DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 497 HE 025 363

AUTHOR	Janes, Jackson
TITLE	Priming the Pump: The Making of Foreign Area Experts.
INSTITUTION	Institute of International Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.; EXXON Education Foundation, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO	IIE-RR-23; ISBN-87206-193-0
PUB DATE	91
NOTE	56p.
AVAILABLE FROM	IIE Books, Institute of International Education, 809 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017-3580 ($4.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Aspiration; *Area Studies; Foreign Students; Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; International Education; Second Language Learning; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; *Student Educational Objectives; Student Interests; *Student Motivation; Teacher Influence

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of a survey of graduate students, both U.S. and foreign, enrolled in U.S. universities who were focusing their advanced studies on a world area. The survey was designed to determine how students become interested and involved in foreign language and area studies and focussed on several questions, in particular: What types of experiences, academic and nonacademic, influenced students to pursue graduate work in area studies? When did these experiences occur? What differences are there in types of experiences across areas? and How do such experiences influence choice of discipline and research interest? The study surveyed 1,032 graduate students currently enrolled at 70 area studies programs at 29 universities across the nation. Of the respondents, 228 were foreign students and 804 were students from the United States. Examination of the results revealed several patterns: (1) catalysts for interests were often found in travel or work experiences; (2) most of the students had considered concentration in a world area during their undergraduate years; (3) most decisions to pursue such study was made before graduate school; (4) departments and disciplines that "welcomed" area students attracted more students; (5) foreign students concentrating on their own world area seem to have a "head start" in language and area knowledge that provided more opportunities for combining with oth r disciplines, and (7) faculty influence on prospective area specialists was important. Included are 13 tables and 18 notes. (JB)

THE MAKING OF FOREIGN AREA EXPERTS

JACKSON JANES
The Johns Hopkins University

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
809 UNITED NATIONS PLAZA, NEW YORK, NY 10017-3580

IIE Research Report Number Twenty-three

priming the pump:

THE MAKING OF FOREIGN AREA SPECIALISTS

JACKSON JANES
The Johns Hopkins University

ISBN: 87206-193-0
Printed in the United States

Contents

Foreword

This report was begun in 1986 while I was at the University of Pittsburgh's University Center for International Studies. The Center's Director, Burkart Holzner, allowed me a generous amount of time to conduct the field research. Dr. Steven Manners of the University Center for Social and Urban Research provided valuable guidance in developing the questionnaire and evaluating the results.

A special note of thanks goes to Lynn Cohen, who was my primary partner in the field research and in the hard work of both assessing our findings and writing the initial versions of the report.

Many others have contributed helpful comments, support and criticism along the long road to completion, among them Richard Lambert, Director of the National Foreign Language Center at The Johns Hopkins University, Ann Schneider of the Department of Education and the many faculty and students who gave me so much of their time at the universities we visited. Parts of this report were presented at the annual meetings of the Council for International Educational Exchange in Cannes (1988) and in Washington D.C. (1989).

We are most grateful to the Exxon Foundation for providing the funding for this report. The American Council on Education also provided additional funding for the evaluation of the data.

None of this would have happened had it not been for Elinor Barber, then Research Director for IIE, who conceived of the project and dedicated more time than she had in helping me to think it through. While any errors and omissions in the report are mine alone, Elinor Barber is the source of the creative energy that we hope will be passed on through some of the ideas presented.

Dr. Jackson Janes
American Institute for Contemporary German Studies
The Johns Hopkins University
Washington D.C.

Introduction

During the past several decades, an impressive array of resources on foreign language and area studies has been assembled within U.S. institutions of higher education. Hundreds of academic centers for teaching and research on world regions and on individual countries have been established with the support of public and private organizations, foundations and government departments. Recently, there have been efforts to take stock of these resources.[1] Special attention has been given to problems that may inhibit the maintenance of area studies, such as limited fellowship support, narrow academic job markets and inadequate foreign language training. However, little attention has been given to examining how early life and educational experiences influence those who commit themselves to advanced academic work on specific world areas and foreign cultures. We know relatively little about the ways in which students are recruited into the field of foreign language and area studies.

The process of committing to an academic specialization in area studies often is the result of accumulated exposure to particular disciplines, experiences in the world area or the influence of academic mentors. Financial and employment incentives are undeniably important to students considering a specialization in area studies. These several factors are interdependent with many others in an evolving educational career.

While the decision-making process is indeed complicated, by asking students about the evolution of their interest in and commitment to a particular world area, we have obtained insights into the main factors and influences that shape these interests, the salient patterns of recruitment into the field of area studies and the consequences of such patterns for research.

This report presents the results of a survey of graduate students, both U.S. and foreign, enrolled in U.S universities who are focusing their advanced studies on a world area. The survey was designed to determine how these students became interested and involved in foreign language and area studies and focuses on several questions: What types

of experiences, both academic and nonacademic, influenced students to pursue graduate work in area studies? When did these experiences occur? What differences are there in types of experiences across areas? How do experiences influence choice of discipline and research interest in graduate school as well as professional goals?

In the entire U.S. educational system, there would appear to be no lack of students who are *potential* foreign language and area studies specialists. Every year, thousands of American students at the postsecondary level are exposed to and participate in foreign language and area studies through curricular opportunities at home and through study, travel and research programs abroad. As of this writing, more than one million American undergraduate and graduate students are enrolled in foreign language courses.[2]

Yet there are weaknesses, discontinuities and imbalances in our educational system inhibiting the development of the scope of expertise needed in both academic and nonacademic areas. Of some 60,000 undergraduate students studying abroad in 1987/88, 80% were in Europe and 9.2% in Latin America. Only 12% of the students studied in Africa, Asia and the Middle East combined.[3] Language competency among faculty and students varies enormously across world area programs. Because of such imbalances in educational exposure and access to certain nonwestern areas at the secondary and postsecondary levels, we found that some students begin their specialization much later than others. The academic disciplines represented within area programs are highly concentrated in the humanities and some of the social sciences; this constitutes another form of imbalance.

The need for foreign language and area expertise in these core disciplines is unquestioned, but it is desirable to broaden the range of disciplines involved. The ability to understand and respond to a global society is a requirement for many other academic and professional programs, such as law, business and economics.[4] Thus, to maintain and expand the size and compositions of expertise in foreign areas, we need to understand the ways in which students are and are not being effectively encouraged to specialize (and/or rewarded or not for their specialization) in foreign language and area studies at many levels of education and in many academic disciplines.

This report is concerned with the nature of the pipeline, or recruitment process, into area studies, focusing on those who *have* made decisions to specialize in a world area in graduate school. The results of this study shed some light on self-recruitment and on the ways in which we are and should be cultivating our national resources in foreign language and area studies.

Notes

[1] See Richard Lambert et al, *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies*, Washington D.C.: Association of American Universities, 1984. Also, Richard Lambert, *Points of Leverage: An Agenda for a National Foundation for International Studies*, New York: Social Science Research Council, 1986. Also, Lorraine M. McDonnell, Cathleen Statz and Robert Madison, *Federal Support Systems for Training Foreign Language and Area Specialists: The Education and Careers of FLAS Fellowship Recipients*, Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1983. The National Foreign Language Center at The Johns Hopkins University is a comprehensive resource for analyses and studies of foreign language and area studies.

[2] Richard Brod, "Foreign Language Enrollments in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education," New York: The Modern Language Association, Fall, 1986.

[3] *Open Doors 1988-89*, New York: Institute of International Education.

[4] Stephen J. Kobrin, *International Expertise in American Business*, New York: Institute of International Education, 1984.

Chapter 1
Framework and Methodology of the Investigation

Foreign language and area experts are defined as having multidisciplinary training and approaches to a world area. While they are usually anchored in a particular discipline, familiarity with several disciplines and skills, especially foreign language competency, is expected of these experts.

In their study of a world area, area specialists, according to Kenneth Prewitt, take a "whole culture approach . . . distinguished by their conscious emphasis on actual places . . . on the history and culture and language of specific places." Prewitt defines area studies as:

> not just a loose alliance of anthropologists, historians, linguists and political scientists who know a second language and who happen to study foreign places. Area studies constitute a research strategy that for its purposes is stronger than the traditional disciplinary traditions on which it is built . . . area studies investigate an interdependent whole rather than unconnected fragments arbitrarily labeled politics or history or language or economics.[5]

In the United States, university-based programs in area studies and international relations emerged relatively late on the academic scene. While a number of programs in Asian, Russian and Latin American Studies had been established earlier in this century, multidisciplinary programs dealing with other world regions were established at an accelerated pace during and following World War II. A combination of support from U.S. government sources and the Ford Foundation's huge International Training and Research Program (ITR) led to an explosion of area studies programs throughout the United States during the fifties and sixties. Between 1953 and 1966, Ford spent more than a quarter of a billion dollars on international studies programs through its ITR, much of which supported foreign language and area studies programs at over 30 universities throughout the United States.[6] It is estimated that today there are over 500 area studies centers in the United States.[7]

Since 1958, the Federal Government, first under Title VI of the National Defense Education Act and later under Title VI of the Higher Education Act, has provided funding for selected campus-based foreign language and area studies centers that are defined as "national resource centers for teaching any modern foreign language, for instruction in fields needed to provide full understanding of areas, regions, or countries in which such languages are commonly used . . . ." Although these Title VI centers are responsible for only a small percentage of the teaching and research devoted to area studies in the United States, they represent leading programs in their respective world area concentrations. As of 1987, there were 85 of these centers located in 53 universities dealing with 11 world regions: Africa, East Asia, South Asia, Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, Western Europe, Canada, Inner Asia and the Pacific Islands. A few of these centers focus only on undergraduate education, while the remaining centers train both undergraduate and graduate students. While the centers vary greatly in their organizational structure, they share a common purpose in providing a framework for multidisciplinary teaching and research focused on a world area.

