lectures on India's ancient heritage and current problems, five lectures to similar subjects concerning China, two weeks to Japan, and three lectures to nationalism, economic development, and communism in Southeast Asia. Contributing lectures were five political scientists, two historians, and an economist.

The Africa and Middle East course treated its regions under four major headings: significant characteristics of the whole area; historical background; ideas, movements, and literary expressions; and problems, crises, and practical politics. Contributing lecturers in winter 1967 included an African historian, two anthropologists, two political scientists, and two specialists in literature. This course gave somewhat more latitude in readings, with three texts and a large list of reserve readings in the

library. Differences in subject matter covered in the two courses were clearly a result of variation in the disciplinary backgrounds of the participating staff, as well as the characteristics of the different world areas.

Between 1963 and 1966, staff for these and other general education courses was drawn from the upper and the general colleges. In this period, forty-eight instructors were appointed in the general college, with the course coordinators helping to locate and select the new faculty. Once the appointments were made, however, lines of separation blurred in actual teaching assignments. Members of the upper college faculty participated in and sometimes acted as coordinators of the general education courses, while faculty of the general college seem to have had some opportunity for teaching outside the required courses of the general college. The practice of having two subcolleges appoint faculty in the same fields, however, required much consultation among the concerned parties.

Within the upper college, staff appointments in fields dealing with African and Asian matters were also made by several subunits. In the early 1960's, President Haggerty had taken the unusual step of establishing a division of area studies and geography, whose present chairman, Peter Wright, was appointed in 1964. This unit has primary responsibility for appointments in the social sciences and humanities concerning non-Western areas. However, the divisions

of history and political economy and literature and philosophy also contained faculty members with a major interest in non-Western areas. Flexibility was achieved by cross-listing courses in the area studies division with those of the other two divisions. Twelve of the forty-plus faculty members with special competence in foreign areas at New Paltz in 1966-67 belonged to this division.

Organizing area studies as a division at New Paltz put it in a strong position but also exposed it to competition with other divisions in the upper college. The division will continue to add faculty even after the bulk of increase in student enrollment, according to new formulas for faculty workload defined in the 1966 Interim Revision of the Master Plan of 1964 for the State University of New York. Thus, the area studies and geography division can expect to make as many as six new appointments in a single academic year for the next few years. In faculty hiring, however, the crosscutting nature of the area studies division produced the same structural problem as the division into upper and general colleges--the power of several units within the college to appoint individuals in the same disciplinary fields sometimes resulted in competition among the units concerned.

In spring of 1967, however, New Paltz appeared to be on its way toward an internal organization more similar to disciplinary departments. The first step was the abolition of the general college and the assignment of its forty-eight faculty to the

departmental groups within the divisions, thus, eliminating potential competition in faculty hiring. No alteration was made at that time in the boundaries of the divisions of the upper college, which became holding companies for the emergence of future disciplinary departments. The flexibility of the situation was illustrated by an organization chart of the college mounted upon the wall of the area studies divisional office. When the author expressed hope that the chart would provide an aid to understanding the college, the divisional chairman replied that it did not now represent, and in fact never had represented, the internal structure of the college.

Area Studies

In addition to the required general education area courses on Africa and the Middle East and Asia, the college offers through the division of area studies and geography the bachelor's degree in African and Asian area studies. The Asia major requires fifty-six quarter credits of work, of which all but eight must be distributed in various social science fields. Two years of instruction in Chinese are available, and students may work individually with tapes of certain other Asian languages.

The African studies major requires fifty-six quarter credits, centered heavily in history, geography, political science, and economics. The division of area studies sponsors a survey course in Islamic civilization, and coursework in African literature and art is available through the humanities division.

The area studies majors, however, have not been particularly popular with students, the vast majority of whom are still future elementary and secondary teachers. Only about twenty students majored in area studies in 1967. Fortunately, faculty growth is based not upon student interest as manifested in majors but on student enrollments in classes as determined by a credit-hour formula which has, until now, been liberally applied. Faculty and administration apparently recognized the necessity to support new programs. Generally, enrollments have been encouraging; an African literature course observed for this study was attended by more than twenty students, at least as many as would be likely to attend such a course at a larger university center. Nevertheless, staff members of the division realize that their existence must be based upon continued student interest as manifested in enrollments and service to the community. They are now planning area studies minors to supplement disciplinary majors, special master's programs, and participation in community education programs.

Impact of Curricular Change

The Asian and African programs of the State University College at New Paltz are the result of a fortunate conjunction of three elements: interest of the president, expanding resources, and rapid institutional change that enabled the president to institute a major curricular and organizational reform in 1957 despite the opposition of a considerable portion of the faculty. In that reform,

control of the first two years of the curriculum was given to the general college, in which required courses on the non-Western world and required infusion of non-Western materials into other general courses guaranteed positions for faculty with special competence on these world areas. Five years later, the president formalized the position of foreign area studies at the college by endowing it with divisional status, thus assuring foreign area faculty formal access to budget makers and more or less guaranteeing foreign area studies a share of the college's expanding financial resources.

Faculty members with specializations on the foreign areas were keenly aware that their presence at the college was the product of the president's interest in the field, and of the entire organizational pattern of the college. They clearly indicated that the foreign area "interest" on the faculty had been embodied in a division so that it might compete for funds and manpower through the institution's regular budgetary procedures, rather than by depending on the formation of a faculty consensus or an institution-wide educational philosophy. Partly because of the rapid institutional change the college was experiencing, staff consensus appeared to be limited at New Paltz.

One manifestation of this lack of consensus was evident among foreign area staff members. To maximize the penetration of non-Western subject matter into the New Paltz curriculum, faculty with

foreign area competences had been appointed in the general college, in the area studies division, and also in the social science division. As a result, faculty interested in Asia and Africa, but appointed outside the area studies division, occasionally found themselves with divided loyalties--to their own divisions, and to the area studies programs in which they taught. Ironically, the college's expanding financial resource provided numerous occasions for such divisions. Every new appointment in the foreign area field presented foreign area faculty members with a potential test of their loyalties. Since the subject matter covered by other divisions in the upper college was not duplicated in other units to the same degree as that of area studies, upper college faculty were less subject to the problems created by divided loyalties. Informal consultation procedures which had sufficed to solve problems of this kind when the college was smaller were now more difficult to maintain with a faculty of increased size. Fortunately the opportunity to present a united front in negotiations with foreign area faculty of other colleges within the system helped to offset the effects of internal division.

A major step toward solving these difficulties was taken during the period of observation. The general college was abolished and its staff reassigned to the divisions. A clear result of this move was an accession of faculty strength, both in absolute numbers of faculty and in relation to students, to the area studies division,

which then took full control of the required introductory area courses. Further evidence of the successful legitimation of this organizational pattern was found in the continued administrative support to the division after President Haggerty's departure, despite the division's very small student clientele. One reason for this continued support was the college's changing institutional context. Within the state university system, the college's specialization in foreign area studies now became a great advantage in advancing claims to a share of the university budget based on institutional distinctiveness. If the level of state funding should be reduced in the future, however, some reassessment of the foreign area program may be required. Conscious of this fact, members of the division were working very hard to create new student constituencies in the Master of Arts in teaching program and through community service.

FOUR-COLLEGE COOPERATION IN THE CONNECTICUT VALLEY

The committee for Asian-African studies of the four-college program in the Connecticut Valley represents an attempt to meet the problems of "internationalizing" the curriculum of the small collegiate institution by combining the forces of several institutions rather than attempting to integrate curricular development on each of the campuses of the cooperating institutions. The committee members are teaching faculty from four cooperating institutions: two small private women's colleges, Smith (1967

enrollment 2,451) and Mt. Holyoke (1967 enrollment 1,810); one private men's college, Amherst (1967 enrollment 1,220); and a rapidly growing state university, the University of Massachusetts campus at Amherst (1967 enrollment 10,621). Committee activities, thus, require the approval of not one chief campus administrator but four. These activities involve some members of the faculty of all four institutions in interaction of varying intensity and have changed the opportunities available to some of the students of all four institutions.

Four-college cooperation in various activities antecedes the Asian-African committee by some eight years. Begun in 1951, the cooperation continued through the 1950's with the aid of a grant from the Fund for the Advancement for Education (1955-66), which permitted both administration and faculty participation in planning and organization of four-college cooperation. Although the planners agreed that cooperation in non-Western studies would be useful, the current committee resulted from the initiative of other interested faculty members--an indirect outcome of the planning experience. During 1958 and 1959 the committee members sought and, with the support of the presidents of the four institutions, obtained outside funds to extend their activities during the following seven years. These activities helped to make the committee somewhat distinct from the cooperating institutions, as well as from other aspects of four-college cooperation.

Characteristics of the Cooperating Institutions

The four cooperating institutions are located within a few miles of each other in three small towns of the Connecticut River Valley in central-southern Massachusetts. The wooded rural setting contrasts strongly with the busy air of the Hartford-Springfield industrial complex further down the river. The greatest distance between any of the institutions does not exceed seven and one-half miles. Besides close proximity, the schools share similar goals and style, which encourage cooperation.

None of the three private colleges in the group is coeducational. Although Smith's enrollment is twice that of Amherst, all three are moderately small. None is under denominational sponsorship; all three are old and well-established institutions catering to a select group of intellectually, socially, and financially advantaged students. All three have recently experienced financial pressures common to small independent colleges, and they have grown slowly in the past decade. Smith has increased from 2,200 students in 1960 to over 2,400 in 1968, making it the largest private women's college in the United States in a period when private women's colleges generally are losing popularity. Amherst, an exceedingly well-endowed institution, increased its enrollment from 1,000 to 1,200 after a reluctant decision on the part of the entire faculty. Mt. Holyoke, whose resources appeared somewhat less abundant than those of Smith and Amherst, increased its enrollment more than the

other two colleges, from 1,400 to 1,800 in the same period. Fees ranged from \$2678 at Amherst for 1967-68 to \$3050 at Mt. Holyoke.

Faculty numbers ranged from 150 at Amherst to 286 at Smith in 1967. The academic qualifications of the faculties were impressive, with 74 percent of both regular and non-regular appointees holding the Ph.D. or equivalent at Amherst in 1967, 66 percent at Mt. Holyoke, and 64 percent at Smith. Judging by the structure of faculty ranks, Amherst was the most stable of the three colleges, with fully 40 percent of its faculty in the rank of full professors, although the recent increase in size was probably reflected in the 32 percent of the faculty who were assistant professors. Mt. Holyoke showed a more even distribution of ranks (29 percent full professors, 19 percent associate professors, 30 percent assistant professors), with recent increases in enrollment reflected in the 48 percent of the faculty who were instructors or assistant professors in 1967.

Smith was somewhat unusual among the three collegiate institutions in the extent of its reliance upon instructors, lecturers, and assistants of various kinds (43 percent of total teaching personnel in 1967). Of the 286 full- and part-time personnel in the ranks of lecturer, instructor, and above, 26 percent were full professors and 17 percent were associate professors. The remaining 57 percent fell in the ranks of assistant professor, instructor, and lecturer.

In matters of governance, the three colleges were known to be "faculty-oriented," to various degrees, although all have well-developed administrative structures, with non-teaching presidents. Each college had six to eight academic deans, plus a registrar. Of the three, Amherst was reputed to exhibit the strongest faculty control, with an elected faculty executive group, the committee of six, meeting regularly to advise the president. Smith, on the other hand, had a monthly meeting of the entire faculty and three or four major faculty committees dealing with curriculum and new courses (educational development committee), personnel (faculty promotion and tenure), and property and planning (faculty planning, faculty conference). The colleges had both rotating departmental chairmanships and five-year rotating deanships, making administrative roles "long-term temporary" at most and placing a premium on personal persuasion rather than on status and authority in decision-making. In recent years, all three institutions have been engaged in ongoing institutionwide curricular revisions that have served to reveal issues and lines of conflict among the faculty of each campus, as well as to sharpen awareness of institutional unity as institutional goals and institutional character are defined.

The University of Massachusetts, which has developed since 1947 on the site of the former Massachusetts State College, differs from the three other colleges in goals, organization, and resources. As a state-supported institution it is a beneficiary of generous

public support and it is also publicly accountable. It is growing, according to a statewide master plan, and much more rapidly than the colleges, having increased from 6,500 students in 1960 to more than 10,000 in 1967, with an expected ceiling of 25,000 to be reached in the mid-1970's. The 561 faculty members in the college of arts and sciences alone is four times that of any of the private colleges in the group. A mark of this large recent growth is the fact that 56 percent of the teaching faculty in this college of the university held the rank of assistant professor or instructor. Its devotion to professional education was apparent in the large proportion of courses devoted to the sciences and to fields, such as journalism and speech therapy, by the 13 percent of the students doing graduate work on the Amherst campus of the university, and by the distribution of Ph.D. holders. In the college of arts and sciences, Ph.D. holders were more numerous than in the associated private colleges, comprising about 90 percent of the faculty in the ranks of assistant professor and above. The university's greater ability to specialize was also apparent in the fact that it alone, of the four institutions, was in the process of organizing a definite undergraduate teaching program in Asian studies separate from the disciplinary departments.

The university's resources, thus, seemed quite disproportionate to those of the three private colleges; its library, for example, could follow an "all current books" purchasing policy,

unlike the private colleges. Yet it maintained little coursework in certain traditional liberal arts fields, such as Latin, classics, and some modern languages (Italian and Portuguese), advising students to seek such courses at the private colleges. Courses listed by the four-college committee also showed a definite differentiation among the four institutions in both disciplinary fields and world regions.

The university also differed from the colleges in its governance pattern and in the social field from which it drew its students. Faculty members were frank to admit that the university attracted a middle and even lower middle class of students drawn primarily from within the state boundaries, despite its relatively high tuition and fees for a state university (approximately \$1,300 in 1968-69). Governance was not left to faculty consensus. Departments were led by appointed heads with indefinite tenure rather than by a faculty chairman. These heads took a leading role in faculty governance on the arts and sciences faculty in the deliberations of the appointive curriculum and academic matters committees, and the location of decision-making responsibility seemed here quite explicitly defined.

Patterns of Cooperation

Despite manifest differences between the university and the three colleges, cooperation on the basis of a certain degree of differentiation of function has seemed beneficial to all the

concerned institutions. Four-college cooperation has grown up since 1951, commencing with the organization of the Hampshire Interlibrary Center, a depository for research collections accessible to the faculties of all four institutions and now located in its own wing of the University of Massachusetts library.

In 1955 the four college presidents sought support from the Fund for the Advancement of Education for a study of the possibilities of greatly expanded cooperation. A single senior faculty member from each university was deputed for the study to serve on the Committee for Cooperation. The committee report, published in 1956, recommended eighteen specific areas for cooperation. The presidents agreed to nine of their recommendations for cooperation in:

1. undergraduate instruction in astronomy, botany, classics, geology-geography, German, Italian, physics, Russian, and Spanish;
2. establishment of an educational FM radio station;
3. coordination of lecture programs;
4. coordination of concert series;
5. circulation of art exhibits;
6. publication of a joint calendar of major events;
7. a joint remedial reading program;
8. a joint program in speech therapy; and
9. the appointment of a coordinator of four-college

cooperation (Whitney, 1966, pp. 1-2; Report of the Committee. . ., 1956).