As interdisciplinary enterprises, area studies programs have been bridge-builders among disciplines. Bridge-building in academia is a demanding and costly effort. It requires significant financial and administrative support to overcome the centrifugal forces of divergent disciplinary approaches and methods embodied in the departmental structure of universities. Area studies programs have faced difficult challenges in times of economic stringency, including limited sources of fellowship support, the allocation of top priority to departmental concerns and a constricted academic job market.

Other perennial problems encountered by interdisciplinary area studies programs are lopsided disciplinary representation and uneasy relations with professional programs. One concern emerges from all of these issues—how to attract and sustain students who will become future foreign language and area studies scholars.

A number of changes in the postsecondary academic environment in the United States have had a substantial impact on recruitment into foreign language and area studies in the last decade. The number of graduate students in the United States (1.4 million) has held constant, and the number of graduate research doctorates in 1986 was the highest since the late seventies. However, growth occurred primarily in the natural sciences, engineering and professional schools. During that same period, the number of doctorates awarded in the traditional core fields of area studies (foreign languages and literature, history, political science) decreased by more than half.[8] The traditional routes to graduate study in these core fields also narrowed. Between 1974 and 1984, the number of bachelor degrees awarded in the social sciences declined by 38%, those in foreign languages and history by 50% each.

During this same ten-year period, the percentages of bachelor degrees in fields not usually associated with area studies, such as business management, engineering, health sciences and communications, increased dramatically. Correspondingly, the increases in doctoral degrees were primarily registered in the life sciences, engineering and the physical sciences. These changes in the overall composition of graduate and undergraduate students in the United States reflect in many ways the ebb and flow of academic and nonacademic employment opportunities.

There is ample evidence that a significant number of students are still exposed to aspects of foreign language and area studies at various academic levels. During the last few years, in the wake of the reinstatement of foreign language requirements at the undergraduate level, foreign language study increased significantly, recently reaching a million enrollments for the first time in almost two decades. There has also been some increase in activities relevant to the development of interests in foreign languages and area studies at the secondary level. Almost one-third of high school students are now enrolled in foreign language courses, the highest level in over 50 years.[9] The number of high school and college students participating in foreign travel and/or study abroad programs has increased enormously in the last decade alone. Undergraduate curricula with international studies components have also been expanding.

One cannot accurately predict how many of these "exposed" students will decide to specialize in foreign language and area studies and to pursue an academic career. They have to take limitations on academic employment opportunities and on financial aid into account when making their decision. They also must consider what their chances are for employment if they specialize in particular disciplines. For many students interested in foreign language and area studies, certain professional goals may inhibit their ability to pursue that interest.

This self-selection process is not adequately understood. We know too little about the ways in which educational and noneducational experiences influence students' decisions. A recent report of the Social Science Research Council, *Points of Leverage*, suggests the need for intervention to shape both experiences and decisions:

> We have now completed some forty years in the development of our national resource base in language and area studies. During those four decades of growth, years in which our national resource base in academic language and area studies was so small that growth in almost any direction was welcome, our national policy with respect to the composition and functions of academic language and area studies has essentially been laissez-faire. The current need is for assuring long-term support for this carefully built-up resource

base, tempered by some greater attention within the field itself to structure and functions, to making it possible for language and area studies to fulfill its original purpose, and to increasing its responsiveness to changing national needs.[10]

Improving on laissez-faire requires a better understanding of the pipeline—that is, the recruitment process—for foreign language and area studies. A number of questions need to be addressed: How do students decide to take their interest in foreign language and area studies beyond an initial exposure to an area and move in the direction of an advanced degree? Which students make pro-area studies decisions? What types of educational and noneducational experiences propel area studies students in a certain direction of study or research? What types of intervention can enrich the outcome of the cumulative recruitment process into area studies? Is there a critical moment when intervention may attract particular kinds of students? In this report, we address some of these questions. The answers may help us not only to maintain the resources that have been developed so far but also to add new talent to that stock of resources.

Our survey explores the relationships among graduate students' backgrounds, their educational experiences in secondary and postsecondary institutions and their range of exposure to the world area currently being studied. We have attempted to ascertain the shared and divergent influences on these students in order to establish the typical routes by which students come to graduate work in area studies.

Specifically we have looked at the following:

a) types of exposure to a foreign area. Such exposure might include growing up overseas, having studied or worked in various capacities abroad and being native or having strong family links to a given area. It may also include exposure through foreign language training and/or curricular opportunities in the United States;

b) the relationship of these different backgrounds and types of exposure to the substantive interests of the students. This involved examining the range of disciplines and research areas of students with different backgrounds and experiences; and

c) the influences and motivating factors identified by students who maintained their interest in the world area before they went to graduate school.

These three topics form the general goal of this study: to understand more thoroughly what factors operate in the existing recruitment and self-recruitment process shaping area studies and what kind of recruitment profile they produce. The study is based on a total of 1,032 graduate students currently enrolled in 70 area studies programs designated as National Resource

Centers under Title VI of the Higher Education Act at 29 universities across the United States. The centers represent the following nine areas: African, East Asian, Southeast Asian, South Asian, Inner Asian, Russian and Eastern European, Western European, Middle Eastern and Latin American Studies.

A total of 3,500 questionnaires were sent to these area studies centers. The number of surveys sent to each center was based on an estimate of graduate students provided by the center's administration. Each area center distributed the surveys. Fifty-eight of the centers representing nine world areas returned completed surveys. The total response of 1,032 students was made up of 228 foreign students and 804 U.S. students. (See Table 1).

Table 1. Numbers of U.S. and Foreign Students Surveyed by Area Study Program

Area	Total	U.S.	Foreign
African Studies	121	94	27
Latin American Studies	222	149	73
East Asian Studies	142	107	35
South Asian Studies	68	47	21
Inner Asian Studies	21	17	4
Russian and Eastern European Studies	261	240	21
Western European Studies	32	28	4
Middle Eastern Studies	128	90	38
Southeast Asian Studies	37	30	7

In addition to the survey, on-campus interviews were held with students and faculty members in 23 area studies programs at seven universities.

A prime purpose of our survey was to elicit data concerning the major educational stages (secondary, undergraduate, graduate) and experiences of the students, with particular emphasis on the type and extent of exposure to the world area they are currently studying. The questions were designed to provide descriptive information concerning the following:

a) biographical and family background, including age, gender, nationality, country of birth, nationality of parents, languages spoken at home, professional and educational backgrounds of parents;

b) elementary and secondary school experiences, including foreign language study, extracurricular activities, and attendance of schools in the world area they are studying;

c) undergraduate study, including major field of study, foreign language

study, non-language courses taken concerning the world area, study abroad experiences;

d) graduate study, including degree program, disciplinary concentrations, research interests, significance of fellowship support, and professional objectives;

e) types of nonacademic experiences in the world area; and

f) perceptions and evaluations of influences and incentives affecting their decision to concentrate their studies on the selected world area.

On the basis of the kinds of data we have accumulated on foreign language and area studies students, we have drawn a number of conclusions about ways of intervening to strengthen foreign language and area studies in the United States.

Notes

[5] K. Prewitt, "Area Studies in the 1980s," *Annual Report 1981-82*, New York: Social Science Research Council, 1983.

[6] Robert McCaughey, *International Studies and the Academic Enterprise: A Chapter in the Enclosure of American Learning*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.

[7] Robert Lambert, et al, *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies*, Washington D.C.: Association of American Universities, 1984, p. 428.

[8] *Summary Report 1986: Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities*, Washington D.C.: The National Research Council, National Academy Press, 1987.

[9] *Report on Foreign Language Enrollment in Public Secondary Schools, Fall 1985*, American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1985.

[10] Richard Lambert, *Points of Leverage: An Agenda for a National Foundation for International Studies*, New York: Social Science Research Council, 1986, p. 54.

Chapter 2
Survey Results

We present the results of the survey in three sections. In the first section, we present a background profile of the population in the survey. The second section contains the students' retrospective evaluation of key influences on the origin and development of their interest in the world area they are currently studying. Faculty views on these influences, which were obtained in interviews, are also described. The third section traces the actual paths of the population in our survey from elementary to graduate school and research on the world area. In this section, we describe if, how and when the study of the world area entered into students' elementary, secondary and undergraduate education. We also examine the relationship between professional objectives, fellowship support, choices of disciplines, degree programs and research topics. In some instances, we analyze the differences between U.S. and foreign students in order to identify divergences in patterns of recruitment and the evolution of substantive interests in foreign language and area studies. We also examine differences among students in the nine world area concentrations in order to determine divergences in the evolution of disciplinary focus.

Finally, we disaggregated the responses of Ph.D. and M.A. students to selected questions in order to identify any differing patterns with particular reference to professional objectives.

Profile of Population

U.S. Students

The general profile of U.S. graduate students we surveyed shows a relatively even balance of males (52%) and females (48%), most of whom (55%) are between the ages of 26 and 35 and pursuing a doctorate. The vast majority of students (91%) were born in the United States and grew up with English as their native language. Most come from middle-class families and have parents with postsecondary degrees.

While the even balance between U.S. males and females appears consistently in most of the individual world areas, we found that there was a slightly

higher proportion of females in the humanities, particularly language and literature, and a slightly higher percentage of males in the social sciences. This corresponds to a larger pattern of doctorates received by males and females in the social sciences and the humanities respectively as reported by the National Research Council (NRC) in 1986. The NRC data show that more men received doctorates in the social sciences (56%) than women, but that more women (55%) did so in the fields of language and literature. As we will see in the next section, U.S. students generally indicated that the study of a foreign language was a significant initial influence on the development of their interest in a world area. More women than men ranked language study to be significant, along with art and music of the area. Thus, it appears that initial interests in foreign language and area studies among women may be more prevalent in the humanities.