At the time they set up the coordinator's office, the four presidents also provided machinery for cooperative decision-making. Each president was to appoint a deputy--at Smith and Amherst a member of the faculty, at Mt. Holyoke the registrar, and at the university the provost and his assistant. The deputies were to meet monthly with the coordinator, who would serve as secretary, and their decisions in cooperative matters would be taken to the four presidents four times yearly. Minutes of the deputies' meetings and those of the presidents' regarding four-college cooperation would be distributed to academic and financial officers of the four schools.

The committee on cooperation also made nine other recommendations for areas of cooperation which were not immediately accepted by the presidents. They included:

1. an invitation to all departments to consider joint appointments;
2. encouragement of joint master's degrees;
3. encouragement of joint Ph.D. programs;
4. institution of cooperative area study programs, especially in non-Western fields;
5. cooperative evening science instruction as a special contribution to adult education;

6. a central collection of audio-visual aids;
7. appointment of a statistician serving the four institutions jointly;
8. creation of a central file for use in recruitment of staff; and
9. formation of a corporation for general administrative purposes (Whitney, 1966, p. 2).

Some of the eighteen projects in both categories have gone forward, while others have never matured. None of the instructional programs proposed as community services have been instituted, although the FM radio station operates on community contributions, and a degree of cooperation with local high school teachers in various fields has developed. A few of the proposed facility pools have materialized. With the development of courses in each institution open to students of all four schools, other facilities have been more urgently needed: The schools now operate an hourly bus service among the four terminals, and the three colleges maintain a common student placement program. Informational activities, such as the joint calendar of events and the dovetailing of co-curricular activities, have proved in some ways the least difficult of the eighteen recommendations to carry through, despite the fact that the four colleges do not even have the same lunch hour.

There have been both substantial advances and substantial difficulties in realizing that part of the planning which called

for cooperative instruction. The joint Ph.D. program, although not a high priority with the presidents, has progressed through the device of naming participant faculty in the three colleges as honorary members of the graduate faculty of the university. Co-operative undergraduate instruction has been realized to the greatest degree in the single four-college department to result from these recommendations, the astronomy department. There is also a small history of science program offered by two faculty members, one jointly appointed by the three colleges and the other a member of the university faculty. In Asian-African and Latin American studies, all four institutions offer some course in the various social science departments and the humanities. While joint faculty appointments have not been popular in these fields, information circulars listing courses in all four institutions are regularly circulated to students, and there has been formal and informal faculty cooperation in seminar teaching.

Enrollment of students from all four campuses in courses on other campuses is handled through the office of the coordinator of four-college cooperation. A special form for the purpose requires the student first to consult with the instructor of the course given on another campus, then to obtain the permission of the chairman of the major department and the chief academic administrative officer of his own college. In addition, the student must guarantee his transportation to class.

As a result, student use of the opportunities presented by four-college cooperative instruction has not been large. In the two semesters of 1965-66, a total of 743 registrations (elections) to interchange courses open to students of all four schools were made by both undergraduates and graduates, out of a total of about 20,000 elections at the three colleges and 65,000 at the university (Whitney, 1966, p. 3). Nevertheless, the program is growing slowly. There is a definite increase in the flow of elections to courses on other campuses. During fall 1966, 109 elections from Amherst and ninety-six from Smith were made. The vast majority of these elections went to courses at the university (115) and Smith (ninety-nine) (Amherst College, December 2, 1966, pp. 1-5). At Smith, students enrolled in courses in art, Arabic, Portuguese, Chinese, and European languages, government, history, music, psychology and sociology. Students went to Amherst for history, classics, and Russian, and to Mt. Holyoke for political science and other special interest courses. Students were attracted to the university by its science courses (particularly computer science, a very heavily enrolled interchange course in 1966-67), Japanese and Asian Studies, and special courses in professional fields, such as wildlife management and landscape architecture.

On the graduate level, however, the situation was reversed, with more university graduate students taking courses at the colleges. Graduate students enrolled in the cooperative Ph.D. program

and studying with professors outside their own institutions also showed its benefits to the university: ninety-two of the 104 enrolled in the program in spring 1966 were at the university, five each at the women's colleges, and two at Amherst (Amherst College, May 10, 1966).

Organizational difficulties in joint instruction have been primarily financial. The three colleges are required to contribute a portion of each student's tuition to the receiving institution when students enroll in interchange courses but the university does not contribute a tuition payment to the colleges for its students' participation in the instructional interchange, giving rise to a certain discontent in the colleges. There have been major difficulties regarding retirement and fringe benefits in making joint faculty appointments. More serious has been the feeling of isolation experienced by recipients of joint appointments, who feel they have no institutional "home" and fear the effect of isolation on their chances for promotion. Faculty in the joint astronomy departments have raised questions concerning promotions: Must they be approved by the administrations of all four institutions? What agency gives final approval to such changes of status? These questions are important, for the autonomy of collegiate institutions and their ability to compel members' loyalty are closely related to their ability to reward or punish their members' performance. College administrators, therefore,

feel they have reason to hesitate before consigning away a part of their institution's independence in a cooperative instructional venture.

The most telling evidence of the four institutions' hesitation to take further fundamental steps toward cooperative operations was their retention, until recently, of complete fiscal independence from one another. Until July 1965 no legal entity could even contemplate holding funds in common. When Four-Colleges, Inc., was chartered as a general purpose corporation in that month, it did not immediately take on such general financial responsibility. It has now been reorganized as Five Colleges, Inc., to accommodate the opening of the new, experimental Hampshire College. Hampshire College is a further outcome of the major planning effort undertaken by the four institutions in the middle and late 1950's with support from the Fund for the Advancement of Education (New College Plan, 1958; Four College Committee, 1966; The Making of a College, 1966). What effect the opening of Hampshire College in 1969-70 will have on the corporation remains to be seen. Meanwhile, one or another of the cooperating institutions has had to act as fiscal agent for the four where outside monies have been a factor. In the case of the committee on Asian-African studies, Smith College has acted as the fiscal agent handling the Ford funds granted to the committee.

Four-college cooperation has clearly proceeded despite powerful institutional pressures toward continued autonomy on the part

of the participating colleges. These pressures appeared to arise from institutional budgeting procedures in combination with faculty promotion procedures that reward individual faculty members for loyalty to their departments and their institutions. Cooperative planning in the name of the four colleges has defined areas of likely and fruitful cooperation, but the development of cooperative projects has followed only loosely the guidelines set forth in planning. The major areas of cooperation have centered upon informational functions and various areas of the instructional programs offered by the colleges, rather than on community service.

The picture that emerged is of a set of relatively unrelated projects sponsored by groups of faculty with a special interest in each project. In the circumstances, the coordinator's function is largely one of information circulation, liaison, and record keeping, with the four administrations exercising facilitative powers and sometimes vetoing projects presented to them by interested groups.

Committee on Asian-African Studies

The committee on Asian-African studies resulted from an application for three years' support to the Ford Foundation written by a committee of four professors, John Harris, Donald McKay, and Gwendolyn Carter of Smith College and Everett Hawkins of Mount Holyoke in summer of 1959. They proposed to "undertake, on a cooperative basis, area programs of somewhat special and limited character" focusing upon Asia, the Middle East, and Africa Programs

of Non-Western Studies, 1959, pp. 1-2]. To do so they would set up a committee of four representing each institution within the existing framework of four-college cooperation. They asked for released faculty time for support of area teaching sufficient to support six one-semester courses given by three full and three assistant professors on the four campuses in any academic year. An undergraduate major in area studies, however, was not envisaged. The committee wished to invite a resident visiting professor to the Connecticut Valley annually and to sponsor a series of visiting lecturers. A sum of \$7,000 annually was asked to support faculty members' summer field study.

The proposal was the result of two years' work on the part of the faculty. Originating in Professor Carter's interest in Africa South of the Sahara and Professor Hawkins' interest in South Asia, the program was expanded to include the Middle East in discussions between the faculty, the four-college coordinator, and the four presidents, one of whom carried the proposal to the Ford Foundation. The faculty advised the presidents that while foundation aid would be instrumental during the difficult initial years, over the long run the institutions themselves must be ready to accept "very substantial budgetary responsibility" for an anticipated four new full professors and four assistant professors during the next ten years [Committee for Asian-African Studies, 1959, p. 3]. The ultimate proposal, reflecting both established faculty interest in Asia and

Africa and one president's concern to establish Middle East studies, received approval in fall of 1959, for expenditures of approximately \$130,000.

The committee then embarked on an ambitious program, bringing visiting lecturers to the valley for public lectures and in-class visits and awarding six small grants for summer field study during its first year. In academic year 1960-61, a visiting team from the Harvard Middle East Center was brought in to give a student-faculty seminar, a venture which roused the opposition of three of the four history departments in the participating institutions. However, the seminar was so successful that similar seminars were planned for South and Southeast Asia during the second year of the grant and for Africa during the third year. One faculty grant for research and summer travel was made during the second year and six for substantial amounts during the third year. The committee published invitations for applications and awarded grants.

During 1961-62 the committee and the foundation negotiated the renewal of the grant. A proposal for a terminal area master's degree met opposition from the faculty of the valley institutions, who objected to the organization of graduate study on a regional basis, and from the foundation, which felt that such programs should be conducted primarily by established centers of regional studies. The foundation did award a terminal four-year grant for a total expenditure of \$500,000 during the seven-year period.

The second grant devoted increasing proportions of resources to grants for summer reading, research, and travel for the faculty of the four institutions until this item ultimately totaled 25 percent of grant expenditures during the seven years. One or two faculty seminars were held annually through 1966 on topics of research interest to the participants. The seminars provided an opportunity to invite as visiting lecturers leading specialists in various fields of social science and the humanities with research interests in Africa or Asia. Such visiting lecturers consumed some 15 percent of the two grants in a seven-year period. Contributions to the libraries arose from \$11,000 during the first year of the second grant to \$30,000 during the last, amounting to almost 30 percent of the two grants (Smith College, January 1967).

Curricular enrichment during the second grant was reflected in the large sums devoted to released faculty time to support extra new courses on Africa and Asia not normally allowed by the teaching schedules of the four institutions. During the second grant period, Smith undertook to offer on an interchange basis two of the major "exotic" languages of the world regions covered by the committee, Chinese and Arabic. Students needing further language instruction after 1965 have also had access to the junior year at Princeton, an arrangement resulting from the Second Princeton Conference on Undergraduate Instruction in Foreign Languages.

Numbers of courses and student enrollments increased as

faculty were added. During 1965-66, the most recent year for which enrollments in Asian-African courses are available, between thirteen and twenty-one courses were offered each semester on three of the campuses (Smith, Mt. Holyoke, and the university). Three courses dealing with Africa or Asia were offered each semester at Amherst in that year. Total enrollments in these courses varied from sixty-five at Amherst in fall of 1965 to 387 at the university in the same period. Total fall enrollments in courses on Africa and Asia that year on all four campuses reached 902; during the spring they amounted to 983.

Relatively few students attended these courses on an interchange basis, however; most of those enrolled took courses as they were available through the departments of their own campuses. During 1964-65, for example, seven students participated in interchange courses on the Far East; two students, the Middle East; five students, South and Southeast Asia; and none, Africa. This was in accord with the original intention to develop basic courses on each campus with advanced courses open to students of all four schools.

Clearly a non-Western element has penetrated the curricula of the four institutions mainly by the addition of faculty and courses in the relevant social science and humanities departments on the four campuses. According to Professor Bates, chairman of the Asian-African committee from 1966 to 1968, this situation has led

some to conclude that it will be easier to bring instructors to the students rather than vice versa. The Smith weakness in Southeast Asia and the Mt. Holyoke weakness on Africa could be alleviated if Miss Bates, an Africanist at Smith, could offer a course at Mt. Holyoke while Professor Jean Grossholtz of Mt. Holyoke, a Southeast Asia specialist, teaches at Smith. However, the problems here are unexpectedly formidable. Even if this faculty exchange could be made informally without institutional budgetary adjustments, the faculty of each college must approve any new course offerings on its own campus, even if taught by a Smith or a Mt. Holyoke faculty member.

Nevertheless, there is little doubt that much progress has been made through a differentiation of function in which both disciplinary fields and world regions have been allocated among the four institutions. From the original six or seven faculty interested in foreign areas has grown a total of forty-eight courses taught by thirty-two faculty members on the regions of Africa, the Middle East, and Asia in the social sciences and humanities in spring of 1967. In addition, twenty-four general or comparative courses or those with an explicit commitment to cultural relativism, involving an additional sixteen faculty members, were available at that time.

By world region and by institution, these courses were disproportionately divided. Twenty-five of the forty-eight were devoted to the Far East or Asia generally, five to South and South-

east Asia, and nine each to Africa and the Middle East. Twenty were given on the Smith campus, sixteen at the university, eight at Mt. Holyoke, and four at Amherst.

Apparently the greatest "internationalization" has occurred at Smith and the university and in the fields of history and political science, both of which have been universalized in American higher education generally as a result of post-World War II interest in foreign areas. No single explanation seemed to account for the differences between the institutions. The university was developing a policy of supporting Asian studies, both in the disciplines and by offering adequate language study, as a foundation for offering graduate degrees in the social sciences and humanities with specialization on East Asia. Smith faculty seemed to display initiative consistently in the committee, along with fiscal responsibility. Mt. Holyoke's lesser development of non-Western curricular offerings seemed to be related to its less ample financial resources while all in the Valley agreed that great conservatism existed at Amherst.

Impact of Curricular Change

Apparently the primary goals of cooperative faculty action by the Asian-African committee in the Connecticut Valley have been to increase numbers of faculty with regional competences, promote faculty intellectual enrichment, stimulate research, and to broaden and extend offerings in the major social science departments of all

four institutions. Primary beneficiaries of the program have been faculty; students have benefited from increased course options. The disciplinary departments have been strengthened rather than weakened by this form of cooperation. In this way, the Asian-African committee's program reflects the faculty orientation of the colleges, together with an implied commitment to faculty research embodied in the generous library contributions to colleges from grant funds. In three of the institutions, the existence of the committee has probably hastened universalization of the social sciences, but neither the committee's work nor this change in the social science departments has been undertaken as the result of a well-formulated institutional philosophy of education. Rather, the commitment in all four institutions has seemed to be to maximum feasible coverage of all fields of knowledge, rather than to educational innovation per se. The Asian-African committee exemplifies such a commitment.

Because the Asian-African committee has been the recipient of outside funds for the development of its program, it has also been somewhat independent of four-college cooperation. The evident difficulties in administering outside monies on a four-college basis have contributed to the formation of a general-purpose corporation. If such a corporation were to appoint faculty on funds it administers, it would indeed represent fundamental change in the eyes of members of the four institutions. The committee itself, however,

does not signify such a change principle.

That curricular development is limited in a small institution was dramatized in 1967-68 when Smith's Arabic course offerings had to be dropped for reasons of low enrollment, although the course was offered on an interchange basis. Chinese, on the other hand, has been well received by students and was offered at both Smith and the university. Only at the university, however, was it to be embodied in a regional studies major focused on the Far East.

While the Asian-African committee, thus, exemplified institutional goals and practices rather than altered them, it has helped by adding faculty to shift the emphasis toward modern studies in faculty dialogue on some of the campuses.

Case Studies: Universities

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Structure and Goals

Undergraduate teaching at Columbia University is carried out by four of the university's constituent units. Three units give general instruction. Columbia College (for men) contains a small (about 2,700 students), select body of undergraduate men admitted as freshmen only. Barnard College (for women) has a small, select student body and is financially quasi-independent of the university, with its own board of trustees of which the president of the university is an ex officio member. The school of general studies, a unique service to urban society, accepts, on rigorous standards, adults twenty-one years and older as undergraduates, and also transfer students. The fourth undergraduate teaching unit is the more specialized college of engineering and applied science. Barnard has a full complement of administrative and academic officers, including a president and deans; Columbia College, engineering, and general studies have as their chief administrative officer a dean reporting to the president of the university.

Instruction is also conducted through many other units of the university: professional schools, such as teachers college and the law school; the school of international affairs, which gives only graduate instruction to the master's degree level; and the graduate

faculties, whose announcement is the thickest of Columbia's many catalogs. In a division of funds and responsibility unusual in the organization of American universities, graduate level instruction is imparted in the social sciences and history through the faculty of political science; in languages, literature, art history, religion, music, and philosophy through the faculty of philosophy; and in mathematics, the sciences, and psychology through the faculty of pure science. Not all faculty members who conduct graduate instruction are members of these graduate faculties; election to the graduate faculties comes with tenure and is looked upon as a privilege.

Faculty appointments are made not in the colleges or graduate faculties but in disciplinary departments. Most departments of instruction are formally located in larger units of the university that deal with graduate professional instruction, such as the graduate faculties, the graduate school of business administration, and the school of the arts. These departments depute faculty representatives to act as agents for the department in the units of undergraduate instruction. Members of the department who teach undergraduate courses in some one of the undergraduate teaching units are listed by the college as members of its faculty as well. The departments, thus, provide a unifying focus for the often fragmented activities of their members; it is possible for a Columbia faculty member to be appointed to a department in the

graduate faculties, to teach a course in the school of general studies, another in Columbia College, and yet another in the school of international affairs. Furthermore, the division of his responsibilities among units may vary from one year to the next.

For purposes of decision-making concerning matters of educational policy, however, the colleges and schools and the graduate faculties are empowered to appoint committees of the faculty and to convene meetings of teaching faculty of assistant professor rank and above for policy-making purposes. It is useful, therefore, to think of the colleges and schools of the university as controllers of courses and vehicles of faculty decision-making, the departments as the primary homes of the faculty (who participate in policy-making through the machinery of the colleges and schools), and the students as participating in the university through the colleges, schools, and departments as well as through their own organizations. Thus, for almost every member of the university (with perhaps some exceptions for full-time administrators of the various units), multiple identifications, multiple loyalties, and partial roles are regular features of their working lives within the university.

The degree of faculty and student participation in the university varies. Columbia is located in a great metropolitan center with strikingly diverse ways of life and with numerous kinds of

career opportunities for educated persons. In addition to the regular full-time faculty in the grades of instructor and above, the university relies upon a small number of graduate teaching assistants, called preceptors, and numerous part-time lecturers at all levels of teaching. Often these individuals are important and highly prestigious in their own walks of life. The structure of university and college governance does not allow a voice to part-time persons and members of the subprofessorate. Instead high-level, temporary committees of distinguished faculty settle questions of policy. There is also a formal system of informal consultations with non-regular faculty, known as "Faculty Smokers," which give lecturers and others some voice in shaping educational policy. As for students, the largest single undergraduate teaching unit of the university is the school of general studies, designed primarily for working adults who have preexisting commitments to other occupational roles altogether. Its 1965-66 enrollment was 3,687, compared with Columbia College's 2,732 Columbia University Financial Report, 1965-66, 1966, p. 67.

In this kind of social setting, the existence of a defined university culture and traditions about higher education are very important in forming a sense of esprit de corps among students and faculty, in promoting their loyalty to the university, and in preventing university members' other roles and identifications from diminishing their identification with the institution.

Continuity of purpose has been sustained in some parts of the university by a deliberate inbreeding of faculty; especially this is the case in Columbia College (Bell, 1966), where undergraduate education represents an attempt to sustain a well-defined tradition.

Columbia College has been the center of a continuing attempt on the part of faculty to retain and reinvigorate a concept of the structured but relatively unspecialized general education for undergraduates first enunciated in 1919. The most recent expression of this concept is Bell's The Reforming of General Education: The Columbia College Experience in Its National Setting (1966). The college faculty in 1919 committed itself to the idea of three broad courses which would be required of all students--contemporary civilization, originally a one-year course, humanities, and sciences. Contemporary civilization in 1929 became a two-year sequence, the first year focusing upon "the intellectual traditions and institutional development of Western society," and the second year dealing with contemporary socioeconomic problems. Contemporary humanities was finally introduced as a one-year course in great books of the European intellectual tradition in 1937, with a second year devoted to music and the arts added in 1947. The science requirement never materialized as an integrated interdisciplinary course.

After some twenty years of educating undergraduate men without imposing the requirement of choosing a curricular major field, the faculty reverted to a more usual method in undergraduate education.

Since 1954, students of the college have been required to complete a major, or concentration (described by former Dean David B. Truman as a "thin major"), in one department for graduation. This decision, according to Bell (1966), led to the participation in Columbia College of certain social science departments whose work had previously been confined largely to the graduate level. After majors were required, the social science departments brought pressure to bear for earlier specialization of major students, complaining that the second year of contemporary civilization did not afford an adequate introduction to the social science majors. Consequently, in 1959 the second required year of contemporary civilization was dropped, and a list of seven courses was elaborated, any two semesters of which would fulfill the second-year requirement in contemporary civilization. Five of these were introductory courses in the social science disciplines (anthropology, economics, geography, government, and sociology); one was a parallel to the first-year course but covering the civilizations of the Orient; and the last was the old second-year contemporary civilization course, whose enrollment fell drastically (Bell, 1966).

Bell's book was the result of an invitation from the dean of Columbia College to reassess the college's educational traditions in the light of modern times. Characterizing his mission as one of adjusting the claims of both college traditions and the disciplinary department, Bell would preserve contemporary civilization and

contemporary humanities at the freshman level, devote the second and third years to the disciplines, and introduce a "third tier" of integrative general courses in the logic and intellectual bases of major fields of inquiry. These proposals were under discussion in faculty smokers during 1966-67 when investigation was underway for the study reported here.

Foreign Area Instruction

Undergraduate instruction on Asia extended Columbia's tradition of undergraduate general education. Although courses in great books of the Orient had been offered in the East Asian languages and cultures department (formerly the Chinese and Japanese department) as early as 1942, the present program dates from 1949, a time when the graduate school of international affairs and a number of the regional centers in it were being organized. At that time, Professor William Theodore deBary of the East Asian department, who has since remained closely associated with the program, proposed to recruit "within Columbia College" a staff to plan courses which would be "comparable in range and quality" to the Western humanities and contemporary civilization courses and to develop course material "hitherto unavailable in English" for such courses [1952, p. 17].

The two courses that resulted were the oriental civilizations course, a lecture, and oriental humanities, conducted as an undergraduate discussion or colloquium with a maximum of sixteen students, together with two faculty members, a generalist and a

specialist. Classics in the philosophy and belles-lettres of India and the Middle East were discussed in the fall semester, and those of China and Japan in the spring. In oriental civilizations, on the other hand, a "loose chronological frame" was followed, with part of each semester devoted to a study of the primary texts and original documents (in translation) of the civilizations of India, China, and Japan. Since 1959 this course has constituted one of the seven alternatives open to students to satisfy part of the required two-year sequence in contemporary civilization and the humanities. Unlike other courses filling the second-year requirement, which treated contemporary problems through the disciplines, oriental civilization dealt more generally with the cultural heritages of China, Japan, and India as they influenced the modern mind of those civilizations (DeBary & Embree, 1964; DeBary, 1959a, 1959b; Keene, 1959; Hay, 1957).

As enrollment has grown in both courses, especially since 1959, staff and sections have been added. During 1966-67, oriental civilization was offered at three different morning hours to classes from forty to one hundred students, with a smaller experimental afternoon section giving exclusive consideration to China and Japan. These classes were considered much too large for the group discussion of primary sources, which has always been the heart of coursework. Consequently, in 1967-68 some five sections of the course were scheduled. Each required the presence for some

portion of each semester of two or three faculty members. Despite its reputation as one of Columbia College's most difficult courses, oriental humanities, too, was elected by more than one hundred students in both 1965-66 and 1966-67, requiring six sections (Columbia University Committee on Oriental Studies, 1966). The only other courses on Asia offered within the college were Islamic civilization, a parallel course attracting a small but devoted following; East Asian language and literature courses; a limited number of seminars for the few undergraduate majors in oriental studies; and several courses in comparative religion.

Staffing these courses was an annual enterprise of considerable complexity. The main contribution of staff has always come from the East Asian languages and cultures department, an old (originated in 1901-02) and distinguished Columbia department offering instruction in the languages, literatures, and histories of China, Japan, and Korea. Other departments that contributed time of their members were history and Middle East languages and cultures (for India and Islam); geography, anthropology, and religion; Barnard College; and the school of international affairs.

Staffing was done through a complicated system of time allocations between the contributing departments and the university committee on oriental studies, which oversees the courses. During the middle 1950's, when faculty members, with the aid of foundation funds, were preparing as texts for oriental civilization students

Columbia's three well-known readers under the general title Sources of Oriental Tradition, it was a committee of Columbia College. Since 1961, however, in recognition of the program's ability to draw undergraduate students from all divisions of the university, the overseeing committee became a university committee, although its operating funds continued to flow directly from the office of the dean of the college. The committee consists of representatives from the various departments that cooperate in staffing the courses. A senior faculty member, usually DeBary, acts as its executor and maintains continuing relations between the East Asian department and the committee's courses.

By 1967 the courses had settled into a recognizable pattern, but one in which certain long term trends were becoming visible. In oriental humanities, the first generation of "generalists"-- who had been drawn from fields of study associated with the European cultural tradition--had retired. As the course enrollment grew and sections were added, and as expertise on the various societies of the Orient has become more specialized and more plentiful, a specialist in one of the regions of Asia usually has acted as "generalist" when the works of other major civilizations of Asia were discussed. However, recruiting faculty to act as generalists to staff six sections of a course renowned among faculty and students alike for its heavy readings has become ever more difficult. Reversion to the single-teacher classroom seems

u

likely in the future.

In oriental civilizations something of the same trend could be discerned in 1967. The course was rigidly divided into time sequences--five and one-half weeks each for India and China and two and one-half weeks for Japan per semester. While students in all sections did the same assigned readings, participating faculty had maximum independence in treating the institutional development of the three societies according to their disciplinary competencies. Faculty were not required to attend each other's lectures. Coordination was provided, away from the classroom entirely, by a weekly staff luncheon devoted alternately to oriental civilizations and oriental humanities. Especially in oriental humanities, the staff luncheon was sometimes conducted as a brief staff seminar in which one faculty member would comment, for the benefit of others, upon his approach to the readings for the week. A constructively critical attitude to the courses was taken, and there was considerable tinkering with details of readings so that, especially in the humanities course, new readings were incorporated as they became available and old ones were discarded. Substantial staff interaction resulted from this concern to improve course content, although it was more difficult to accomplish in oriental civilizations, where no substitute existed for the texts, making revision no small matter.

Perhaps the single most common faculty criticism concerning

oriental civilization was that this format afforded inadequate coverage of each civilization in view of the great efflorescence of knowledge concerning each of them in the past twenty years. A possible harbinger of the direction of change here was the establishment of an experimental section of this course dealing only with China and Japan in 1966-67. Nevertheless, staff interaction supported a generally high morale and level of interest in the courses, and their roots in Columbia College tradition were acknowledged by all. Sighed one young staff member in 1967, "I'm not a Columbia College product and I don't think I will ever be fully acculturated to teaching these courses."

It is ironic that oriental civilizations profited from its parallelism with the first year of contemporary civilization to stand upon the ashes of the old second-year "CC" requirement in 1959. The course achieved popularity among students in a period of growing strength of disciplinary departmentalism in the college. This growth in disciplinary interest was reflected in staff members' freedom to treat course content entirely from the vantage point of their own disciplines, if they wished to do so. But a serious barrier to change existed in the course's very parallelism with contemporary civilization: almost any change acceptable to participating faculty would tend to destroy that parallelism, and with it the essential character of the course.

When faculty members with research interests centered upon

Africa became more plentiful during the 1950's, they could not be fitted into university organization in the same way as new faculty members with research specialization on Asia. No well-established regional studies department existed for Africa and none was likely to emerge. Consequently, they were fitted into the departments of the graduate faculties according to their disciplinary fields, with the somewhat paradoxical result that undergraduate coursework on Africa became probably more plentiful than undergraduate coursework on Asia. Thus, in Columbia College alone, courses in Africa for undergraduates were available in anthropology, combined art history and music, history and sociology. No major or concentration, however, was available.

At the graduate level, African studies were concentrated in the school of international affairs and the African regional institute associated with it. This program has been the work primarily of L. Gray Cowan, associate director of the school of international affairs at the time the African institute was founded in 1961. He has been closely associated with this unusual graduate-professional school since its founding and is its official historian (Cowan, 1954). Founded in 1949, the school was the outgrowth of Columbia's wartime experience in training Navy personnel for military government work in occupied areas. It was designed to provide professional training at the master's level and to house the associated regional institutes, the first of which, Columbia's

Russian institute, predated it by some four years. While the school offered coursework in its own right, the regional institutes provided a focus for graduate coursework on a particular region; their programs provided a certificate to graduate students who were also regularly enrolled members of disciplinary departments. The original three or four regional institutes have expanded to cover all the major world regions. The latest institute to be established was the new (1968) South Asia regional institute. The institutes did not merely coordinate coursework and facilitate faculty research; they could and did sponsor short term appointments of research scholars and undertake special research projects of their own. Most of the teaching they coordinated, however, consisted of coursework in regular university departments taught by faculty with appointments in the graduate faculties.

In 1963 the African institute applied for and received approval for a NDEA language and area center which because of its combination of language and area course support would have been difficult to locate in a university department. (The East Asian languages and cultures department, on the other hand, has proved a suitable location for an East Asian NDEA center). The African Institute has been active recently on a broad front, sponsoring coursework in Hausa and Swahili in general studies and a wide variety of graduate courses in social science, humanities, and even law. In 1966, the institute inaugurated, with teachers college, a program

parallel to that of the school of international affairs, leading to a combined institute certificate in African studies and a Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree in teachers college. This resulted in the cross-listing of a considerable variety of teachers college courses on African education in the African institute. Paradoxically, the very different ways that Asian and African studies developed at Columbia have meant that African history was a regular undergraduate offering in 1967, while the histories of China, Japan, and India were studied only in graduate-level courses!

Impact of Curricular Change

In 1967-68, while the Bell report pleading for conservation of elements of the Columbia College tradition was still under discussion, staffing pressures in the undergraduate oriental studies program accented an apparent long term trend toward more conventional, and more discipline-oriented organization of a program with roots both in the holistic tradition of earlier American study of the Orient and in institutional tradition. Reframing the freshman courses after the Bell report would, however, present an opportunity to adjust oriental civilizations to make the course more consonant with the present state of knowledge concerning the Orient, while preserving some linkage with institutional tradition. In this way the committee on oriental studies, as did the rest of the college, reflected the continuing conflict between the social science disciplines and institutional traditions in undergraduate

education.