There is significant variation by area in the ages of the U.S. students. Approximately 40% of the students in East Asian Studies and Russian and Eastern European Studies (REES) and almost one-third of those in Latin American Studies were age 25 or younger. This contrasts with much lower figures for those in the same age bracket in the fields of African Studies (22%), South Asian Studies (21%), Middle Eastern Studies (18%) and Southeast Asian Studies (10%). Over half of the U.S. students in the fields of African Studies and South Asian Studies and 46% in Southeast Asian Studies were 30 and over.

In conversations with students and faculty, we found some explanations for these age differences. Most U.S. students in East Asian, Latin American or Russian Studies had either spent time in their world area as undergraduates or begun their focus on the world area early in their undergraduate careers or even during secondary school. We also found that most went directly to graduate school following completion of their undergraduate studies. This contrasted with U.S. students in African or Southeast Asian Studies who often began their graduate studies after a period of time in their world area between undergraduate and graduate school. In comparison to Western Europe and now East Asia, there are fewer of both opportunities for undergraduate students with regard to Africa, South Asia or the Middle East. However, there are alternative ways of getting in-area experience, often after undergraduate studies, such as private travel, the Peace Corps, the military or employment opportunities in the private or nonprofit sectors—all of which contribute to a later start at graduate school.

The decision to pursue graduate study in any field represents a large investment of both time and money. The average age of students in postsecondary education has been increasing steadily during the last 15 years, with enrollment of students age 25 and over increasing by 114%. The mean age at receiving a doctorate was 33 in 1984/85. The mean time required to complete a doctorate has also increased to 10.4 years. While the cost of graduate education has been rising in the last decade, the sources of federal support for graduate study, particularly in the social sciences and humanities,

dropped significantly.[11] Since extended study in graduate school tends to be a heavy burden on students, there may be a greater possibility of attrition among those students who begin their graduate work somewhat later in their career, a pattern verified by many of the center directors we interviewed. Some area studies students, such as those in REES or East Asian Studies, are evidently getting started earlier in their graduate work than those in Southeast Asian or African Studies. The infrastructure of undergraduate and graduate curricula and in-area study opportunities would seem to provide students in some areas with a head start. As we examine the academic paths taken by area studies students, we will see in more detail how the educational system creates such head starts for some students and leaves others having to catch up.

In examining three potential influences on the development of U.S. students' interest in a world area, i.e., family background and ethnic ties to the world area, childhood experiences in the world area or growing up in a bilingual home, we found little evidence that students were influenced by any of these. The vast majority of foreign language and area studies students and their parents are born and raised in the United States. Only 9% of all U.S. students surveyed were born outside the United States, the approximate average for students in most of the world areas. Only in the areas of REES, South Asian Studies and Middle Eastern Studies was there a slightly higher proportion of those born abroad. Between 13% and 14% of the U.S. students in each of these three areas indicated that they had been born abroad, and most of these were born in the area they are currently studying. Approximately 86% of the U.S. students' fathers and mothers were born in the United States. There is a larger proportion of parents born abroad, primarily in the Middle East, among U.S. students in Middle Eastern Studies, whereas U.S. students in African Studies have the lowest proportion of parents born abroad.

In line with the fact that most American students grew up with parents who were born in the United States, 95% indicated English was their native language. Ninety-two percent of the students reported that they spoke English at home. Fewer than 2% answered that their family language was Spanish. While other languages were spoken in some homes, this amounted to less than 1% for each language reported.

Overall, the U.S. students we surveyed do not show strong ethnic roots in the world area they are studying. Very few students suggested that family members who come from the world area influenced the development of their interest. As we will see in the following section, the profile of students in area studies has changed over the last two decades. More students now become interested in area studies without necessarily having prior direct in-area experiences; other factors ignite their interest in the area.

Area studies students have family backgrounds with high educational levels and a middle class socioeconomic status. Almost three-quarters of the

students surveyed have fathers who have earned a college degree and 57% reported that their mothers have a college degree. Over 50% of the students reported that their fathers worked in a professional field with the highest percentage in the field of education. While a quarter of the students reported that their mothers are housewives, the largest percentage of professionally-engaged mothers is again in the field of education.

There is very little information on the socioeconomic backgrounds of area studies students, but there is evidence that a large proportion of them rely on personal resources for their graduate study. Data from the National Research Council shows that almost 50% of graduate students in the social sciences and humanities—the core disciplines of area studies—rely on personal financial sources as their primary support. Similar data stem from a Rand Corporation study of area studies graduate students, which shows that over half those surveyed supported their graduate study through personal savings, non-training related employment and family contributions.[12] The large financial burden students are forced to carry on their own due to the relatively small amount of fellowship support available may produce a selection process within area studies that eliminates many students without such family support.

Foreign Students

The profile of the foreign students in our survey shows a greater proportion of males (66.5%), a pattern in all area studies programs. This figure corresponds to the overall proportion of foreign males and females studying in the United States as reported in *Open Doors 1988/89*, published by the Institute of International Education (IIE).[13] More male and female foreign students—over 66%—are pursuing doctorates than are their U.S. counterparts. However, we find a selection of disciplines similar to that of U.S. students. A larger proportion of females are in the humanities, particularly language and literature, whereas males predominate in the social sciences. Two-thirds of the foreign students are between 25 and 26 years of age.

The foreign students come from a total of 60 countries. Twenty-three percent come from Latin America, 18% from East Asia, 15% from Western Europe, 10% from the Middle East, 9.5% from Africa, 7% from South Asia, 3.5% from South East Asia and 3% from the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe.

Among foreign students, 67% overall are native to the area they are studying. Approximately 75% of the foreign students in African, Latin American, East Asian, South Asian, Western European and Southeast Asian Studies were born in the area they are studying. Fifty-eight percent of the foreign students in Middle Eastern Studies are from the Middle East. Only 21% of foreign REES students are originally from Russia and Eastern Europe, with an additional 21% coming from the areas of Asia and Western Europe, respectively.

Our sample of foreign students in South and East Asian Studies came predominantly from Taiwan, The People's Republic of China, Korea and India. According to *Open Doors*, these four places account for almost 50% of all South and East Asians studying in the United States.[14]

Within Latin American Studies, 50% of the foreign students came from Brazil, Mexico, Peru, Colombia and Costa Rica. The leading countries of origin of students in Middle Eastern Studies were Iran and Israel. In African Studies, over half the foreign students were from South Africa, Ghana, Ethiopia, Nigeria and Tanzania.

In terms of family background, over half of foreign students surveyed reported that their fathers have earned a college degree and 30% said that their mothers have a college degree. Approximately one-third of the students indicated their fathers are employed in a professional field with the highest percentage in the field of teaching. Fifty-six percent of the foreign students said that their mothers are housewives. The largest professionally-engaged group of mothers was in the field of teaching.

According to *Open Doors*, only 0.3% of all foreign students are enrolled in area studies programs at U.S. universities. Fewer than 12% are enrolled in the core disciplines of area studies, the social sciences and the humanities. Yet, these students are enrolled for reasons similar to that of their U.S. counterparts. Most have academic professions in mind. The advantage of fluency in the languages of the region they are studying can provide opportunities for research that may be less accessible to U.S. students. As we will see later in the report, the disciplines selected by foreign students in area studies programs are generally the same as those chosen by U.S. students. We will explore the implications of this later in the report.

Initial Interest in the World Area

A key survey question focused on factors the U.S. students identified as having been central to the origin and development of their interest in the area they are currently studying. Students were asked to identify one or more such factors. Our list of alternatives included the following:

- ❑ Political events or current affairs
- ❑ Religious customs
- ❑ History of the area
- ❑ Music of the area
- ❑ Art
- ❑ Sports/athletic events
- ❑ Archeology
- ❑ The language(s) of the area
- ❑ Social and cultural traditions
- ❑ Family members from the area
- ❑ Close friends from the area

Students were also given the opportunity to volunteer additional factors they perceived as important.

Among U.S. students, the most prevalent responses fell into the following categories:

- Current events in the world area: 35.1%
- The language of the area: 32.3%
- The history of the area: 31.0%
- Social and cultural traditions of the area: 25.3%
- Close friends from the area: 9.7%
- Religious customs: 9.6%
- Art: 8%
- Family members from area: 7.9%

Three of these variables—current events, the language of the area and the history of the area—occurred most frequently overall, but we found some significant variation in the combination of these variables, producing different emphases in different areas. Table 2 depicts this variation in detail.

Table 2. Initial Interest Factors Cited as Important by Students, by Area of Study

	(%)								
	AS	LAS	EA	SA	A	REES	WE	ME	SEA
Current Events	29	18	14	4.5	4.5	22	17	17	9
Language	3	19	17	10	18	23	15	15	9
History	15	13	17	11	19	19	19	18	9
Social/ Cultural traditions	17	15	14	18	22	6	12	9	25
Friends	9	6	4	5	0	2	8	6	14
Religion	3	3	6	15	0	2	8	15	14
Family	5	3	3	0	9	8	8	3	2

AS = Asian Studies, LAS = Latin American Studies, EA = East Asian Studies, SA = South Asian Studies, A = Asian Studies, REES = Russian and Eastern European Studies, WE = Western European Studies, ME = Middle Eastern Studies and SEA = Southeast Asian Studies

There are a number of contrasts worth noting in Table 2. In African Studies, we see a high emphasis on current events and a virtual absence of language study as an influence. In the case of South Asian, Inner Asian and Southeast Asian Studies, there is little emphasis on current events but much more on social and cultural traditions. Religion appears particularly important to students in South Asian, Middle Eastern and Southeast Asian Studies, but plays virtually no role in other areas. The combination of current events and language study are the leading influences in REES and Latin American

Studies, whereas current events and history are more prevalent as influences in Middle Eastern and Western European Studies.

Students were asked to describe any other factors or to supplement the response categories with additional comments. These comments varied extensively but tended to underline the overall pattern of responses. Many students in South Asian Studies wrote that they had become intrigued by the philosophy and religion of the area. East Asian Studies students cited literature and history courses more frequently. On the other hand, Latin American Studies students mentioned experiences in the area and contacts with people from the area. Among REES students, the largest category of additional responses mentioned the importance of Russian history, language and literature studies as having generated their first interest in the world area.