On the other hand, in extending the principle of unspecialized undergraduate education, the committee itself represented a new form of organization of undergraduate teaching. It has not, however, become strongly institutionalized. While its budgetary placement in the dean's office has helped to assure a hearing in the division of internal funds, it also has limited the committee's autonomy to some degree. Thanks to the tireless work of senior faculty members, generous outside funds have been available for the preparation of texts related to the program. However, secretarial help and materials seem in somewhat short supply.

African studies at the undergraduate level represented not the development of college traditions about undergraduate teaching but the universalization of the social sciences at Columbia. In its strong position in the school of international affairs and its association with professional schools, such as teachers college, African studies at Columbia were primarily directed toward graduate and professional study. These patterns seem likely to continue.

The effect of the post-World War II development of the social sciences on local patterns of curricular organization in higher education was clearer at Columbia than in many other case study institutions because those local patterns were based on premises antithetical to disciplinary specialization. Another major university, Chicago, offered a similar set of local curricular

traditions with which foreign area study and social science have been integrated rather differently.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Among the early and eminent programs of foreign area study on the non-Western civilizations at undergraduate and graduate levels were those at the University of Chicago. In the 1950's, several prominent faculty members in social sciences inspired the development of a group of year-long interdisciplinary courses directed at upper division students and analyzing the civilizations of South Asia, the Middle East, China, and Russia. In the ten years and more since then, these courses and their successors have become deservedly famous among American academics interested in these world areas in the various social science and humanistic disciplines. Most of the courses have generated a considerable number of syllabi and reports on associated research that have profoundly influenced teaching practice and intellectual orientations to the study of these regions elsewhere in the country. Their considerable prestige and intellectual influence have given the courses a public character beyond their position in the university itself.

Structure and Goals

Within the university, the courses were originally developed to apply some methods of civilizational analysis suggested by the late anthropologist, Robert Redfield (professor and dean of the

social sciences at the University of Chicago from 1934 to 1946). The common elements in all the civilizations courses included analysis of the modern social structure of the civilization or region; studying through original sources in translation or through secondary materials the cultural themes transmitted from the past; and some attention to current forms of political organization. These elements were combined in different proportions and taught by various methods in different courses.

The three oldest regional civilization courses at Chicago-- Indian civilization, Islamic civilization, and Chinese civilization-- illustrated such variation in method from their inception. The Indian civilization course appeared more unorthodox than the others in the degree to which it dispensed with a historical and chronological framework to demonstrate the similarity of basic social processes at different societal levels and at different points in time. In some years, many guest lecturers covered various aspects of the society while continuity was maintained by graduate teaching interns supported by foundation funds, a special feature of this course. In recent years, the course has tended to be the responsibility of a single faculty member. Islamic civilization, on the other hand, has almost always been the province of a single specialist. The China course, in still another adaptation, appeared to achieve interdisciplinary integration through a multidisciplinary staff.

Other foreign area courses have been modeled on the three just described. The Russian civilization course, to some degree modeled on the Indian civilization course, has been the most popular with students, consistently claiming the largest enrollment of all the civilizations courses. The Chinese civilization course has proved a model for another on Japan, in which integration was achieved by dividing the course among three faculty members in different disciplines, each of whom teaches for one quarter. World coverage in the civilization courses included Latin America, and an interesting new development in 1968-69 was the creation of an interdisciplinary undergraduate course on Africa, along the lines of the earlier civilization courses. A course on Western civilization was also available, so that full world coverage was provided in the general education "common core."

This group of undergraduate courses, thus, represented a concerted attempt at curriculum planning to universalize the undergraduate intellectual experience. Like other innovations, these courses have continued to develop since their origin--especially by incorporating new research on the regions--and some of them are now very different indeed from their original forms. Nevertheless, their position remains strong. The civilization courses are a major option that satisfies advanced general education requirements, and the Indian, Russian, Japanese, and Chinese variants are required in some majors. Their organizational and

intellectual effect was also demonstrated in the 1966 reorganization of the undergraduate college discussed below. How the courses originated, and how they have been successfully institutionalized, must be understood against the interplay of three factors: the organization of teaching within the institution, the faculty's ongoing efforts to define a general intellectual position and approach to learning reflecting a uniquely Chicagoan conception of higher education, and the leadership of particular faculty members in developing the courses.

The prospectus for a new Midwestern university with which William Rainey Harper, subsequently Chicago's first president, sought the support of John D. Rockefeller in 1889-90 combined in a single institution both "pure" research on the German model and utilitarian services to society in a manner unusual for the time. The university was to maintain an elementary school and an academy (today the famous University of Chicago Laboratory Schools), and a college or two, as well as graduate and advanced professional training in many fields. The university would maintain a printing press and offer extension work in many practical fields and it was to operate the year around (the quarters system). Finally, it would be coeducational in an era when coeducation was still an advanced idea in higher education.

But President Harper proposed also "to make the work of investigation primary, [and] the work of giving instruction

secondary," and from this governing principle has arisen the major axis of structural differentiation that marks the internal organization of this university: the distinction between undergraduate instruction and graduate research. Declared the first president:

Promotion of younger men in the department will depend more largely upon the results of their work as investigators than upon the efficiency of their teaching, although the latter will by no means be overlooked [Frodin, 1950, p. 27].

A further extension of this principle was seen in 1893, when a junior college was opened. The junior college covered the first two years of undergraduate instruction, which were considered to overlap with high school work. A senior college gave instruction in the last two years of the undergraduate course. Although the faculty of the colleges was jointly appointed with the disciplinary departments of graduate level research, the colleges had their own budgets and possessed a degree of independence. (A somewhat similar recent organizational experiment is reported in the account of the New York State University College at New Paltz in this volume; an older example of a similar division between graduate disciplinary departmental organization and undergraduate, general education collegiate organization was described at Columbia University.)

According to the University of Chicago's own historians, opposition soon developed between the claims of the graduate departments, representing discipline-based specialization, and the undergraduate colleges, representing general education, in

which the colleges soon proved the weaker side. This tension has marked the entire history of organizational reforms and curricular revision at this university. Thus, through the practice of joint appointments in the colleges and the graduate departments, the colleges by 1930 had experienced "almost complete submersion. . . under the dictates of the graduate schools [Frodin, 1950, p. 32]," led by a group of powerful and long-tenured heads of the graduate departments. The result, at the undergraduate level, was to make the course of study a conventional one, with a major and minor field chosen in the second year of study and an integrated four-year sequence of study which left the senior college-junior college distinction little reality. At the institutional level, the colleges' budgetary claims received second priority to those of the departments, and the practice was established of appointing graduate students in the departments to teaching positions in the colleges.

Attempts to reduce the diversity of course offerings and to concentrate instruction upon general intellectual principles in the major fields of science and the humanities during the 1920's made little headway against faculty opposition. However, late in the decade a proposal was circulated, advocating elimination of course credits and substitution of comprehensive examinations in five fields for the junior college and three fields for the senior college, to be administered when the student felt ready for them.

In the subsequent reorganization under President Robert Hutchins, comprehensive examinations of this kind became a cardinal feature of the undergraduate educational experience.

Hutchins did away with the distinction between the junior and senior colleges, forming the college of the university to provide instruction during the first two years of undergraduate education. A larger budget was provided to replace some of the numerous graduate students of the departments who were teaching in the colleges with regular instructors. For the remainder of a student's education, four divisions (biological sciences, humanities, social sciences, and physical sciences), each headed by a dean reporting to the president, were set up. The graduate departments, although assigned to the divisions, supervised the last years of undergraduate work and graduate work as before and controlled the awarding of all degrees. Joint appointments in the divisions and the college were encouraged.

Two principles governed the practices then established in the college. One was Hutchins' expressed interest in reducing the amount of time expended in undergraduate education. It was his goal to place before the public an example of integrated undergraduate education commencing in what would normally be the junior year of high school. The second principle was that credit and standing should depend upon the completion of placement and comprehensive examinations rather than upon course credits. An independent

board of examiners and examining staff was constituted to implement this proposal. Thus, it was possible to set up broad general courses of a year's duration to prepare students for seven comprehensive examinations, five specified by the college and two elected by the students. Four of the preparatory year-long courses were to be new general introductions to the fields of the four divisions (humanities, biological sciences, physical sciences, and social sciences). These courses were to be taught by groups assembled for the purpose, having directors but no departmental affiliations. Syllabi were to be prepared and published for the general courses. From 1932, appointments were made to the college faculty without the necessity of a concurrent appointment in the graduate departments.

The faculty did not immediately take steps to effect accelerated undergraduate education--probably the single best-known feature of undergraduate education at Chicago in the first half of the twentieth century. Only in 1937 did a four-year program of general education beginning after the sophomore year of high school commence, and not until 1942 did the college faculty set up a single four-year program for students entering after either the second or the fourth year of high school. This four-year program required a somewhat greater proportion of time to be devoted to the "common core" courses on

the part of those entering at age eighteen and preserved a few specialized elective options for those entering at sixteen (Frodin, 1950).

Meanwhile in 1942 Hutchins introduced a proposal giving the college--as opposed to the divisions--complete control over the content of the bachelor's degree (and, therefore, control over courses at all levels of undergraduate education). After acrimonious discussion the faculty agreed that the college should grant the bachelor's degree "on completion of general education as redefined by the College faculty." In view of the wartime emergency, however, the divisions of biological and physical sciences retained the right to award the Bachelor of Science degree, leaving a loophole through which further conflict between the college and the divisions could develop.

There has been much tinkering with this structure since 1942. While the cumulative effect was one of change, these changes have taken the form of modifications of details of the structure rather than revolutionary dismantling of the edifice. The concept of a "common year" for all undergraduate students remains. The requirement of "competence" in the four divisions, to be satisfied by four year-long courses, still appears in the undergraduate curriculum. However, the available options for satisfying this requirement have increased, especially in physical sciences, in which five basic surveys deal with: introduction to the physical sciences,

astronomy and geo-physics, basic chemistry, general physics, and "a study of modern physics and chemistry." Placement tests, especially in languages, were still used for diagnostic and accelerative purposes, and comprehensive examinations in the various general education fields were regularly given under the supervision of the college examiner, a senior member of the faculty.

Beyond these features, the general pattern of change in the last twenty years has resulted in significant increases in the options available to students both in satisfying "common core" requirements and in fields of specialization available during later undergraduate education, and in a visible reversion to more "normal" patterns of undergraduate education. Few sixteen-year-old students are admitted, and the course of undergraduate instruction in the humanities and social sciences is considered to commence at graduation from high school and to last the usual four years, although professional degrees combining three years of undergraduate instruction and one year of graduate professional instruction are available in business and library science.

The effect of these changes has been to make undergraduate education at Chicago a much more conventional matter. The position of the undergraduate college was painfully redefined in the early and middle 1950's under the pressure of a steep decline in both undergraduate enrollments and income (Kimpton, 1952). President Lawrence Kimpton, in his November 1953 report to the faculty, acknowledged the failure of the college's program designed for students entering at the end of the sophomore year of high school.

The program, he said, had earned the hostility of the high schools and within the university "made fast a distinction between general education and specialization, to the detriment of both [p. 3]."

Joint committees of the graduate divisions and the college were appointed to redefine the bachelor's degree as a combination of general and specialized education and relocate it in the college. But implementation was delayed because of the great hostility existing between the faculties of the college and the divisions. In 1957 a committee failed to redefine the content and control of the Bachelor of Science degree because, according to Kimpton, "those shaggy fellows of the Departments of Physics, Chemistry and Math snarl menacingly when their grim clutch on the content of their degrees is in any way threatened [1958, p. 6]." Consequently, the reorganization of 1958 concerned only the Bachelor of Arts degree and the general education content of the Bachelor of Science degree. In this reorganization, a new faculty, called the college but composed half and half of appointments from the existing college and the divisions, was to award the A.B. General education was to be reduced from three to two years, with a year of free electives and one of departmental specialization. This entity was to have its own dean and dean of students. Despite a further major reorganization of the college in 1966, a Bachelor of Science degree in 1968 remained under the joint jurisdiction of the college and the divisions of biological and physical sciences (University of Chicago, August 31, 1967).

Although Chicago's civilizations courses emerged intellectually from the research tradition in the social sciences that developed at the university in the first half of the twentieth century, the courses also represented institutional adjustments arising from the revision of the college curriculum during the early and middle 1950's. Apparently, structural flexibility--both in budgeting and in organizational patterns--was an important precondition for both intellectual and curricular developments in foreign area studies at Chicago.

One evidence of this flexibility was the committee structure, which filled the interstices between the disciplinary departments in a rather unusual manner. In addition to committees that handled the business of the university (promotions and tenure, curriculum review, and so forth), some committees represented current and ongoing traditions of research in substantive fields requiring the collaboration of more than one discipline. These committees annually give one or more seminars for faculty and advanced students on topics of interest to the members; in some cases they have awarded advanced degrees and may make faculty appointments. Whether they award degrees or not, they have received formal mention in the catalog of instruction of the graduate divisions, and the courses they sponsor are announced there with the departmental course offerings. Thus, at the time of writing, the division of humanities contained four degree-granting committees (on analyses

of ideas and study of methods, comparative studies in literature, general studies in the humanities, and history of culture), while the social science division contained three such committees (human development, international relations, and social thought). Non-degree granting committees, such as the committee on the comparative study of new nations, often had funds available to support advanced graduate students working in their fields of interest.

The formal recognition to interdisciplinary faculty dialogue and, thus, promotion of research in intellectual areas on the fringes of the traditional disciplines, is not a recent development at Chicago. The committee on the history of culture, formed in 1931, began to include non-Western cultures in its purview in 1945, and the committee on international relations came into existence in 1946. This mode of operation proved particularly useful when in 1951 Hutchins, as associate director of the newly formed Ford Foundation, agreed to support a Redfield proposal for a project in the comparative study of civilizations. At the heart of this proposal was a series of ongoing interdisciplinary faculty seminars on "Great and Little Traditions," "The Little Community," and "The Study of World Views," as well as on Islam, India, and the Far East. The general intellectual products of this project included the collected papers of a number of international conferences, a distinguished collection of new comparative journals, and much individual research.

As evidence of growing interest in non-Western areas, a

committee on Far Eastern civilizations was organized in 1950-51 and a committee on Southern Asian studies in 1953-54. Within the university, these activities had an "immediate and contagious" institutional impact, apparent in the deliberations of the joint committee of the college and the social science division to revise the content of the B.A. degree. Its report of January 1956 opted for the preservation of both a common core of liberal education in social science and an opportunity for specialization as well. Its most unusual recommendation, however, was that the study of non-Western civilizations be included in the common core with American civilization and Western civilization (Singer, 1959). As a result, three one-year courses on the civilizations of Islam, India, and the Far East commenced simultaneously in the fall of 1956. Undergraduate social science majors were to choose one such sequence during the third or fourth year, but the courses were also open to other students as electives. Because of the polarized faculty opinion at that time, the committee's recommendations met considerable opposition from the college faculty, receiving approval only by a narrow margin. Yet, the civilizations courses have been described in retrospect by one long-time member of the college faculty as "one of the few creative achievements" of the middle 1950's.

Developing civilizations curricula and building institutions in the foreign area fields have proceeded in several directions

since the late 1950's. First, curricular revision has been required by the format of the courses, which were to be broadly chronological in conception, but had as their objective a synthesis of information derived through the various social sciences and the humanities. In consequence, readings for the courses included primary source material and major findings of contemporary scholarship. As scholarship has changed so have the courses. New syllabi for the Indian civilization course, for example, issued at approximately four-year intervals, show considerable development in scholarship on this region (University of Chicago Syllabus Division, 1957a, 1957b, 1958, 1965; Weiner, 1961; Galanter, 1965; Patterson & Inden, 1962).

Much of this work was done by faculty members with special competence in the study of foreign civilizations who have joined the University of Chicago since the middle 1950's. For the size of its faculty in 1968, the university possessed an exceptional proportion of faculty interested in India in the fields of law, political science, anthropology, history, and Indic languages and literatures. Continuity in the direction of the program has been provided by Professor Milton Singer (1966), and the staff has experienced remarkably low turnover. For some of the present faculty, acculturation to the aims of undergraduate and graduate instruction on India was provided through the graduate internships in the Indian civilization course. Recently the university

has tended to retain its graduate students as faculty members in some of the India fields.

Extending the committee structure at Chicago has provided a convenient ground for the interactions across departmental boundaries of faculty members interested in particular world regions. Following the pattern of regional committees established in 1950 (Far Eastern civilization committee) and 1956 (South Asia committee) have been the committees on Slavic studies (1959), Near Eastern studies (1960-61), and African studies (1964). Each committee came to sponsor a civilization course. In addition, however, this kind of interaction has resulted in a major new development in undergraduate curriculum organization at Chicago.

The origin of the new development was the creation, in 1962, of a committee on comparative civilizations to continue seminars of the type Redfield had initiated for the staff and honors students of the civilizations courses. This committee became the nucleus of a major program of the college in its 1966 reorganization. At this time, the college was formed into four collegiate divisions paralleling the graduate divisions, each under charge of a master. In addition, however, a fifth division, the new collegiate division, was created "to provide a place for experiments in undergraduate education." Five special programs, each under a program chairman, comprised the offerings of the division. They included history and philosophy of science, history and philosophy of religion, _ .

philosophical psychology, and civilizational studies, under the chairmanship of Professor Singer (1967). The core program of the new division consisted of "introductions in depth to two civilizations, one Western and one non-Western. . .and to methods and problems in the comparative studies of civilizations [University of Chicago, August 31, 1967, p. 90]." One of the basic courses in the civilizational studies program was a comparative humanities sequence offered by Professors Edward C. Dimock and A. K. Ramanujan, both of whom joined the Chicago faculty to build the India program.

All Chicago faculty members with whom these developments were discussed agreed that much of the freedom to experiment in this manner at Chicago derived from almost complete budgetary flexibility in accounting for the time faculty members spend teaching in the graduate divisions and in the college. While faculty members were appointed primarily in the divisions or in the college (and differences in salary underlined differences in appointments), the cooperation of the college and the divisions permitted individual faculty members to spend their efforts on undergraduate and graduate teaching according to their interests.

A final field of institution-building was evident in the changes in departmental organization that have occurred at Chicago since 1958 to accommodate the new faculty strength on various foreign regions. At Chicago, as at other universities, adding specialists on some of the regions has been especially awkward because of the

lack of a departmental "home" for these new fields of study. Various arrangements were employed, with the new specialists receiving joint appointments in the departments of linguistics and oriental languages which, in recognition of its role in housing historians of both Eastern and Southern Asia, became in 1959 the department of oriental languages and civilizations. Ultimately in 1966, three language and civilization departments covering South and East Asia and the Near East were formed in the division of humanities. As all three oversee B.A. programs conjointly with the college, they have increased the opportunities for specialization at the B.A. level (Singer, 1966).

Impact of Curricular Change

What seemed most distinctive in the Chicago experience in developing foreign area curriculum was that the program was firmly based on the long-held institutional belief in the necessity of synthesis and integration in general education, a view fully shared by the faculty originating the program. To include civilizational studies in the common core of general education has required the faculty to retain a firm grip on integrative ideas as organizing principles. This they have successfully done, thanks in part to a large degree of continuity in faculty associated with the foreign area courses.

The entire effort has enjoyed additional advantages: strong and consistent leadership, organizational forms available for

exploitation to faculty with interests in all foreign regions, and access to generous outside funds to support teaching and the preparation of teaching materials. The ability to insure continuity in staff has been greatly enhanced by the availability of outside funds to support graduate students, some of whom have been retained as junior faculty. Thus, in 1966-67 the committee on Southern Asia could offer from foundation funds forty graduate fellowships and twenty-four additional stipends from NDEA funds.

The structural results of the introduction of teaching and research on foreign areas have included both organizational proliferation, as committees on each of the major world regions have been formed, and real change in the organization of undergraduate teaching. The appearance of numerous committees armed with outside funds has brought corresponding pressure for integration, which has been accomplished by the formation of a committee on international programs, recently retitled the center for international studies, whose function is to administer special funds for the development of area programs and comparative studies. It is directed by Chauncy D. Harris, long associated with foreign area interests at Chicago, who also acts as the university delegate to the committee on institutional cooperation of the eleven leading universities of the Midwest. Foreign area interests, thus, receive high-level consideration within this university. The center's committee is made up of officers of the various regional committees and centers

in the university.

Recent changes prepare for the time when foundation funds will run out in the near future. The major elements of the curricular program would likely be preserved even in the face of retrenchment in support of graduate teaching following reduction of outside funds; provided the university would accept budgetary responsibility for the three regional language and civilization departments, if NDEA support were continued, and if the civilizations courses were continued both as a social science common core requirement and as a major feature of the new collegiate division.

Paradoxically, however, the most evident byproduct of foreign area curricular development has been the marked increase in options for both graduate and undergraduate studies in the social sciences and humanities on foreign areas. Students may choose year-long instructional sequences available on seven contemporary world regions. All three language and civilization departments (Far East, Near East, South Asia) and the Slavic language and literature department offer B.A. programs. Thus, the foreign area programs at Chicago emphasize the college's commitment to synthesis in undergraduate general education and reinforce the specialization which has created a continuing polarity in values within this university in the past.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY

Foreign studies have been no stranger to the Berkeley campus

from the time of its founding. When the university opened its doors in 1872, it received from Edward Tompkins, a grant of land, the subsequent sale of which provided a fund endowing a chair for oriental languages. The purpose was a utilitarian one: to aid trade with Asia by equipping some graduates with facility in Asian languages. From this chair grew one of Berkeley's oldest departments, the department of oriental languages.

In 1919 the university demonstrated a general attitude of "internationalism" by establishing a bureau of international relations as a depository for records of international organizations. The bureau persisted until 1956, when it was subsumed into the present institute for international studies. By 1927 courses were offered on trade of the Far East, Latin America, and Europe; history of Latin America, Mexico, China, and Japan; international relations of the Far East, Mexico, and Latin America; and Chinese religion and philosophy. Coursework was primarily oriented toward the interests of government and American business, although holistic study of Asia was assured (University of California, 1927).

In the early 1930's, Berkeley was one of the leading centers in the campaign of the American Council of Learned Societies to establish Chinese and Russian studies described in Chapter 2. In 1934, for example, the ACLS sponsored at Berkeley a summer seminar on Northeastern Asia for faculty members, one of the first of its kind. By 1941 the Berkeley campus possessed three major

regional language departments that were foci for holistic study of major civilizations: oriental languages, Semitic languages, and Slavic languages. More than twenty-five years later, they remain the three departments of non-Western regional studies at Berkeley, although Semitic languages is now named Near Eastern languages, and Slavic has become purely a department of language and literary studies.

By 1941 in addition to an undergraduate major and master's program in international relations and a somewhat ill-defined "program of study leading to the doctorate concerning Latin America," Berkeley was one of the first American universities to offer undergraduates a "group major" on the Far East. The group major consisted of courses in geography, history, political science, economics, and anthropology concerning the Far East, and included but did not require one or more of the following languages: Chinese, Japanese, and Slavic. A major in oriental languages was also available. Coursework dealing exclusively with the Far East was offered by a geographer, two historians, two political scientists, and four members of the oriental languages department. As for Africa, one course in anthropology dealt with that continent (University of California, October 20, 1941).

Regional group majors evidently developed very rapidly during World War II at Berkeley, for by 1951 it was possible to specialize not only in international relations and East Asian studies, but

also in China, Southeast Asia, Japan, Latin America, European and Slavic studies, Germany and Central Europe, France and French colonies, and Russia and East Europe. According to a university brochure of the day, these majors were "intended to provide both liberal education and training for diplomatic, commercial, and cultural relations between the United States and other nations." A Ph.D. was available in East Asian studies, and in Latin American studies "only for exceptional scholars whose peculiar interests cannot be served by an existing discipline." The recently formed institute of East Asiatic studies was in process of planning new M.A. programs in Chinese and Japanese studies. Both the M.A. and the Ph.D. were offered in Slavic studies (University of California, 1951; June 6, 1949; & Oct. 10, 1950).

According to a contemporary announcement on Asiatic and Slavic studies on the Berkeley campus, the faculty realized that

the special needs of students and the public at large can best be served by the organization of flexible, correlated programs of study cutting across departmental lines, and planned by departmental representatives ready to make mutual adjustments of requirements and curricula [University of California, 1947, p. 21].

The keynote was one of flexibility on the part of departments in making arrangements for individual students.

Multidisciplinary coursework in the regional group majors was offered entirely through the existing disciplinary and regional language departments, but the students majoring in a field of

regional studies were supervised by the participating faculty members as a group, even if only through a faculty member designated as group representative. Although the majors were interdisciplinary, the faculty remained members of their disciplinary departments, and integration was left to the mind of the student. Thus, the regional majors were compromises between purely disciplinary majors and an outright interdisciplinary approach but they were the earliest examples in the case study institutions of a rather broad-based attempt to focus students' intellectual endeavors on regions as wholes, using tools of all the disciplines.

Today opinion on the wisdom of regional study has changed very greatly on the Berkeley campus. Present arrangements and requirements for the undergraduate curriculum are basically those proposed by the 1957 Report to the Faculty of the College of Letters and Science by the Special Committee on Objectives, Programs, and Requirements, which divided the curriculum into breadth requirements and depth requirements, the latter being a conventional departmental major and the former a prescription that a certain proportion of student study time be spent upon the humanities, social sciences, and the natural sciences. In the following ten years, an increasingly elaborate list of general and special courses at lower division and upper division levels has been listed in university catalogs as satisfying the breadth requirements. In addition to the conventional departmental major, this report also

endorsed more general field majors in humanities, social sciences, biological sciences, and physical sciences, each under the supervision of a special committee of the faculty and, for exceptional students, "individual majors" to be taken in two or more departments or in intensive study of a special aspect of the work of one department.

This is the basic structure of the undergraduate curriculum at Berkeley today, pending further faculty review. It implies the obsolescence of the undergraduate regional majors, which were abolished after 1959. But because the oriental languages and near Eastern languages departments continued to gain in enrollment in the expansion of the late 1950's, general regional majors in oriental civilization, Islamic civilization, and South Asian civilization remained available through these departments. Near Eastern languages, in fact, grew into a holding corporation for instruction in South Asian languages, literatures, and civilizational study after 1956, when a linguist with a specialty in Indian languages joined that department. It was the home of one of the first South Asian language and area studies centers under the NDEA.

The only other regional program now available to undergraduates is the honors program in American studies. Although termed an interdisciplinary program, American studies courses must be taken through one of the three cooperating departments. The basic course is taught in three sections by instructors from the three departments,

and a student may not enroll in a section taught by an instructor whose department is not the focus of the student's course of study.

At the graduate level, the university in 1968 still offered in three fields of Asian Studies (East, South, and Southeast) the master's degree first developed in the early 1950's though faculty planning centered in the institute of East Asiatic studies. A Ph.D. in East Asian Studies or Latin American Studies was also available to exceptional students. The three M.A. programs and the Ph.D. program on Asia were supervised by a faculty group in Asian studies with a formally deputed faculty program advisor. The Asian studies M.A. is regarded as a terminal degree preparatory to government or other nonacademic service or to further graduate work in a disciplinary department. It is moderately popular, attracting perhaps thirty to fifty students annually, often persons with Peace Corps experience. A graduate certificate in Russian and Slavic studies is now awarded, based on coursework applicable toward an advanced degree in either humanities or the social sciences. No particular arrangement exists at Berkeley for African studies although coursework is available.

Thus, it would appear that the last fifteen years at Berkeley have seen a retreat of interdepartmental cooperation in the name of integrated regional study.

Structure and Goals

Scarcely a faculty report or interpretive essay about Berkeley

has appeared which did not either strongly imply or bluntly state the great power of the departments at Berkeley (University of California, 1967; Trow, 1968). Undergraduate instruction is parceled out among four professional colleges and one college of general education (the college of letters and science); three professional schools also admit undergraduate students after the sophomore or junior year. By far the largest is the college of letters and science, which enrolls more than 14,000 of Berkeley's 18,000 undergraduates.

This gigantic college enterprise oversees courses and enrolls students but has no independent teaching faculty of its own. Instead, it "recruits" (this term is explicitly used) its faculty from the departments, which supply teachers and administrators to the various undergraduate colleges and schools and to the graduate division, which controls graduate students and oversees graduate course offerings in all schools and departments. On the other hand, almost all undergraduate and graduate courses at Berkeley are offered through the departments, which, thus, control their contents. Departmental power arises, in considerable part, from sheer weight of faculty numbers, which are determined in a general way by the application of state formulas tying number of faculty appointments to number of students enrolled (FTE). The basic unit to whose account student enrollments are credited are the departments. More weight is granted the enrollments of major students than of non-

major students (courses for whom are considered "service" to the university), and faculty-student ratios are such that departments "earn" more faculty by enrolling more graduate students than undergraduates. Upper division courses are tied to graduate courses by permitting graduate students to enroll in some of them for credit. The effects of the system are to keep departmental attention firmly fixed upon graduate and upper division education and to discourage interdepartmental cooperation unless it can be credited to the "accounts" of all participating departments.

Both university policy and physical factors have reinforced this outcome. Since 1957, enrollment on the Berkeley campus has grown from 15,000 (5,000 graduate students) to its maximum 27,500 under the California Master Plan for Higher Education (about 10,000 graduate students). Other units of the state university system have devoted greater attention to undergraduate education. These institutional arrangements have buttressed Berkeley's specialization on upper division and graduate education within the state university system. Mirroring Berkeley's emphasis on graduate education is the growth not merely of organized research generally on this campus but of organized "non-standard units" of research personnel.

A special example of non-standard units of research appeared in the field of foreign studies, where research has been more closely linked to teaching than in many other research centers at this

university. By the end of the 1940's, a trend toward establishing graduate level regional research institutes was apparent at the major American universities. Columbia University's Russian institute was first in the field, in 1945-46, and Berkeley's institute of Slavic studies followed in 1948. Both had foundation funding. During 1947-48, a group of faculty interested in the cultural history of East Asia negotiated with foundations and the university administration for the organization of a second institute for East Asiatic studies, which was created in 1949 under the leadership of Woodbridge Bingham of the history department. Although the founders included at least one specialist on South Asia, and the institute's competence was defined to extend from South Asia to Korea, China was designated its chief area of activity.

Unlike the Columbia institutes, the Berkeley institutes never offered graduate or undergraduate instruction in their own names; ~~their~~ function in this regard was limited to giving "aid in planning undergraduate departmental majors and graduate studies." The main function of the East Asian institute, at the time of its founding, was to "take the lead in the cooperative planning of research programs among members of the various departments concerned [University of California, January 21, 1949, p. 17]." It was to be an organization of, and by, the members of the departments, for purposes of research not instruction. The dean of the college of letters and science, in presenting the proposal for the approval of the

regents, "stressed the point that research is a basic ingredient of a university program, and is not be regarded as an independent function, but as an integral part of the whole [University of California, January 21, 1949, p. 27]."