It is clearly difficult to generalize from these responses. Interest in current events in a world area can be closely linked to an interest in its history, language and social/cultural traditions. However, in the evolution of a long-term commitment to teaching and/or researching a world area, different combinations of these factors have evidently been central to the recruitment of students in advanced foreign language and area studies programs.

The responses demonstrate different opportunities of initial exposure to world areas among U.S. students. Language study is clearly more important to those in fields such as Latin American Studies or REES, a fact that can be related to the much greater opportunity for Spanish or Russian language study at the secondary and postsecondary levels than in other fields such as South or Southeast Asian Studies. Current events play a key role in those areas that presently receive more attention in the U.S. media, such as the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Middle East. In contrast, religion and social or cultural traditions are emphasized by students in South and Southeast Asian Studies as important influences, suggesting that current events and language study are less available points of access.

The general circumstances in which these factors occur are also susceptible to change. For example, a decade ago, there was a significant decline in the number of students studying foreign languages in U.S. colleges. Today, after the reintroduction of foreign language requirements, there is a new emphasis on learning foreign languages throughout secondary and higher education, which may increase the pool of potential foreign language and area specialists. This has been particularly visible in the increase of Japanese and Chinese language study at both the secondary and postsecondary levels.

Interaction among students from world areas is also increasing and is an influence on student interests in area studies. As an example, ten years ago, The People's Republic of China was largely inaccessible to U.S. students and faculty. Today, thousands of U.S. and Chinese students and faculty study in each others' countries every year.

Attention to the Middle East has increased since the mid-seventies in the wake of the oil embargoes, the revolution in Iran and the continuing political and military conflicts in that region. According to many faculty we interviewed, Latin American Studies programs have also shown large enrollment increases since the late seventies as a result of events in Central America.

It is perhaps not surprising that current political events in the areas of South and Southeast Asia were mentioned far less frequently by students than the cultural, religious and social traditions of the areas as sources of initial attraction. Southeast Asia had, of course, a far higher profile in the late sixties and early seventies on U.S. campuses during the war in Vietnam. In comparison with the Middle East, Latin America, Western Europe or the Soviet Union, these two areas are far less frequent topics in the current U.S. media.

In any event, it is evident that current events play a substantial role in the development of student interests in most world areas. This is underlined in the responses of students to another question in the survey concerning possible influences on their decision to concentrate on a world area during their undergraduate studies. Possible influences included a particular professor, the language of the area, courses, an interest in the cultural traditions of the area, travel in the area, the significance of the area in current events or previous study there.

Corresponding closely to the responses about the origin of initial interests in the world area, about one-third of U.S. students indicate that interest in the current events of the area was the primary influence on their decision to study the area as undergraduates. An interest in the cultural traditions of the area was listed by 14.2% of the respondents. Eleven percent said that their decision to study the world area was influenced by actually having studied in the world area. About 6% attributed influence to courses taken, and fewer than 2% mentioned professors as having been influential during their undergraduate studies.

There was some divergence in the responses of the U.S. students according to world area, but these divergences were parallel to those concerning initial interests in the world area. We found that an interest in current events was mentioned by over 40% of the REES students, 34% of students in both Latin American and Middle Eastern Studies, and a quarter of the students in African and East Asian Studies. This was in contrast to 13% of the Southeast Asian Studies students and only 6% of those in South Asian Studies. Over 28% of the South Asian Studies students mentioned an interest in the cultural traditions of the area as being an important influence in contrast to fewer than 6% of those in African Studies.

According to faculty and students interviewed, a number of additional influences affecting student interests in area studies programs have emerged during the last ten years. In the case of Russian and Eastern European

Studies, many faculty suggested that, two decades ago, family background or the influence of emigres from the area who were teaching in college or graduate school were frequent factors in the development of a student's interest in the field. Today, at least in Soviet Studies, the majority of graduate students we interviewed explained their interest as a result of an exciting Russian history course (often in high school), a desire to focus on international affairs and, very frequently, the study of the Russian language. An ethnic tie was far less important than for those students interested in Eastern Europe. Given the fact that the curricula of most secondary and undergraduate schools offers little opportunity for the study of Eastern Europe or its languages, the motivating factor for students working in this area is often a family link to the area.

According to faculty in Asian Studies, students involved in the field in the immediate post–World War II years were frequently the sons and daughters of missionaries, business people or diplomats who had spent substantial time in Asia. Others were influenced during their undergraduate or graduate studies by faculty who had spent time in Asia during World War II in the military or intelligence. Today, faculty cite the significance of the East Asian world economic role and the increasing opportunities for study and travel as broadening the possibilities for U.S. students to become interested in Asia. Professional opportunities in business appear to many faculty as primary incentives for many students studying Japan. We were told that, compared to a decade ago, there are now many more U.S. students entering graduate school who have spent time in East Asia, primarily Japan, and who have achieved advanced language proficiency. The majority of these students are pursuing their interest in Asia as undergraduates through language and course work, but for those in East Asian Studies, the opportunity to travel is seen as a vital catalyst for long-term commitment to the field. In addition, Asian students now make up the largest foreign national student group on U.S. campuses and may therewith affect the interests of U.S. students on campus as well.

For those in South and Southeast Asian Studies at the undergraduate level, the role of travel opportunities was mentioned far less frequently by faculty and students. In these areas, U.S. students have usually spent time traveling or in a professional capacity, such as the Peace Corps or the military, following undergraduate studies and prior to graduate school. Yet, according to faculty, the initial interests U.S. students have in these areas stem largely from an attraction to their cultural and religious traditions.

While U.S. students and faculty in African, Middle Eastern, South and Southeast Asian Studies complained about the limited opportunity for study in the area prior to graduate school, many of the students and faculty in the field of East Asian Studies reported that the recent expansion of summer study programs was responsible for the long-term interests of students in the world area. For instance, three of the major organizations sponsoring foreign study, The Council of International Educational Exchange (CIEE), Youth for

Understanding (YFU) and the American Field Service (AFS), reported significant increases among students desiring to spend time in Japan. Since 1979, YFU reports an increase of 56% in students in their largest summer program in Japan, whereas AFS shows a 63% increase in their summer program enrollments in Japan, the third largest of all its programs. CIEE also shows a large jump in the number of applicants to its Japan program.[15]

We were told there have been different influences on student interest in Africa over the last four decades. There was an initial attraction caused by the independence movements in the fifties. The creation of the Peace Corps in the sixties stimulated another wave of student interest in Africa. In the late sixties and early seventies, African Studies became linked to the development of African-American Studies in the United States, drawing a larger number of black American students into the field. More recently, issues associated with economic aid and development have acted as stimulants for student interest in Africa. One faculty member suggested that the problem of AIDS may be adding another type of incentive to study Africa while others suggested it might be a disincentive.

Most of the students we interviewed in African Studies had spent some time in Africa, primarily through the Peace Corps or some other professional activity, graduate research or through private travel. Very few had spent time there studying as undergraduate students although some had participated in the Crossroads Africa program. Many attributed their initial interest in Africa to meeting Africans on their campuses, some courses on economic development or private travel in the area.

In Middle Eastern Studies, there is an increasing ethnic influence on interest in that field. We were told that the influx of large numbers of students from the Middle East during the seventies, particularly from Iran, has led to a correspondingly larger number of graduate students from the Middle East in area studies programs. Some faculty observed an increase in second-generation Armenian students now entering the field. Given that it is extremely difficult for Americans to acquire language proficency in Arabic or Farsi, we were told that those first- or second-generation students who have such language capabilities are in a very advantageous position with regard to their research and, therefore, in a stronger competitive position in the academic job market.

The impact of foreign language study and the initial exposure to world areas in non-language related course work and/or travel/study programs are evaluated by both the students and their faculty as highly instrumental in the development of a long-term commitment to advanced study of the world area. This was underlined by the significant proportions of in-area study activities reported by the students in the survey.

Overall, 64.5% of U.S. students surveyed have in-area experience, much of it

occurring prior to graduate school. The range of experience includes work, study/research, travel, military or diplomatic service, missionary work, Peace Corps service and living in the area as a child. The highest percentages of experience fall within the category of study/research, work and travel, with some variance in certain area programs. (See Table 3).

Table 3. U.S. Students with In-Area Experience (%)

AS	LAS	EA	SA	IA	REES	WES	ME	SEA
64	80	83	57	65	66	89	75	66

AS = Asian Studies, LAS = Latin American Studies, EA = East Asian Studies, SA = South Asian Studies, A = Asian Studies, REES = Russian and Eastern European Studies, WE = Western European Studies, ME = Middle Eastern Studies and SEA = Southeast Asian Studies.

Study and travel are particularly prevalent in the following area programs: Russia and Eastern Europe (study/research = 46%, travel = 72%), Latin America (study/research = 53%, travel = 67%), South Asia (study/research = 48%, travel = 52%) and the Middle East (study/research = 42%, travel = 53%).

Southeast Asian Studies has the lowest percentage of students with study/research experience (25%), while African Studies has the lowest percentage of students with travel experience (21%).

Program areas that have higher percentages of students with work experience are: South Asia (30%), Southeast Asia (30%), Africa (19%) and Latin America (24%).

REES students had the lowest percentage of work experience (10%), with Middle Eastern Studies students also having a low share (13%). Three areas showed proportionately high levels of development work, primarily Peace Corps service: Southeast Asian Studies (25%), African Studies (35%) and Latin American Studies (24%). Overall, the percentage of students who have lived in the area they are currently studying is less than 10%.

In summary, the responses of the students and the views of the faculty indicate that the students' interests in world areas have many different starting points, all of which ultimately affect the paths taken to graduate school. The questions addressed in the next section deal with the extent to which these initial interests are sparked within the educational system and how they are nourished and channeled in the direction of advanced study and research.