The early documents of the institute of East Asiatic studies make clear the participating faculty's dual thinking. Much of their initial effort was devoted to pointing out gaps in departmental offerings as well as in research fields and to defining priorities in filling these gaps. The faculty consistently voiced its support for study of the modern languages of Asia and urged the addition of historians for all regions of Asia (University of California, November 24, 1948). While major effort was devoted to defining and furthering research projects in the translation of Chinese historical documents, Mongolian and Thai dictionaries, and studies in modern Chinese and Japanese political history during the first several years of the institute, during 1950 and 1951 the faculty also planned interdisciplinary master's degrees in Chinese and Japanese studies. Thus, despite the institute's major concern with research, it was never completely divorced from teaching.

After 1951, the institute began further to diversify its projects, taking in the India Press Digests established in that year and, in 1954, adding two major research projects on India supported by Ford funds--the modern India project, concerned primarily with modern political developments, and the Indian village

studies project, an anthropological study under the direction of anthropologist David G. Mandelbaum, a founder of the institute. The burgeoning research projects within the institute, and the corresponding increase of faculty with special interests in Asia on the Berkeley campus, led to the preparation of a university Report on Asian Studies (1956) which became the basis for reconstituting the then overgrown institute of East Asiatic studies.

On January 31, 1956, the chancellor of the Berkeley campus announced the formation of a new institute of international studies, comprising the institute of East Asiatic studies and the bureau of international relations, which had become the university's public relations and service arm in matters international. A committee on international studies was appointed to oversee the reorganization, including the creation of new units "to support faculty research interests appropriate to the University." A subcommittee on curriculum was to give advice on the curriculum generally, with special reference to the interdepartmental majors and interdepartmental graduate work on foreign regions [University of California, January 31, 1956, p. 37].

The first unit to be formed from the old institute for East Asiatic studies was the center for South Asia studies, formally approved by the committee on educational policy of the faculty senate in August 1957. The remaining programs of the former institute were formed into the center for Chinese studies and the center for

Japanese and Korean studies. Also integrated into the new institute were the institute of Slavic studies, formed in 1948, and a center for Latin American studies, formed in 1956.

Geographical coverage was extended by the organization of a center for Southeast Asia studies in 1960 and committees on Middle East studies (1962) and African studies (1965). The fact that the latter committees have not developed into centers, despite growth in the number of Berkeley faculty members with special interest in these areas, represents a real limitation upon development at Berkeley stemming from its participation in a statewide system. High-level agreements between the chancellors of the Berkeley and the Los Angeles campuses have given the Los Angeles campus responsibility for developing the main thrust of modern Middle Eastern and African studies within the university system.

During the first eight years, the institute's program consisted primarily of the work of its area centers. But during the middle and later 1960's, with the aid of a Ford Foundation grant, the institute has increasingly embarked on organized research separate from its area centers, under the categories of comparative/international and theoretical/methodological studies, directed primarily to the social sciences rather than to history or language studies. As a recent announcement stated,

Within a little more than ten years, the Institute has become one of the largest research organizations of its type in the world. During that period, however, there has been a gradual change of emphasis within the

organization. Through the early 1960's the emphasis was primarily on area studies, with some attention being given to international service programs, e.g., training programs for overseas mission personnel, community development projects in foreign countries, etc. The Institute was essentially the creation of its area centers. Since then, . . . there has been a readjustment within the Institute of the balance between area and comparative/international studies [University of California, 1968].

Much of this growth has been accomplished through the full- and part-time support of research personnel entirely separate from the teaching component of the university. The present foundation grant supporting their work expires in 1970, and a reorganization of the institute's research activities was already underway.

Foreign Area Instruction Since NDEA

As this discussion shows, the development of an elaborate institutional structure for foreign area research at Berkeley has been paralleled by a corresponding disaggregation of organized undergraduate instruction on the areas. Foreign area history; the politics of China, Japan, Africa, and South Asia; the anthropological study of foreign areas; and vastly increased modern language offerings were all absorbed into their respective departments. Upper division and graduate course offerings on Asia and Africa in the departments have increased steadily since 1958. This development had the merit of assuring the area centers of indefinite continuation at the faculty's wish, since the area centers have tended to use their shares of foundation funds to support faculty

research rather than to mount large independent research projects.

General university expansion of the last twelve years and the establishment of three NDEA language and area centers have greatly enlarged foreign area instructional offerings at Berkeley. Two of these centers--in Middle East and Slavic studies--are housed in the relevant regional language departments. The third is now located in the South Asia center. Enlarged foreign area staff and course offerings, and reduced outside income from foundation sources, are especially visible in the South-Southeast Asia regions. In 1970 a Southern Asian languages department will absorb linguists and literary specialists on these regions now housed in Near Eastern languages. In 1968-69 the two research centers on these areas merged. The only regional research center with substantial outside funds available after 1970 is the China center, which remains the most active of the centers in furthering research and even some language teaching.

New Integrative Efforts in Regional Instruction

Recently the area centers have again become foci for new interdisciplinary curricular planning. These efforts coincided with a major attempt at innovative curricular planning for undergraduates heralded by the Report of the Select (Muscatine) Committee on Education to the Academic Senate of the University of California, Berkeley (March 1966). This report suggested the formation of machinery, outside the departmental structure but under

faculty supervision on the Berkeley campus, to encourage innovation and new approaches in graduate and undergraduate curricula. As an example of the kind of enterprise to be encouraged, the committee cited approvingly a proposal for a one-year upper division interdisciplinary course on the society and civilization of India then being developed in the center for South Asian studies (University of California, March 1966).

Financed in part by a short-lived innovational faculty unit, the board of educational development, the course was placed in the social science integrated courses because no departmental location was easily available. This interdisciplinary program, since 1957 the home for the "field major" in social science, offered one or two courses in its own right with faculty borrowed from the social science departments. Between 1967 and 1969 it proved a convenient administrative home for many of the board-sponsored courses.

The undergraduate Indian civilization course each quarter analyzed one major problem area in modern Indian society. Thus, one quarter was devoted to society and the family, examining its subject matter through anthropological methods and approaches. A second quarter was devoted to society and polity and dealt with major issues of political process and socioeconomic planning in modern India. A third quarter provided an opportunity to focus upon the role of cultural traditions in shaping modern identities. Because the course was outside the purview of the departments,

however, it has had difficulty in maintaining a student clientele. Presumably, it will become a basic offering in the new Southern Asian languages department.

In 1967-68 the South Asia faculty complemented the undergraduate course by offering an interdisciplinary graduate seminar on South Asia intended to "promote discourse among graduate students in the social science disciplines" by introducing them to problems susceptible to analysis through more than one discipline. The problem for analysis during the first year was regions and regionalism in South Asia; during the second year it was the city in South Asia. In its first year, it attracted twelve students. This course was also housed in the social science integrated courses during its first years, when it was receiving board of educational development support. Subsequently it will be a regular offering in the departments of the faculty members among whom it rotates.

Proposals for similar regional interdisciplinary courses have developed in both the Southeast Asia center (merged with the South Asia center) and the Japan center but both have failed to materialize. By the spring of 1969, the tempo of educational innovation had definitely slowed at Berkeley, and funds invested in various experiments throughout the college of letters and science ~~were being~~ diverted to a single major enterprise, the third world college.

Impact of Curricular Change

The pattern of development in the foreign area field at

Berkeley showed a tendency for institutionalization along already existing lines to absorb innovational programs more than at any other case study institution. The regional research centers were new products of the 1950's which have endured and which have served a useful purpose as foci for innovations in teaching on occasion. But their future is far from secure. And whatever their innovative potential, it is limited indeed by the evident tendency of existing organizational units--the disciplinary departments--to absorb innovative coursework.

The single major structural change to result here in the organization of teaching will be the establishment of a new language and literature department focused on South and Southeast Asia. But in faculty numbers it will not be impressive by comparison with large social science and humanities departments, in an institution where manpower is one of the most important elements contributing to departmental power, prestige, and influence. It will follow the model of a few long-established departments, such as Near Eastern and oriental languages, whose purpose has always been to uphold the holistic study of a single world region. Curricular innovation is unlikely to be a major goal of such a department, unless the general university environment becomes more favorable.

Conclusion

Foreign Area Studies and Educational Change

The seven college and university curricular programs on Africa and Asia described in Part II provide a basis for analyzing the interrelation between the programs and their institutional settings, and for some observations on the interaction between the institutional and national levels. The interrelationship between programs and institutional setting may be seen as a two-way flow, affected by preexisting variables in the institutional setting and in the program itself. The institution, of course, is the larger system; the program, a much smaller system. The primary direction of flow, then, is from the institution to the program. Four preexisting variables in the institutional setting seem most important in determining the nature of this flow:

(1) the degree to which the institution has previously defined a distinctive point of view or educational philosophy governing its curricular offerings, (2) the position of the originators of proposed foreign area programs within the institution, (3) the structure of decision-making about curricular matters within the institution, and (4) the character of scholarly traditions governing the study of particular world regions.

This last variable in the institutional setting framing the program is the only one of the four that is not strictly a local

matter. Scholarly traditions concerning the study of particular world regions are both national and local. They are made national by the operation of the faculty job market, which assures that Ph.D. holders from each center of graduate training will circulate through the colleges and universities of the nation. The more prestigious the center of graduate training, the wider the circulation of its products is likely to become. Scholarly traditions become local when faculty members internalize the traditions, which are manifested both in the scope and organization of the courses they teach and in the foreign area programs they organize. In a sense, the scholarly traditions of a local institution concerning foreign area studies are largely identical with the beliefs of the most senior faculty members teaching in the field.

Scholarly tradition on foreign area studies, as we have seen, presents two models to faculty members who would organize programs on foreign areas: the holistic model of antiquarian oriental studies, arguing that the foreign culture can best be known by studying it as a whole, and the partitioned model arising from modern social science, supposing that the foreign society can best be known by studying its aspects through the theoretical perspectives and research tools of particular disciplines. Stated as extremes, the two views are mutually exclusive; in practice, a program may and usually does fall at one of several possible points midway between the two extremes. Our original hypothesis concerning

this variable was that most programs on South and East Asia would prove more holistic in nature than those on Africa, because of the stronger association of Africa with the modern development of the social sciences.

This hypothesis was borne out. Programs with explicitly holistic aims were the Columbia University committee on oriental studies, the Chicago non-Western civilizations courses, and the area studies division at the State University College at New Paltz. Chicago and New Paltz were the only case study institutions with holistic undergraduate course offerings on Africa. At these institutions and elsewhere, courses on Asia tended to be more oriented to language, literature, and history than those on Africa, which were often incidental parts of the course offerings of social science departments. Nevertheless, even at institutions with holistic programs, both Asia and Africa programs benefited the social science and history departments foremost. Only case study institutions that were major centers of graduate training emphasized strongly the humanities, belles-lettres, and languages of the African and Asian regions. Even at New Paltz with its area studies division, where a concerted effort to develop a holistic program on Africa was underway, about as many foreign area specialists existed in the social science departments as in the division itself. It was apparent that scholarly traditions were insufficient in themselves, as a variable in the local situation, to account for

the differences in institutional effect on foreign area programs.

Of the remaining institutional variables, that which appeared to have the strongest effect--in conjunction with scholarly traditions--on the content of programs pertained to whether the institution had defined a distinctive educational philosophy governing its curricular offerings. For example, an institution might have a distinctive, well-defined philosophy concerning undergraduate education which limited considerably the nature of course offerings (University of Chicago, Columbia College); or the institution might develop a laundry list philosophy, attempting to offer as many choices in coursework to its undergraduates as possible (University of California, University of Massachusetts, New Paltz); or the institution, without really defining a philosophy of undergraduate education, might develop selective competences in its course offerings, which become a recognized part of its special appeal to students (most private colleges studied).

In both universities having a distinctive philosophy concerning undergraduate education, the foreign area programs had been constructed and justified in terms of that philosophy. The resulting courses were distinctively different at each university and uniquely characteristic of the institutions where they were developed. From their inception, these programs have continued to serve as models for other programs throughout the country. This does not mean that strong and viable institutional support structures

emerged, however; at Chicago, the holistic courses, after experimentation with course staffs, seemed to regress little by little toward the one-teacher model. At Columbia, course staffs were maintained through a weakly institutionalized program with an ominous feature: some faculty members administering the program feared that their efforts on behalf of the program would compete with what they ought to be doing for their departments.

At the small institutions with selective curricular competencies, and at the large institutions with laundry list philosophies, foreign area studies tended to be considered as yet another selective competency. Although this often resulted in undergraduate survey courses--India at California, India and China at Mills--the effect was to strengthen the social science departments of these institutions.

At large institutions with laundry list philosophies, an additional factor entered. Where small institutions might decide to support foreign area studies precisely because it is a special competency (Earlham, Mills less so), at the large institutions the outcome was quite different. At large institutions, holistic thinking about world regions was nurtured in non-regularly funded regional research centers or institutes and in a few language and literature departments, which were invariably small and powerless by comparison with large social science departments. There, foreign area programs must join "on their merits" in the general competition for funds and faculty positions with all other teaching programs within the

institution. The "merits" were seldom philosophically based, consisting rather of political influence that could be mobilized by program members and the outside funds and prestige that these members could bring to the institution. Not that such "merits" did not impress administrators at institutions with well-defined philosophies of education. However, the justifications differed in the two cases. Thus, so did the terms of the competition for funds faced by a foreign area program.

New Paltz, a small institution with a laundry list philosophy of education, was a somewhat special example of this general difference because the originator of the program was also the president of the institution and because of its rapidly changing institutional setting. Apparently, there was much faculty opposition (which came to naught) to his plan to establish an area studies division in the late 1950's and early 1960's. Since then, however, the college has been ever more closely integrated into the rapidly growing state university system, and faculty who once opposed it now find the college's area studies program a convenient ground on which to stake a claim of special competency against other institutions in the system which now compete more closely for funds from Albany.

Faculty opposition to foreign area studies at New Paltz might have had more success if the originator had not been the president of the college. In the case studies, originators were either faculty members or administrators. The distinction is

important, because it relates to control over financial resources. Faculty members originating foreign area programs must either persuade administrators to provide resources for developing the program or they must become administrators of funds they secure from outside sources. Administrators who originate programs control resources in their own right, and the essentially captive faculty can only impede the program. In no case study institution did a reluctant faculty succeed completely in scuttling an administration-sponsored foreign area program, although some faculties appeared to implement such programs more as duty than privilege. It is not without significance that in the three administration-sponsored programs (New Paltz, Mills, and Earlham, a less obvious case of administration sponsorship because of its decision-making techniques), new faculty members who identified strongly with the administration's position were brought in to implement the program.

Where faculty members were the originators of foreign area programs (all the universities in the program and the four-college cooperative program), on the other hand, the exigencies of their situation drove them to become a special class of administrators, dispensing their own funds and directing their programs but jealously retaining their faculty titles and faculty identities. This was apparently made necessary by the structure of decision-making about curricular matters within their institutions. All the case study institutions possessed elaborate apparatus for formal decision-making

about the curriculum, but the decisions which determined the nature of the foreign area programs that developed in each institution were defined by the relations among faculty and between faculty and administrators.

Despite much that has been written about the academic community, none of the case study institutions were communities of equals. A division of loyalties and opinions existed among groups of faculty as well as between faculty and administration. The lines of competition among faculty were related to the size of the institution; in larger institutions, departments offered convenient foci for loyalties and boundaries for competition between groups of faculty; in smaller institutions, divisional lines (as of humanities against social sciences, or political economy against languages and literature) offered convenient points of fission. It was advantageous to the administration to sustain limited competition among different groups of faculty to prevent the combination of faculty groups against the administration. Only at Earlham was this problem confronted and an attempt made to dilute its effects by community decision-making on budgetary priorities. In terms of decision-making on curriculum, Earlham was closest of the case study institutions to a community of equals. Most similar to Earlham in this respect were the three private colleges in the Connecticut Valley group, whose entire faculties evidently were very active in decision-making. Yet, the result was, seemingly, to limit in some degree

the activity of the foreign area faculty. A possible explanation is that Earlham's program was administration sponsored with full faculty concurrence whereas the program in the three private colleges was originated by the faculty with outside funds. But in obtaining outside funds and jurisdiction over them, the foreign area faculty risked violating the rules of faculty equality. Some evidence suggested that the foreign area faculty feared that if they moved ahead too boldly with an innovative program supported by these funds, sanctions would be expressed against them through faculty decision-making processes on curriculum. As a result, a large proportion of the funds was spent for faculty enrichment: visiting lecturers to give seminars and colloquia, and support for faculty research and travel. In both these "democratic" models, there was strong emphasis on files and written records. Decision-making was not left to the memory of the group.

An alternative decision-making system to the academy as a community of equals was seen in the two small colleges with administration-originated foreign area programs, Mills and New Paltz, although the latter institution was undergoing changes that are visibly altering the system of decision-making. In brief, both institutions under past presidents had acceded more to the model of paternal autocracies than to democracies. Mills, the smaller of the two, had very limited possibilities of expansion of faculty and program; within those possibilities, presidents had proposed and faculties

disposed in the past. The Mills faculty prided itself on its ability to achieve an informal consensus; records of decisions in the foreign area program were few but accessible. The college was a harmonious working group under President Rothwell but not an innovative one. In the last analysis, neither the president nor the faculty was willing to accept and institutionalize the structural changes implied in the creation of the styles of civilization course.

The college at New Paltz, because of growth and change in personnel, has emerged from a long period of paternal autocracy (an administrative form in American institutions of higher education that seems most viable when faculty size is very small). Heretofore, the president made decisions in many spheres, often by communicating directly with faculty members; records and files here appeared to be minimal. The president took advantage of a large incremental increase in the college's financial resource to establish area studies and geography as a division of the college. Recently, the college has shown signs of moving into an oligarchic style of decision-making, intermediate between autocracy and the kind of democracy displayed by some small colleges in the case studies.

Oligarchy may be either formal or informal. New Paltz appeared to be moving toward formal oligarchy, in which appointed department or division heads whose tenure in office is limited only by the pleasure of the administration have substantial powers

of budget-making, better access to administrators than do other faculty members, and often considerable control over their colleagues through an ability to originate recommendations for promotion.

Something of the same situation appeared to prevail at the University of Massachusetts, in which institutional expansion was proceeding so fast that the funds available through the four-college grant seemed very small by comparison with the institution's own resources. Thus, formal oligarchy, in this study, was associated with the medium-sized institution with large resources from public sources. Under this system of decision-making, it is maximally advantageous to a foreign area program to occupy an organizational position parallel to that of other teaching units within the institution, as at New Paltz. While the New Paltz area studies and geography division did compete for funds with other units in which foreign area courses were taught, the program was unlikely to be injured by this competition because of the local system of decision-making and its advantages to the institution in the wider state university system. If formal oligarchy is not present in medium- and large-enrollment institutions with many available curricular options, such a teaching unit, whose competences cross-cut those of the disciplinary departments, is far more likely to suffer in the competition for funds.

An informal oligarchy tended to form where chairmanships of

departments rotated at short intervals among senior members of the department and where promotion and tenure of junior faculty members was dependent not primarily upon the opinion of the department head but upon the assessment of the senior departmental faculty as a whole. This system characterized some of the institutions of medium and large enrollment studied. Under these decision-making arrangements, the faculty were more or less formally equal, with due regard to differences in age and grade of faculty appointment. Nevertheless, some individuals, usually found in middle and senior grades, were more influential and powerful than others. A major measure of power in the informal oligarchy observed was a faculty member's ability to attract, over a long period, substantial outside funds. Faculty oligarchs usually used such funds to establish curricular and research programs in which they had a special interest, claiming with considerable justice that these programs were equal to the general interest of the institution. Such faculty oligarchs had no fear of sanctions from their colleagues; rather their aim was either to maintain or to expand their academic domains within the institution.

In terms of the faculty-originated foreign area programs studied here, a combination of faculty oligarchy, defined institutional philosophy regarding curriculum, and strong adherence to the holistic scholarly tradition seemed to provide the most favorable environment for the growth of a sound foreign area program at the undergraduate

level. The main elements in assuring the success of administration-sponsored programs, on the other hand, appeared to be: plenty of funds and aggressive leadership expressed through the formal organizational structure of the institution.

However, evidence from the largest case study institution, the University of California, suggested that increase in institutional size gradually decreases the effectiveness of oligarchy as a governance pattern. There appears to be a numerical limit beyond which this principle cannot be extended. As the institution grows larger, the would-be oligarch is less able to communicate with all the members of the institution whom he must influence in order to realize his aims. Eventually the oligarch comes to represent one pressure group among many within the system. Simultaneously, justifications of programs based on their curricular content become less and less relevant to the fate of the programs. The questions which must ultimately be answered in organizing a new curricular program are now reduced to two: Will the members in the group affected by the proposal accept it? Does it in any way damage the interests of some other pressure group within the system?

*

*

*

Finally, what of the foreign area program's effect upon the institution, the "return flow" from the program to its institutional setting? The impact of the program on the institution varies considerably. At the minimum, the program might have established a

successful claim to compete for a share of the institution's financial resources sufficient to support at least one faculty members and have added to the curricular options available to students of the institution, although actually affecting the studies of only a small minority. A maximal impact on the institution, on the other hand, would mean that the program had established a legitimate claim to compete for a sizable share of the institution's financial resources and had changed the course of studies pursued by a majority of the institution's undergraduate students.

All of the programs studied here had more than a minimal success in altering their institutional environments but the programs with least impact were those in the largest and smallest institutional settings. While the foreign area programs made less impact at Mills than at any of the other case study institutions, the University of California was also largely unaffected. Foreign area studies were only a small part of the total scheme of curricular offerings at UC. Moreover, the vast bulk of curricular offerings to undergraduates in foreign area studies were courses offered through the social science and humanities departments as a part of the universalization of these disciplines. The foreign area research centers here functioned primarily as foci for pressure groups to universalize the course offerings of the discipline-based departments, an enterprise not yet completed.

Closest among the case study institutions to the maximal-effect end of the spectrum were Earlham, New Paltz, and Chicago, in that order, and these results were the outcome of very different constellations of factors at each institution. At Earlham, the result seemed largely unintended and was in fact specifically prohibited by faculty decision at the program's outset. Rather, the success of the program has developed from the successful exploitation of the foreign study program and of possibilities for off-campus organization. It required unceasing organizational work that would be unprofitable to faculty in institutions that reward research and publication. At New Paltz, the success of the program appeared to be the result primarily of the decision-making processes of the institution in a favorable financial situation. Decision-making processes are altering, and the financial situation may also change at this institution. Presumably such changes would create new strains for the foreign area program. At the larger University of Chicago, more curricular choices were available to students, and the course of curricular reform has further enlarged their curricular options. As a result, the foreign area courses affected a smaller proportion of students at this institution than at the other two. Nevertheless the accomplishments here were significant and substantial among the universities studied.

The structural mechanisms linking the institutional and national

levels should now be apparent: they are the participation of individual faculty members from various institutions in national voluntary associations and these individuals' quests for outside funds, both for their institution's programs and often for the purposes of the national associations. In addition, formal and informal channels of communication provide crucial links--the published account of a program in a scholarly journal, the invited lecture or seminar at an institution considering establishing a new foreign area program, and the frequent long-distance telephone conversations of institutional leaders with funding sources and with each other. Through these mechanisms, both levels of existence for foreign area studies are made viable; without them, perhaps neither would exist.

References

- Abrams, I. Interinstitutional cooperation in international studies. Liberal Education, March 1968, 54, 20-29.
- American Council of Learned Societies. Promotion of Chinese studies. American Council of Learned Societies Bulletin, April 1929, 10, 4.
- American Council on Education, Committee on Institutional Projects Abroad. Report on the first year of operation (August 1955). Quoted in Caldwell, L. K. The university-government relationship. In R. A. Humphreys (Ed.), Universities and development assistance abroad. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.
- Amherst College, Office of the Four-College Coordinator. Four-college cooperative Ph.D. candidates. Amherst, Massachusetts: The College, May 10, 1966.
- Amherst College, Office of the Four-College Coordinator. Elections in interchange courses, first semester 1966-67. Amherst, Massachusetts: The College, December 2, 1966.
- Anderson, T. R., & Warkov, S. Organizational size and functional complexity: A study of administration in hospitals. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 23-28.
- Anthony, D. F. International education: Challenge to the liberal arts college. Liberal Education, December 1967, 53, 484-496.
- Antioch College & Earlham College. Final report on development grant for cooperative program in non-Western studies, July 1959 to June 30, 1962. Yellow Springs, Ohio (Antioch), and Richmond, Indiana (Earlham): The Colleges, 1962.
- Antioch College & Earlham College. Report on terminal grant for cooperative development of non-Western studies, April 1, 1962, to March 30, 1964. Yellow Springs, Ohio (Antioch), and Richmond, Indiana (Earlham): The Colleges, 1964.
- Association for Asian Studies, Committee on Asian Studies in Undergraduate Education. Minutes of January 10-11, 1964.
- Association for Asian Studies, Committee on Asian Studies in Undergraduate Education. Minutes of March 21, 1964.

Association for Asian Studies, Committee on Undergraduate Studies.
Minutes of April 1, 1965.

Association of American Colleges. Non-Western studies in the liberal arts. Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1964.

Atwood, R. S. The U.S. Point Four Program: A bilateral approach. In R. W. Gable (Ed.), Partnership for progress: International technical cooperation. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1959, 323, 33-39.

Axelrod, J., & Bigelow, D. N. Resources for language and area studies. A report on an inventory of the language and area centers supported by the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1962.

Bailey, J. H. Non-Western studies in a small liberal arts college: An experiment at Earlham and Antioch. Liberal Education, 1961, 47, 405-411.

Bailey, S. K. International education: Shadow and substance. In International education: Past, present, problems, and prospects. Hearings before the Task Force on International Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, on H.R. 12451 and H.R. 12452. March 30-April 7, 1966. Pp. 153-158.

Beckman, G. The role of the foundations. In D. N. Bigelow & L. H. Legters (Eds.), The non-Western world in higher education. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November 1964, 356, 13-15.

Bell, D. The reforming of general education: The Columbia College experience in its national setting. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Bennett, W. C. Area studies in American universities. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1951.

Bennis, W. G. Changing organizations: Essays on the development and evolution of human organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Bennis, W. G., Benne, K., & Chin, R. The planning of change. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1961.

Bigelow, D. N., & Legters, L. H. NDEA language and area centers: A report on the first five years. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1964. (a)

- Bigelow, D. N., & Legters, L. H. (Eds.) The non-Western world in higher education. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November 1964, 356. (b)
- Bloland, H. Higher education associations in a decentralized education system. Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1969.
- Boardman, E. (Ed.) Asian studies in liberal education. Washington, D. C.: Association of American Colleges, 1959.
- Bolling, L. Innovation, educational improvement and the Earlham community. Richmond, Indiana: Earlham College, December 13, 1967.
- Brown, W. N. India and humanistic studies in America. Indic studies in America. American Council of Learned Societies Bulletin, 1939, 28, 22.
- Brownell, S. Foreign language teaching and the Office of Education. Modern Language Journal, 1955, 39, 223.
- Bulletin of Mills College Catalogue, March 1967. Oakland, California: Mills College, 1967, 136-143.
- Butts, R. F. International studies at Teachers College. Annual report, 1966-67. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967.
- Cahnman, W. J. Outline of a theory of area studies. Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 1948, 38, 234.
- Caldwell, L. K. The university-government relationship. In R. A. Humphreys (Ed.), Universities and development assistance abroad. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.
- Caplow, T. Principles of organization. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1964.
- Carlson, R. O. School superintendents and the adoption of modern math. In M. B. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964. Pp. 329-342.
- Carter, E. C. China and Japan in our university curricula. New York: American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1929.

- Chesler, M. Principal's role in facilitating innovation. Theory into Practice, December 1963, 3, 269-277.
- Columbia University, Committee on Oriental Studies. Annual Report, 1965-66. New York: The University, 1966.
- Columbia University financial report 1965-66. New York: Columbia University, 1966.
- Committee for Asian-African Studies of the Four-College Program of the Connecticut Valley. Area programs to be given by the faculties of Amherst, Mount Holyoke, and Smith Colleges and the University of Massachusetts: A report of the Committee on Area Studies of the four institutions. Amherst, Massachusetts: Amherst College, February 4, 1959.
- Committee on the University and World Affairs, J. L. Morrill, Chairman. The university and world affairs. New York: Ford Foundation, 1960.
- Cowan, L. G. A history of the School of International Affairs and associated area institutes, Columbia University. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954.
- deBary, W. T. The general education program in oriental studies at Columbia College. New York: Columbia College, Columbia University, October 15, 1952.
- deBary, W. T. Asian studies for undergraduates. Journal of Higher Education, 1959, 30, 1-7. (a)
- deBary, W. T. Oriental classics in a general education. Journal of General Education, 1959, 12, 3-8. (b)
- deBary, W. T. Education for a world community. Liberal Education, 1964, 50, 437.
- deBary, W. T., & Embree, A. T. (Eds.) Approaches to Asian civilization. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964.
- Derthick, L. G. The purpose and legislative history of the foreign language titles in the National Defense Education Act, 1958. Publications of the Modern Language Association, May 1959, 84, 48.
- Diekhoff, J. S. The mission and method of Army language teaching. American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 1945, 31, 619-620.

- Earlham College. Earlham 1966-68 catalog. Richmond, Indiana: The College, 1966.
- Earlham College. Minutes of the joint meeting of the faculty members of the Long-Range Planning Commission, Faculty Affairs Committee, and Educational Policy Committee. Richmond, Indiana: The College, December 13, 1967.
- Education and World Affairs, Committee on the College and World Affairs. The college and world affairs. New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964.
- Education and World Affairs. The university looks abroad: Approaches to world affairs at six American universities. New York: Walker, 1965.
- Evans, R. I. Resistance to innovation in higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.
- Federal role in education. Washington, D. C.: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1965.
- Fenton, W. N. Preface. Area studies in American universities. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1947. Pp. vii-xi.
- Fisher, H. H. Mills College seminar on the study of non-Western civilization. Oakland, California: Mills College, December 6, 1961.
- Four-College Committee report on Hampshire College. Amherst, Massachusetts: Amherst College, 1966.
- Fraser, S. E. International and comparative education. Review of Educational Research, February 1967, 37, 57-73.
- Frodin, R. Very simple, but thoroughgoing. In The idea and practice of general education: An account of the college of the University of Chicago by present and former members of the faculty. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950. Pp. 25-90.
- Gaff, J. Innovation and evaluation: A case study. Unpublished paper, Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, May 1968.
- Galanter, M. (Ed.) Legal materials for the study of modern India. Chicago: Syllabus Division, University of Chicago Press, 1965.