Academic Paths to Graduate School

Elementary and Secondary School Experiences

Among U.S. students, fewer than 5% attended elementary or secondary school in the world area they are currently studying, and fewer than 12% took non-language courses in high school involving that world area. There were only two exceptions: Russian and East European Studies and Western European Studies. In both these cases, approximately one-third of the students indicated that they had taken courses pertinent to their current area focus.

In individual interviews with students in these fields, most of them said that either foreign language or history courses were their initial introduction to the world area. Almost all students in REES answered that the focus of such courses was on the Soviet Union, not Eastern Europe. Students interviewed in other fields said there was nothing in their curricula that dealt with their current world area.

In response to questions concerning the role of extracurricular activities in the development of their interest in the world area, fewer than 14% of the students indicated that they had been engaged in such activities at the high school level. Two exceptions were students in Latin American (27%) and Western European Studies (41%). Students in these two areas as well as REES concentrated the vast majority of such activities in language clubs. Asked about extracurricular activities in the other areas, students responded that they were involved in programs like a model United Nations and, particularly in the Asian areas, judo or karate activities.

With regard to secondary school foreign language study among U.S. students, French, Spanish, German, Latin and Russian account for over 96% of secondary school language learning, with French being the most prevalent, followed by Spanish, German, Latin and Russian. The nonwestern languages were rarely studied at the secondary level.

The figures in Table 4, which describes foreign language study at the secondary level, suggest that students in the United States who are currently working in nonwestern areas had little or no opportunity for exposure to the languages of their world areas at the secondary level. Other studies provide additional evidence of such trends. According to the latest report of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, French, German, Italian, Latin and Spanish account for 99% of all foreign language enrollments in grades 7 to 12.

While a large number of U.S. high school students are studying or traveling abroad each year (primarily in Europe or Latin America), the cohort of foreign language and area studies students we surveyed included very few who had participated in such programs. However, those who did have a significant

Table 4. U.S. Students Who Studied Foreign Language(s) in Secondary School, by Program Area and Language Studied (%)

	French	Latin	Spanish	German	Russian
African Studies	44.1	20.5	18.1	12.6	
Latin American Studies	26.1 (Portuguese: 1.6)	11.4	50.0	6.0	
Asian Studies	39.0 (Chinese: 1.5; Japanese: 7.0)	14.0	28.7	11.0	
South Asian Studies	22.4 (Tulugu, Japanese, Thai, Tagalog and Arabic: 1.7)	13.8	32.8	19.0	
Inner Asian Studies	20.0	20.0	28.0	24.0	8.0
REES	35.9	13.0	18.4	15.5	11.6
Western European Studies	42.0	11.0	15.0	30.0	
Middle Eastern Studies	42.1 (Hebrew/Arabic: 3.8; Italian: 1.5)	13.5	15.0	11.3	3.0
Southeast Asian Studies	33.3 (Japanese: 2.8)	25.0	16.7	22.2	

REES = Russian and Eastern European Studies

amount of exposure to a world area in high school, be it in the form of language training, in-area study/travel experience or coursework, attributed a great deal of importance to these experiences in the evolution of their decision to pursue their interest in the world area in graduate school.

The most prevalent example of this pattern was among U.S. students currently in a REES or Inner Asian Studies program, who had taken Russian in high school and felt they had acquired a high degree of both interest and capability in dealing with the language and history of the Soviet Union. Many said that the prominent position of the Soviet Union in world politics amplified the interest they felt in high school, and, in several cases, contributed to a feeling that those studying Russian made up a special "club." Over 80% of the U.S. students who took Russian in high school went on to take Russian in college.

U.S. students in Western European Studies also indicated that the combina-

tion of language and history had ignited their interest while they were in high school. Almost two-thirds of the students who took French, German or Spanish in high school continued with their language study in college. In the case of Latin American Studies, the figure for those continuing Spanish after high school was 56%. Some U.S. students in Latin American Studies indicated that they had been active in Spanish clubs and had traveled in the area, but there was little evidence that they had dealt with Latin America in any depth within the secondary school curriculum.

In the case of the other nonwestern area programs surveyed, it was clear that most students had little if any exposure to the areas they are currently studying. Based on both surveys and individual interviews, we found that high school experience—particularly as a catalyst in the development of interests in nonwestern world areas—has been very limited.

The Undergraduate Experience

In examining students' undergraduate experiences, we wished to find out the degree to which they had been exposed to the area they are now studying and to what extent the undergraduate experience laid the groundwork for their graduate concentration.

Undergraduate Degree Major

Almost half the U.S. students we surveyed majored in one of four disciplines: History (16%), Language and Literature (14%), Political Science (12%) and Anthropology (6%). Three-quarters of the students majored in one of 10 fields. (See Table 5).

Table 5. Undergraduate Majors of U.S. Area Studies Students

History	16.3%
Language and Literature	13.8%
Political Science	12.3%
Anthropology	6.3%
International Studies	6.0%
English	5.0%
Economics	4.8%
Psychology	2.5%
Sociology	2.1%
Fine Arts	2.0%

Examining undergraduate majors across area studies programs, we found different disciplinary clusters. Almost half the REES students majored in either history or language and literature, followed closely in similar concentrations by those in Western European Studies. History was also the most

prevalent major among those in African Studies, Inner Asian Studies and Middle Eastern Studies, followed by political science and anthropology.

Among students in three Asian studies fields (Southeast, South and East), we found again that history, political science, anthropology and Asian studies were the leading undergraduate majors. Finally, in Latin American Studies, the most prevalent fields were political science, language and literature and anthropology.

The vast majority of foreign students surveyed received their undergraduate education in a foreign institution. Table 6 lists the disciplines most often cited as undergraduate majors by foreign students. The first five fields account for approximately half of the total, with the remaining fields accounting for an additional 25%.

Table 6. Undergraduate Majors of Foreign Area Studies Students

Language and Literature	12.9%
Economics	11.6%
History	10.2%
Political Science	8.4%
international Studies	4.9%
English	4.9%
Sociology	4.4%
Agriculture	3.6%
Fine Arts	3.6%
Engineering	3.1%
Education	3.1%
Philosophy	2.7%

Among the foreign students, one notices a pattern similar to U.S. undergraduate majors. History, political science and language and literature were leading undergraduate majors in all fields. However, some divergences are evident. There is a much larger proportion of undergraduate economics majors among the foreign students, especially among those in Latin American Studies. Secondly, anthropology is virtually absent as a major among foreign students in all fields. Thirdly, two more applied fields, education and agriculture, are more prevalent as majors than among U.S. undergraduates.

The concentration of Bachelor degrees in the fields of history, language and literature and political science is representative of a general trend among U.S. area studies students going on to doctoral work. The Rand Corporation study cited earlier confirms that almost two-thirds of U.S. doctoral students in foreign language and area studies took their degree in the same discipline as their undergraduate major, most of which were in history or language and literature. In 1985, The Department of Education reviewed the disciplinary majors of undergraduates who took 15 or more semester hour credits of Title

VI center-sponsored courses between 1979 and 1983. The results showed that nearly half of all majors were in one of four fields: history, literature and language, political science or anthropology. A similar concentration of disciplines was revealed among the disciplines of M.A. and Ph.D. graduates from Title VI centers during the same time period. In some fields, such as South Asian Studies and REES, these four disciplines made up nearly two-thirds of the undergraduate majors.

Faculty members at universities we visited confirmed that these disciplines are the primary channels for students interested in pursuing an area studies interest and that they provide the main cluster in which the students enroll in language and non-language courses. They also indicated that the initial disciplinary track on which the student begins his or her study of a world area and the initial choice of foreign language concentration usually determines the content and direction of graduate area studies. Most of the core faculty, i.e., the faculty with whom students are more likely to have initial contact in area studies programs, are in the four primary disciplines. Hence, recruitment into area studies is a process that tends to *clone* students in the disciplines of the key faculty in each program, beginning at the undergraduate level and continuing on through graduate school. We will explore this further in the section on graduate studies.

This combination of influences creates a selection process that makes it difficult for students to combine an interest in area studies with an undergraduate concentration outside of the primary disciplines.

In interviews with U.S. students, we were told that those who had an undergraduate major in fields such as economics, engineering or communications are often confronted with curricular requirements during their undergraduate studies that made the pursuit of both the major and the world area interest a difficult task. These major field requirements also affected study abroad. According to the students, their professors tended to be less actively involved in area studies.

It was pointed out earlier that undergraduate students did not rank very highly the influence of professors on the initial development of their interest in a world area. However, we found in interviews with both students and faculty that faculty make up a significant part of the context in which students decide to pursue area studies. If there is little reward from professors in certain disciplines for involvement in area studies programs, students majoring in those disciplines will find it difficult to combine them with their interest in area studies. The involvement of faculty from a broad variety of disciplines is the goal of all area studies programs, but it is evident from the concentration of area studies disciplines that this goal is not being reached.

One alternative for students is an interdisciplinary concentration. We found this particularly prevalent among students in East, South and Southeast Asian Studies. According to faculty members in Asian studies, there has

been a marked increase in interdisciplinary Asian Studies both at the undergraduate and M.A. levels during the last decade. One explanation for this increase is the response of colleges and universities to increasing student interest in Asia, particularly Japan and China, partly because students expect that they will have more professional opportunities with such an academic background, but also because of the generally increased focus on Asia in the United States in light of world economic developments.

In Latin American Studies, according to both students and faculty, there has been a similar trend during the last several years. Political developments in Central America have increased the interest of undergraduates in Latin American Studies. In addition, the increasing number of Hispanic undergraduates has influenced the demand for academic programs focused on Latin American affairs.