- Gardner, C. S. Chinese studies in America: A survey of resources and facilities--I: Eastern Canada and New England. Washington, D. C. American Council of Learned Societies, 1935.
- Gardner, J. W. AID and the universities. New York City: Agency for International Development, 1964.
- Glick, P. M. The administration of technical assistance: Growth in the Americas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Goodlad, J. I. The organizing center in curriculum theory and practice. Theory into Practice, October 1962, 1, 216.
- Goodman, L. A sociological case study of a teachers college, with special reference to academic freedom. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Columbia University, 1962.
- Graves, M. Two experiments in education. American Scholar, 1934, 3, 359-360.
- Great Lakes Colleges Association. Final report to the Ford Foundation, Great Lakes Colleges Association non-Western program, 1964-67, December 1967.
- Griffin, E. Progress of Chinese studies in the United States of America. American Council of Learned Societies Bulletin, May 1931, No. 11.
- Griffiths, D. E. Administrative theory and change in organizations. In M. B. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.
- Guba, E. G. Diffusion of innovation. Educational Leadership, January 1968, 25, 292-295.
- Haire, M. Modern organization theory. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1959.
- Hall, R. B. Area studies: With special reference to their implications for research in the social sciences. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1947.
- Hamilton, E. J. World regions in the social sciences. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1943.
- Hart, C. National development and international academic activity. Unpublished paper written for the Committee on South Asia, Association for Asian Studies, March 1968.

- Hay, S. N. The Chicago and Columbia readings compared. In M. Singer (Ed.), Introducing India in liberal education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Hornby, R. Styles of civilization workshop, Mills College, June 26-30, 1967, final report. Oakland, California: Mills College, 1968.
- Howard, L. C. Interinstitutional cooperation in higher education. New Dimensions in Higher Education, No. 21. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1967.
- Hucker, C. O. Memorandum to board of directors, Association for Asian studies. November 1, 1962.
- Humphreys, R. A. (Ed.) Universities and development assistance abroad. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1967.
- Indik, B. Organizational size and member participation. Human Relations, 1965, 8, 339-350.
- Johnson, L. B. Speech before the Smithsonian Institution, September 16, 1965.
- Johnson, L. B. Special message to Congress of the United States, February 2, 1966.
- Jones, L. B. Curriculum innovations in a public school system. Theory into Practice, October 1962, 1, 197.
- Keene, D. The Tale of Genji in a general education. Journal of General Education, 1959, 12, 9-14.
- Keniston, H. We accept our responsibility for professional leadership. Hispania, May 1953, 36, 182-186.
- Kimpton, L. A. The state of the university--a report to the faculties of the University of Chicago. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, October 14, 1952; November 10, 1953.
- Kimpton, L. A. The state of the university: A report by Lawrence A. Kimpton to the faculties of the University of Chicago, no. 11. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Klohr, P. R., & Frymier, J. R. Curriculum development. Review of Educational Research, June 1963, 33, 304-321.

- LaTourette, K. S. Far Eastern studies in the U.S., retrospect and prospect. Far Eastern Quarterly, 1955, 15, 9.
- LeFevcur, E. Styles of civilization: A new course. Mills College Magazine, Autumn 1965, 10.
- Legters, L. H. Introduction. In L. H. Legters (Ed.), Asian studies under the National Defense Education Act. Supplement to Newsletter (Association for Asian Studies), April 1967, 12, 2.
- MacKenzie, G. N. The social context of curricular change. Theory into Practice, October 1962, 1, 189.
- MacKenzie, G. N. Curricular change: Participants, power, and processes. In M. B. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964. Pp. 339-424.
- The making of a college: Growth in a major academic community. Abstract of Hampshire College working paper no. 1, Amherst, Massachusetts: Amherst College, September 1966.
- Matthew, R. J. Language and area studies in the armed services: Their future significance. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1947.
- Mead, A. F. Innovators and crusaders in education. Education, September 1964, 85, 24-27.
- Miles, M. B. The nature of the problem. In M. B. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964. Pp. 5-7. (a)
- Miles, M. B. On temporary systems. In M. B. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964. Pp. 437-490. (b)
- Mills College. A proposal for the further development of non-Western emphases and perspectives in the educational program of Mills College. Oakland, California: The College, 1961.
- Mills College Ford Foundation non-Western studies grant financial report 1963-1967. Oakland, California: Mills College, no date.
- Modern Language Association, Commission on Trends in Education, Special Committee. A survey of language classes in the Army specialized training program. New York: The Commission, 1944.

- Morehouse, W. (Ed.) Asian studies in liberal arts colleges. Washington, D. C.: Association of American Colleges, 1961.
- Morse, R. M. The challenge for foreign area studies. Educational Record, 1966, 47, 238.
- Munger, F. J., & Fenno, R. National politics and federal aid to education. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1962.
- New college plan: A proposal for a major departure in higher education. Report of a committee of Amherst, Mt. Holyoke, and Smith Colleges, and the University of Massachusetts. Amherst, Massachusetts: 1958. (Reprinted 1965.)
- Newcomb, T. M., et al. Persistence and change: Bennington College and its students after twenty-five years. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967.
- 1966 interim revision of the master plan of 1964 for the State University of New York. Albany, New York: State University of New York, September 1966.
- Parker, W. R. The national interest and foreign languages. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1954.
- Patterson, M. L. P., & Inden, R. South Asia: An introductory bibliography. Chicago: Syllabus Division, University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Pellegrin, R. J. An analysis of sources and process of innovation in education. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, February 28, 1966.
- Proceedings of a Pennsylvania conference on the International Education Act of 1966: Its impact on higher education in Pennsylvania. State College, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University, March 27-28, 1967.
- Programs of non-Western area studies to be given by the faculties of Amherst, Mount Holyoke, and Smith Colleges and the University of Massachusetts. A proposal to the Ford Foundation. Amherst, Massachusetts: The Colleges, summer 1959.
- Quattlebaum, C. Federal educational policies, programs, and proposals. Part I. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960.

- Redfield, R. Area programs in education and research. Social Science Research Council Archive volume University social science research organizations 1935-1946. Vol. II: Conference proceedings, 1937-1944. New York: Social Science Research Council, no date. Pp. 583-591.
- Reining, H., Jr. The government contract as an administrative device. In R. W. Gable (Ed.), Partnership for progress: International technical cooperation. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1959, 323, 68-79.
- Report of the Committee on Cooperation to the presidents of Amherst College, Mount Holyoke College, Smith College, and University of Massachusetts. Amherst, Massachusetts: Amherst College, 1956.
- Rivlin, A. The role of the federal government in financing higher education. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1961.
- Rogers, E. M. Diffusion on innovations. New York: The Free Press, 1962.
- Rogers, I. L. The process of institutional change, with particular reference to major curricular change in selected colleges. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Michigan, 1964.
- Rushing, W. A. Organizational size and administration: The problems of causal homogeneity and a heterogeneous category. Pacific Sociological Review, fall 1966, 9, 100-109.
- Singer, M. Chicago's non-Western civilization program. Journal of General Education, 1959, 12, 22-23.
- Singer, M. The social sciences in non-Western studies. In Donald N. Bigelow & Lyman Legters (Eds.), The non-Western world in higher education. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1964, 306, 30-44.
- Singer, M. (Ed.) South and Southeast Asian studies at the University of Chicago 1966-67: A midway report. Chicago: Committee on Southern Asian Studies, 1966.
- Singer, M. On understanding other cultures and one's own. Journal of General Education, 1967, 19, 1-23.
- Smith College, Office of the Assistant Treasurer. Ford four-college Asian-African grant summary fiscal report, December 1, 1959 - September 30, 1966. Northampton, Massachusetts: The College, January 1967.

Social Science Research Council, Minutes of Committee on World Regions. February 25, 1943. In Social Science Research Council Archive volume Committee on World Regions 1941-1943; Joint Exploratory Committee on World Area Research 1945-1946; Committee on World Area Research 1946-1953; Minutes of Committee on Problems and Policy, Executive Committee, Board of Directors, Committee. New York: Social Science Research Council, no date. (February 25, 1943)

Social Science Research Council, Minutes of April 1-2, 1944. In Social Science Research Council Archive volume Committee on World Regions 1941-1943; Joint Exploratory Committee on World Area Research 1945-1946; Committee on World Area Research 1946-1953; Minutes of Committee on Problems and Policy, Executive Committee, Board of Directors, Committee. New York: Social Science Research Council, no date. (April 1-2, 1944).

Social Science Research Council, Minutes of Committee on Problems and Policy. February 10, 1951. In Social Science Research Council Archive volume Committee on World Regions 1941-1943; Joint Exploratory Committee on World Area Research 1945-1946; Committee on World Area Research 1946-1953; Minutes of Committee on Problems and Policy, Executive Committee, Board of Directors, Committee. New York: Social Science Research Council, no date. (February 10, 1951)

Social Science Research Council, Minutes of March 31-April 1, 1951. In Social Science Research Council Archive volume Committee on World Regions 1941-1943; Joint Exploratory Committee on World Area Research 1945-1946; Committee on World Area Research 1946-1953; Minutes of Committee on Problems and Policy, Executive Committee, Board of Directors, Committee. New York: Social Science Research Council, no date. (March 31-April 1, 1951)

Social Science Research Council, Committee on World Regions. A project for training area specialists. In Social Science Research Council Archive volume Committee on World Regions 1941-1943; Joint Exploratory Committee on World Area Research 1945-1946; Committee on World Area Research 1946-1953; Minutes of Committee on Problems and Policy, Executive Committee, Board of Directors, Committee. New York: Social Science Research Council, no date.

State University College, New Paltz, New York. Bulletin 1966-67. New Paltz, New York: The College, no date.

State University College, New Paltz, New York. Bulletin 1967-68.
New Paltz, New York: The College, no date.

Stature and excellence: Focus for the future. The master plan,
revised 1964. Albany, New York: State University of New
York, 1964.

Sufrin, S. C. Administering the National Defense Education Act.
The Economics and Politics of Public Education, No. 8.
Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1963.

Talachi, S. Organization size, individual attitudes and behavior:
An empirical study. American Journal of Sociology, 1964,
69, 398-420.

Taylor, G. R. The leadership of the universities. In D. N. Bigelow
& L. H. Legters (Eds.), The non-Western world in higher
education. Annals of the American Academy of Political and
Social Science, November 1964, 356, 7.

Thompson, J. D., & Bates, F. L. Technology, organization, and
administration. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1958, 2,
325-343.

Trow, M. Bell, book and Berkeley: Reflections occasioned by a
reading of Daniel Bell's The reforming of general education.
Experiment and Innovation, January 1968, 1, 1-18.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of the
Assistant Secretary for Education, Division of Foreign Studies,
Institutional Assistance Section. Summary of courses, faculty,
and enrollments at 98 NDEA language and area centers by world
area, fall 1965. Washington, D. C.: The Department, 1967.

U.S. Department of State, Agency for International Development,
Contract Services Division. AID financed university contracts
as of September 30, 1967. Washington, D. C.: The Agency,
1967.

U.S. House of Representatives, 85th Congress, 1st and 2d
sessions, Education and Labor Committee. Hearings on scholar-
ship and loan program, August 12, 1957-April 3, 1958.

U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor.
87th Congress, 1st session, Joint Subcommittee on Education.
Hearings on HR 6774, HR 4253, HR 7378, and related bills to
extend and improve the National Defense Education Act and for
other purposes. Part I: Hearings held in Washington, D. C.,

June 1-2, 1961; and Part III: Hearings held in Washington, D. C., June 7, 8, 13, and 14, 1961.

- U.S. House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 2d session, Task Force on the International Education Act. Hearings before the Task Force on the International Education Act, HR 12451 and HR 12452, bills to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research. March 30-31, April 1, 4-6, and 7, 1966. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.
- U.S. Office of Education, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, Institutional Assistance Section, Division of Foreign Studies. Course offerings at NDEA language and area centers, 1967-68. Washington, D. C.: The Office, 1968.
- U.S. Senate, 85th Congress, 2d session, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Hearings on science and education for the national defense. January 21-March 13, 1958.
- University of California. Study of international relations at the University of California. Berkeley, California: The University, 1927.
- University of California. World affairs. Facilities for the study of international relations in the University of California, Berkeley. University of California Bulletin, October 20, XXXV, 1941, 35.
- University of California. Asiatic and Slavic studies on the Berkeley campus, 1896-1947. Berkeley, California: The University, 1947.
- University of California, Institute of East Asiatic Studies. Plan for an institute of East Asiatic studies. Berkeley: The University, November 24, 1948.
- University of California, Board of Regents. Excerpts from minutes of January 21, 1949. Berkeley: Institute of East Asiatic Studies, 1949.
- University of California, Institute of East Asiatic Studies, Advisory Board. Minutes of June 6, 1949.
- University of California, Institute of East Asiatic Studies, Advisory Board. Minutes of October 10, 1950.
- University of California. The study of international relations. Research and facilities. University of California, Berkeley. Berkeley: The University, 1951.

University of California, Office of the Chancellor. Institute of international studies. Founding principles. Berkeley: The Office, January 31, 1956.

University of California, Academic Senate, Select Committee on Education. Education at Berkeley. Report of the Select Committee on Education to the Academic Senate of the University of California, Berkeley. Berkeley: The University, March 1966.

University of California, Special Committee on Academic Program. Report of the Special Committee on Academic Program to the College of Letters and Science. Berkeley: The University, 1967.

University of California, Institute of International Studies. Announcement. Berkeley: The Institute, 1968.

University of Chicago, Syllabus Division. Changing dimensions of Indian society and culture. Chicago: Syllabus Division, University of Chicago Press, 1957. (a)

University of Chicago, Syllabus Division. Emergence of India and Pakistan into the modern world. Chicago: Syllabus Division, University of Chicago Press, 1957. (b)

University of Chicago, Syllabus Division. Tales and romances from Sanskrit literature and supplementary selections on Indian thought. Chicago: Syllabus Division, University of Chicago Press, 1958.

University of Chicago, Syllabus Division. Additional readings in Indian civilization. Chicago: Syllabus Division, University of Chicago Press, 1965.

University of Chicago, The College. Announcements 1967-69, LXVII. Chicago: Office of Official Publications, University of Chicago, August 31, 1967.

Wayland, S. R. Structural features in American education as basic factors in innovation. In M. B. Miles (Ed.), Innovation in education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964. Pp. 587-613.

Weidner, E. W. The world role of universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Weiner, M. (Ed.) Developing India. 2 vols. Chicago: Syllabus Division, University of Chicago Press, 1961.

White, L. T. Educating our daughters: A challenge to the colleges.
New York: Harper Brothers, 1950.

Whitney, R. B. Nine years of four college cooperation. Paper
prepared for New York State Teachers Association in Higher
Education conference, 1966.

Wilson, C. E. A study of the background and passage of the National
Defense Education Act of 1958. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation,
University of Alabama, 1960.