There is a good deal of controversy in academic circles about the interdisciplinary major in area studies. Some argue that such programs act as magnets for students who are considering a focus on a world area but have not yet decided on a discipline; area studies programs may allow the undergraduates to combine an interest in several disciplines with their interest in the world area, and thereby broaden the "pipeline" of potential area experts. Others argue that the area studies degree at the undergraduate level is a "cafeteria style" education and results in ineffective training in any discipline. In spite of the latter viewpoint, the large number of graduate students we surveyed in Asian Studies who had interdisciplinary degrees suggests that students are being recruited into the field by such programs.

Another perspective on the development of disciplinary mixes in area studies is that of encouraging students to strive for *dual competence* in an undergraduate concentration. Examples, such as the Japanese Science and Technology Program at MIT, permit students to combine the study of Japan, including the Japanese language, with an engineering concentration. Similar programs exist at the graduate school level in business schools, such as at the University of Pennsylvania and the University of South Carolina.

However, such programs require substantial faculty cooperation as well as the financial resources to build the necessary curricular bridges. The academic system does not always reward faculty for such cross-fertilization efforts, given the predominance of disciplinary norms and measures of success. It also does not allow the student in certain disciplines or professional fields much time to make such efforts. Yet, it is evident that many students interested in combined studies are being recruited for the programs that do exist, particularly at the undergraduate levels. We will return to this point in the conclusion of the report.

Foreign Language Study

In order to assess the influence of foreign language study among U.S. students in the development of their concentration on a world area, we

asked the graduate students in their respective world areas what languages they had studied as undergraduates. Overall, two-thirds of the U.S. students we surveyed took French (34.8%), Russian (26.5%), Spanish (25.6%) or German (24.9%). However, across areas, we find significant variation among these four languages as well as additional languages in each world area. (See Table 7).

Table 7. Languages Most Often Studied at the Undergraduate Level, by World Area of Concentration

(%)

	AS	LAS	EA	SA	IA	REES	WE	ME	SEA
French	39	17	20	19	15	17	32	17	25
Spanish	15	50	9				25	12	9
German	15	9	10	11	15	19	32	12	22
Russian					15	42			
Italian					10		3		
Chinese			27						
Japanese			20						9
Arabic	5							24	
Zwahili	7								
Hindi				9					
Tibetan				8					
Latin					10				
Polish						4			
Hebrew								10	
Farsi								4	

AS = Asian Studies, LAS = Latin American Studies, EA = East Asian Studies, SA = South Asian Studies, A = Asian Studies, REES = Russian and Eastern European Studies, WE = Western European Studies, ME = Middle Eastern Studies and SEA = Southeast Asian Studies.

There were additional languages listed by a smaller percentage of students in each of the world areas. Only 3% of students in African Studies studied Yoruba. Among students in South Asian Studies, 6% studied Sanskrit. Fewer than 1% of REES students studied other Eastern European languages, such as Bulgarian, Hungarian, Slowak and Lithuanian.

When these figures are compared with those from the secondary level, it becomes evident that U.S. students in nonwestern areas are first exposed to the languages of their world area as undergraduates. In the fields of East Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, there are significant proportions of enrollments in the languages of the area, but we find far smaller percentages of students taking regional languages in the fields of South Asian, Southeast Asian or African Studies. In contrast, students who have had an opportunity for training in the languages of their world areas prior to college, like those in REES, Western European or Latin American Studies, are enrolled in far greater proportions in those languages.

In those cases where students studied the languages of a nonwestern world region, they reported taking an average of two years. However, in the case of Western European languages and Russian, students reported studying for more than two years. This suggests that students with secondary-level training are in a better position to pursue more years of their college-level foreign language training before entering graduate school than those confronting the language of their world area for the first time at the undergraduate level.

In most areas, two-thirds or more of the students took two years of a foreign language. In the case of Western European Studies, the majority (60%) of students studied a language for three to four years. A significant portion of REES students (43%) also pursued language study beyond two years. Approximately one-third of the students in Latin American Studies, East Asian Studies and Middle Eastern Studies studied a language for more than two years in college.

Non-language Courses on the World Area

Forty-nine percent of U.S. students said they took up to five non-language courses on the world area as undergraduates; 18% said they took between six and nine such courses, and 10% indicated they took more than nine. At the same time, 22% took no non-language courses during undergraduate study. These figures are generally representative of the trends in Latin American, East Asian and South Asian Studies.

There are some significant differences in other fields, however, which demonstrate differences in access to world areas at the undergraduate level. Ninety percent of the students in REES had taken at least one non-language course, while approximately 48% took more than five; 83% of the students in Western European Studies indicated they took at least one non-language course, while 35% indicated they took more than five such courses. By contrast, 44% of the students in Southeast Asian Studies said that they took no courses on their world area as undergraduates, and only 13% indicated they took more than five. Similarly, 33% of the African Studies students said they took no courses about Africa as undergraduates, with only 16% saying they took more than five.

The field of Middle Eastern Studies presents a unique picture. While an above-average number of students (28%) indicated they took no non-language courses, we also found an above average number taking more than five courses (53%).

These different proportions of foreign language and non-language courses taken by students in different world areas are related to divergent opportunities for study at the undergraduate level and, in the case of foreign languages, to prior opportunities at the secondary level. As was pointed out in

the Rand study of FLAS recipients, there is a wide range of undergraduate institutions from which area studies students come to graduate school. Most of these institutions offer some coursework in the traditional fields of REES, Western European or East Asian studies. However, it is evident that, despite more limited curricular options in some areas, students are developing interests in fields such as African or Southeast Asian Studies and, as shown in the next section, some are finding ways to have in-area experience already as undergraduates. Hence, as the Rand study points out, limited curricular opportunity may not be a measure of student motivation to study a world area.

Direct Exposure to World Areas during Undergraduate Career

As undergraduates, U.S. students were exposed to world areas through language training, coursework and, in some cases, directly through study abroad experiences. Very few of the students in our survey (fewer than 5%) had been to the area they were studying prior to their undergraduate studies. However, one-third of the U.S. students indicated that they had spent at least some time during their undergraduate career in the world area they are currently studying. This varied somewhat among the areas.

As many as 46% of the students in Western European Studies had studied for a period in Western Europe, while only 24% of those in Southeast Asian Studies had done so. Approximately one-quarter of the African Studies students had studied in the area, while over 40% of Latin American Studies and REES students had been in Latin America or the Soviet Union.

The duration of sojourns in the world area varied considerably, with 50% or more of the students in all areas having spent from a semester to a year there. Table 8 describes the variation in the duration of study abroad programs across areas.

Table 8. Undergraduate Study Abroad: Duration of Study by Area

	(%)								
	AS	**LAS**	**EA**	**SA**	**IA**	**REES**	**WE**	**ME**	**SEA**
Semester:	28	20	21	29	20	31	15	23	71
One year:	25	38	33	47	20	18	38	30	14
Two years:	24	3	11	5	15	15	13		
Summer:	16	31	14	5	20	29	23	33	14

AS = Asian Studies, LAS = Latin American Studies, EA = East Asian Studies, SA = South Asian Studies, A = Asian Studies, REES = Russian and Eastern European Studies, WE = Western European Studies, ME = Middle Eastern Studies and SEA = Southeast Asian Studies.

The figures in Table 8 coincide with the IIE study *U.S. Students Abroad,* [16] which found that two-thirds of U.S. students studying abroad spend either a semester or a summer abroad. There is a relatively large number of students in REES, Latin American Studies and Middle Eastern Studies who have had only a summer program in the area. These programs are primarily for language training. On the other hand, relatively high percentages of students spent a year abroad in Latin America, Western Europe and East Asia.

The overall picture of undergraduates in foreign study programs reveals a heavy bias toward Western Europe. As was cited earlier, *Open Doors* shows that over three-quarters of the U.S. students study in Western Europe, with only 9.2% in Latin America, 6.1% in Asia, 4.7% in the Middle East and 1.2% in Africa. Similar figures emerge from a study conducted by CIEE.

These imbalances reflect the contrasts in both purpose and structure among study abroad programs. The heavy concentration of students in Western Europe can be explained by what is seen as a comparable infrastructure in which U.S. students can pursue their studies abroad. It can also be explained in part by the fact that students may seek out an opportunity to study a foreign language to which they have already been exposed.

Students seeking opportunities for study elsewhere, such as in Africa, the Middle East or South Asia, are often confronted by more difficult problems involving credits, supervision and curricular differences. The lack of language capability often results in study abroad programs consisting almost entirely of intensive language study. The obstacles for students in the core disciplines of area studies are imposing enough but are that much greater for students in other disciplines. Such considerations are grounds for revising structures of study abroad for different purposes and for different disciplinary interests.

The Graduate School Experience

The path of our population now having reached graduate school, we shall examine the type of degree program in which our respondents are currently enrolled, their professional objectives and their disciplinary concentrations. We shall then examine how they arrived at their destination: when they decided to go to graduate school, the significance of fellowship support and the impact of experiences in their area on their research.

As we examine these aspects, it is instructive to keep several related issues in mind. The choice of degree (M.A. or Ph.D.) is directly related to the choice of a professional goal. Most students, as we will see, are pursuing a doctorate with an academic career in mind, more often in some fields than in others. At the same time, the need for foreign language and area expertise in nonacademic professions is significant and growing, as reflected in the increase in M.A. programs combining such skills with professional degrees.

Nevertheless, there is still concern that foreign language and area study has become, as Robert McCaughey has said of international studies in general, "not only . . . an estimable academic enterprise . . . (but) . . . primarily and almost exclusively that."[17] In line with what we have already learned about the disciplinary paths area studies students take as undergraduates, the following examination of the continuation of that path in graduate school underscores the need to find new ways of mixing foreign language and area skills with both academic and nonacademic professional pursuits.

Degree Program

The majority of U.S. students (54.2%) responded that they are pursuing a Ph.D., while 43% are enrolled in a M.A. program. Fewer than 2% responded that they were in a professional degree program.

Three world areas have proportionately higher percentages of U.S. students enrolled in M.A. programs: Latin America (56%), East Asia (52%) and Western Europe (57%). African Studies has the lowest percentage (20%) of students enrolled in M.A. programs. In South Asian Studies, 27% of the students are in Master's programs. In Middle Eastern Studies, approximately one-third of the students are master's degree students. REES and Southeast Asian Studies are almost evenly divided with 43% each.

Among U.S. master's degree students, an average of 38.1% indicate that they intend to continue toward a Ph.D., while 39% say they have not yet decided. Only 22.5% stated they would not continue toward a Ph.D. These responses varied somewhat across areas. Over 60% of the students in African Studies and in Southeast Asian Studies indicated that they would go on to a doctorate, and 55% of those in Inner Asian Studies also had made that decision. On the other hand, in Western European Studies, only 18% of the students had decided to go on to a doctorate, and in the Latin American Studies area, one-quarter of the students had decided to continue. Foreign students were predominantly enrolled in a Ph.D. track (66%), with only 31% in a master's degree program. Of those in master's programs, approximately half said they intended to go on to a doctorate while another third indicated that they had not yet decided.

Table 9 depicts the distribution of foreign and U.S. students enrolled in M.A. or Ph.D. programs by world area.

According to *Open Doors*, only 14.7% of all foreign students enrolled in U.S. graduate schools are in doctoral programs and 21.5% are in M.A. programs.

Professional Objectives

The fact that the majority of students are pursuing a doctorate is directly related to their evaluation of professional objectives. The majority of U.S.

Table 9. Degree Program of U.S. and Foreign Students by World Area

	(%)		
U.S. Students	**M.A.**	**Ph.D.**	**Professional**
African Studies	20	78	2
Latin American Studies	56	37	7
East Asian Studies	52	43	5
South Asian Studies	28	72	
Inner Asian Studies	52	48	
REES	43	56	1
Western European Studies	57	40	3
Middle Eastern Studies	35	62	3
Southeast Asian Studies	43	57	
Foreign Students			
African Studies	18	78	3
Latin American Studies	41	54	4
East Asian Studies	17	80	3
South Asian Studies	24	76	
Inner Asian	25	75	
REES	47	53	
Western European Studies	50	50	
Middle Eastern Studies	32	68	
Southeast Asian Studies	14	86	

(59.9%) and foreign students (66%) ranked an academic career as their first choice, thus making a doctorate a necessary prerequisite. Government was the second highest option for U.S. students (24%). Among foreign students, the public sector was also the second highest option (16%).

Among the world areas, we found significant divergences, particularly with regard to the distribution of doctoral and M.A. students. These differences suggest that students in some areas see professional opportunities based on area expertise outside of academia; others evidently see few such opportunities.

For example, there is a high percentage of those U.S. students who rank an academic career as their primary goal in Southeast Asian Studies (75%), Inner Asian Studies (75%), REES (69%), South Asian Studies (68%) and African Studies (61%). By contrast, only 39% of the students in Latin American Studies ranked an academic career as their first professional choice. Approximately one-third ranked a career in business or the nonprofit sector as their primary objective. Similarly, one-third of the U.S. students in Western European Studies indicated that they are interested in a career with the government.

Approximately one-fifth of the foreign students in Latin American, South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies indicated that they are aspiring to a

government career, with the vast majority (over 75%) aiming for an academic profession.

When we disaggregated the population according to U.S. master's and Ph.D. students, we found significant variations that underscore different perceptions of professional opportunities among the world areas. Overall, about one-third of the M.A. students plan to go on to a doctorate. Of the U.S. master's students in African, Latin American and South Asian Studies, one-third intend to pursue a career in the private sector with roughly only one-quarter interested in an academic career. About one-third of the East Asian M.A. students indicated that they would be interested in going on to an academic career and one-third were interested in the private sector. Over 60% of the M.A. students in Western European Studies indicated that they would be going into government work.

On the other hand, in the fields of Inner Asian, REES and Southeast Asian Studies, over half the M.A. students have an academic career in mind and plan on continuing toward a doctorate. This suggests, as was underscored in our interviews, that these students do not see as many alternative professional careers outside of academia and will probably continue toward the doctorate.

Not surprisingly, approximately 80% of the Ph.D. students indicated that they would pursue an academic career. With two exceptions—Middle Eastern and South Asian Studies—most foreign M.A. students intend to pursue an academic career. Fifty percent of the foreign students in Middle Eastern Studies are leaning toward a government career, and 40% of the students are intending to pursue a career in either business or government.

To pursue further the spectrum of professional objectives, students were asked, in light of the job market, what kind of job they *expected* (rather than hoped for), in which their world area expertise might be utilized. Among U.S. students, the largest proportion still indicated that they are interested foremost in an academic career. However, as a second option, a public sector career was indicated as frequently as a private sector career by about 20% of the students. More than 40% of students in East Asian Studies indicated that they expected to be in business, given the job market. Approximately one-third of REES students indicated that they expected to be in government work. One-fifth of the students in Middle Eastern Studies thought they would work in the private or nonprofit sector.

These figures vary even more when U.S. master's students are compared with Ph.D. students. Over 62% of the East Asian M.A. students indicated that they thought they would work in the private sector. In South Asian Studies the figure was 45%; in African Studies, 42%. Approximately 45% of the students in REES, Western European and Southeast Asian Studies thought they would work in a government job. With the exception of REES and South East Asian Studies, fewer than a quarter of the U.S. master's students felt

that hey would wind up in academia. Among U.S. doctoral students, the majority (60%) still felt that they would go onto an academic career.

Among foreign students, the academic career choice still dominated, with bi siness and government a distant second and third.

These figures underline the pervasive presence of academic professional goals throughout the population. The development of more terminal M.A. programs in some fields than in others is, in part, a result of the changing supply-demand relationship outside of academia. There is a relatively greater interest in the business community in foreign language and area studies skills today, particularly with regard to East Asia. This creates an incentive for students to seek dual competency in a disciplinary or professional area and in a world area at the M.A. level. Such incentives are far less prevalent in fields such as Southeast Asian Studies, where students predominantly see their futures as academics.

The Choice of Disciplinary Concentration

Almost two-thirds of the U.S. doctoral students reported being in one of four disciplines: history (21.3%), language and literature (15.1%), political science (15.1%) and anthropology (13.1%). Economics (6%) and sociology (4.5%) make up an additional 10%. As a result, 75% of the respondents are concentrated in six disciplines.

Among foreign students, we found that 75% of the respondents are in eight disciplines: history (15.2%), economics (13.3%), language and literature (10.8%), anthro/archaeology (8.9%), political science (8.9%), education (6.3%), sociology (4.4%) and fine arts (4.4%).

Table 10 lists the leading disciplines by world area for U.S. and foreign students.

The description of the disciplinary spread of the U.S. respondents in our survey is similar to other studies done on the breakdown of disciplines in area studies programs. In *Beyond Growth* it was noted that among area studies groups, the core disciplines are anthropology/sociology, history, language and linguistics, literature and political science. A review of the disciplines among Ph.D. students at Title VI Centers between 1979 and 1982 revealed that the four fields of anthropology, history, language and literature and political science accounted for more than half the doctoral concentrations, with history and language/literature alone making up a third. An additional 15% on average were in the fields of sociology, art history, economics and education.

The hospitality of certain disciplines to a country or an area-specific focus is reflected in these statistics. The four primary disciplines cited above

Table 10. Disciplinary Concentration of U.S. and Foreign Doctoral Students by World Area

U.S. Students	(%)								
	AS	**LAS**	**EA**	**SA**	**IA**	**REES**	**WE**	**ME**	**SEA**
History	21		14		20	33	16	18	11
Anthropology	16	24		22				15	52
Political Science	14	10	18			21	25		
Language/ Literature		18	13	50	25			11	
Economics		16							
Religion				16					
Sociology							16		
Middle Eastern Studies								23	

Foreign Students	(%)								
	AS	**LAS**	**EA**	**SA**	**IA**	**REES**	**WE**	**ME**	**SEA**
History	18		18	12		15		23	33
Anthropology	13	11		18					1
Political Science	13		22			12		11	
Language/ Literature			15			61			16
Economics		39							
Religion				18					
Sociology									
Middle Eastern Studies								26	
Asian Studies					66				
Education		9							
Business							50		

AS = Asian Studies, LAS = Latin American Studies, EA = East Asian Studies, SA = South Asian Studies, A = Asian Studies, REES = Russian and Eastern European Studies, WE = Western European Studies, ME = Middle Eastern Studies and SEA = Southeast Asian Studies.

incorporate an emphasis on actual places and on the background of these places. As was underlined in the Rand study, students in the four primary disciplines spend proportionately more time on studying the area and its languages than in other disciplines. In other disciplines such as economics or psychology, or in professional fields such as law or engineering, there is less emphasis on world areas *per se* and much more on general theory, problems or skills. As noted earlier, similar trends occur at the undergraduate level and are directly related to this clustering of disciplines at the graduate level. By the time the student has arrived at graduate school, he or she is usually fully aware of the primary disciplinary options in area studies programs. Given the

tendency among most graduate students in area studies to pursue an academic career, there is a corresponding tendency to model themselves after their academic mentors in their selected discipline. In this sense, the cloning process mentioned earlier continues straight through graduate school.

In response to a question concerning the degree to which the discipline encourages a concentration in a world area, two-thirds of the students indicated that their selected discipline encourages such a concentration very strongly. However, it is important to note that most students have chosen their world area interests prior to a particular disciplinary concentration. Over 78% of both U.S. students and foreign students indicated that the selection of their respective world area concentrations emerged before selecting a discipline. In light of the fact that over half of the students we surveyed had their undergraduate degree in one of four primary disciplines and two-thirds of them were enrolled in one of these four fields as graduate students, it seems evident that disciplinary selection is influenced by the expectation that one can pursue interests in a world area more readily in these disciplines.

The particularly strong emphasis on economics in Latin American Studies among both U.S. and foreign students is an indication that at least some students are pursuing a combination of area studies with a less prevalent discipline in area studies. Faculty in Latin American Studies indicated that nonacademic professional opportunities for those with an economics concentration and expertise in Latin America have increased during the last 10 years. However, another explanation for this trend among U.S. students was that language proficiency in Spanish can be more easily acquired by graduate students than would be the case for language competency in nonwestern fields. This leads to a greater opportunity for the student to pursue course work in both Latin American Studies and economics.

When the Decision was Made to Enter Graduate School

Students were asked at what point they decided to study a world area in graduate school. The majority of the U.S. students indicated that they made the decision prior to graduate school. There are higher proportions of students making that decision during the first graduate year in Southeast Asian and Inner Asian Studies. This difference reflects our interviews with students in these latter areas, who indicated that they first "discovered" the field only in graduate school. Other students indicated that they made the decision in their first year when they discovered certain courses that encouraged their interest in a certain area. (See Table 11).

At least 50% of foreign students made the decision to concentrate before entering graduate school regardless of their interest, and approximately one-third of them reported that they had made the decision to specialize in the first year. Once again, only in the case of Southeast Asian Studies and Inner Asian Studies did more than half of the foreign students indicate that

Table 11. Time of Decision to Specialize Among U.S. Students by Area (%)

Prior to:	AS	LAS	EA	SA	IA	REES	WE	ME	SEA
Graduate School	49	53	70	55	29	53	54	59	31
First Year	33	39	24	38	41	38	28	34	45
Second Year	11	6	4	2	23	4	10	5	17

AS = Asian Studies, LAS = Latin American Studies, EA = East Asian Studies, SA = South Asian Studies, A = Asian Studies, REES = Russian and Eastern European Studies, WE = Western European Studies, ME = Middle Eastern Studies, and SEA = Southeast Asian Studies.

they had made their decision in the first year of graduate study. One explanation offered for relatively late involvement in area studies programs among foreign graduate students was that area studies as a course of study, particularly in nonwestern areas, is not generally available in foreign universities. As a result, many foreign students are first aware of the possibility of an area studies concentration once at a U.S. university. As was indicated earlier, only 0.3% of all foreign students are enrolled in area studies.

Table 12. Response to "Did Fellowship support influence your choice of world area?" by U.S. Students (%)

	AS	LAS	EA	SA	IA	REES	WE	ME	SEA
Yes	34	23	18	30	12	19	23	22	48%
No	66	77	81	70	88	80	77	78	52%

AS = Asian Studies, LAS = Latin American Studies, EA = East Asian Studies, SA = South Asian Studies, A = Asian Studies, REES = Russian and Eastern European Studies, WE = Western European Studies, ME = Middle Eastern Studies, and SEA = Southeast Asian Studies.

Significance of Fellowship Support in Choice of World Area, Discipline and Decision to Attend Graduate School

With regard to the possible influence of fellowship support on the choice of world area concentration, on average one-quarter of U.S. students indicated that their choice was influenced by fellowships. Significantly higher proportions were found to answer the question positively in Southeast Asian Studies.

Among foreign students, again, 25% overall said that their choice of world area was influenced by fellowship support. However, the figure was much higher among doctoral students in East Asian Studies (41%), African Studies (42%) and Southeast Asian Studies (66%).

A further question concerning the influence of fellowship support on the choice of disciplines revealed that, among all U.S. students, only 15% indicated that fellowships influenced their selection of a disciplinary concentration, a pattern which did not vary across fields or between degree programs.

While 26% of the foreign students in both M.A. and Ph.D. programs indicated that fellowship support influenced their decision in choosing a disciplinary concentration, the figure among doctoral students in East Asian Studies and African Studies was over 42% and in Southeast Asian Studies as high as 66%.

As for the influence of fellowship support on the decision to attend graduate school, 39% of the U.S. students indicated that fellowship support was an influence. Fewer M.A. students (32%) rated fellowship support important, with one exception, African Studies, in which over 60% of the students indicated that a fellowship was influential. While 44% of all Ph.D. students indicated that a fellowship was important, over 58% of U.S. doctoral students in African Studies and Southeast Asian Studies rated this as an important influence.

Among foreign students, an average of 36% said that fellowship support was an influence on their graduate school decision. However, over 55% of the doctoral students in African Studies felt that it was influential.

Our data regarding U.S. students corresponds roughly to those of the Rand Survey of Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowship Recipients. About one-third of the FLAS doctoral students and one-quarter of the nondoctoral students indicated that fellowship support influenced their choice of world area. It appears that the majority of students are making their initial decision to pursue graduate study of a world area in a certain discipline independent of fellowship support. In interviews with students, a prevalent response might be summarized as follows: "Money did not bring me into the field, but it enabled me to stay in."

The implications of these responses from U.S. students are evident. Most of them first make up their minds to study a world area in a certain discipline and then search for the funding to support themselves. There do appear to be three areas where the availability of fellowship support plays a more important role in choices: African Studies, South Asian Studies and Southeast Asian Studies. Faculty members in these three areas had some explanations for this pattern. The vast majority of students are pursuing a doctorate and are thereby confronted with higher expenses for field research and language training; but in theses areas there are fewer fellowship resources to draw on in comparison with other world area programs, be they U.S. resources or those located in the world area itself. Students without research experience in the world area are at a decided disadvantage in competition for the academic positions they eventually seek. Thus, students in these three areas, many of whom enter graduate school at an older age for reasons cited earlier, see fellowship support as a "make or break" situation given their strong interest in academic careers.

While most students also are not decisively influenced by fellowship support

in their choice of discipline, we have seen that they tend to choose one of only four or five disciplines. Thus, whatever area studies fellowship money is available tends to benefit students in these disciplines. Given the serious curricular obstacles mentioned earlier for those students outside of these disciplines who may be interested in a world area, an area-based framework of fellowship support may well be an obstacle to recruiting a broader set of disciplines into the field.

Influences on Choice of Graduate School

Seeing that most students make up their minds about the world area they wish to study before they attend graduate school, we wanted to learn more about their decision to study this world area in their present graduate school. We were interested in the extent to which the students were previously aware of the area center's reputation and of faculty with whom they might be working as a measure of their prior involvement in the field.

More than half of all U.S. students (54%) indicated that the reputation, i.e., the makeup of the faculty and resources available in a particular area center, was influential in their decision to study the world area in graduate school. Approximately two-thirds of U.S. master's students (64%) indicated that the area center's reputation was important. This was particularly true among M.A. students in African Studies. On the other hand, only 47% of the U.S. doctoral students shared that opinion; presumably they were more influenced by the reputation of their disciplinary department.

Foreign students in general were less influenced by the area center's reputation. Fewer than 37% of both M.A. and Ph.D. students responded that the area center's reputation had influenced them. However, over half of the Ph.D. students in African, Middle Eastern and Southeast Asian Studies believe that the reputation was an important influence on their decision to pursue studies at a particular graduate school.

Individual interviews conducted with students on several campuses underscored the fact that the students clearly were guided in their selection of graduate schools by the presence of the area centers as well as by their knowledge of faculty expertise in departments represented in the area centers.

Overall, 47% of U.S. students indicated that the reputations of graduate departments and faculty members influenced their decision to attend a specific graduate school with the intention of focusing on a world area. This was less so among M.A. students (43%), but, with the exception of Western European and Inner Asian Studies, over half of the Ph.D. students in the individual areas said that the reputation of the graduate department and its faculty were important influences.

As for foreign students, 42% overall believed that the reputation of the graduate department was important. The majority of M.A. students in East Asian,

South Asian Studies and REES believed that the reputation of the graduate department was significant, as did the majority of doctoral students in REES and East Asian Studies.

Foreign Student Incentives for Graduate Study in the United States

We asked the foreign students more specifically what reasons they could identify as important in their decision to study a world area at a U.S. university. Almost two-thirds indicated that the availability of research materials at the university influenced their decision. Forty-three percent indicated that they wished to acquire an advanced degree from a U.S. university, and 40% said fellowship opportunities brought them to the university.

Given the large interest in research materials in all groups, these responses indicate that foreign students come to area studies in the United States with specific objectives in mind. It appears also from our interviews that foreign students are attracted by the opportunity for interdisciplinary work and research, which is not widely available in their home institutions.

Choice of Research Topic

A final set of influences investigated were those having to do with the choice of research topics. Doctoral students were asked to provide the title of their dissertation. In examining the dissertation titles by world area, we found that they reflected the typical clusters of disciplines in each world area described earlier. Thus, 85% of the dissertations in REES and Inner Asian Studies dealt with subjects having to do with history (primarily of the Soviet Union), language and literature and political issues. In the South Asian and Southeast Asian fields, subjects dealing with economic and social development or religion were most prevalent. In Latin American Studies, a broad range of dissertations dealing with political and economic development, social change, anthropological questions and history were cited. Among the dissertation titles reported in African Studies, there was a clear predominance of social and economic development subjects. In contrast, dissertations in Middle Eastern Studies most often dealt with historical matters. Among the East Asian dissertations cited, there was a wide range of topics in the fields of politics, history and anthropology.

This review of the dissertations reported in our survey suggests that field research plays a major role in the development of dissertations in African, Latin American and South Asian Studies.

We also asked the students to indicate which influences were very, somewhat or not important to the development of their research focus.

Table 13 provides the overall averages for the U.S. and foreign students.

Table 13. U.S. and Foreign Students' Ratings of Influences

(%)

	Not Important		Very Important		Somewhat	
	U.S.	*Foreign*	*U.S.*	*Foreign*	*U.S.*	*Foreign*
Professor	41.3	56.0	40	31	19	13
Courses	27.9	38.3	46	35	25	6
Prior Experience in Area	51.4	57.3	23	28	25	14
Language	42	44.3	35	28	23	28
Field work	46.3	44.7	31	30	22	25

Whereas among the foreign students particular professors and courses are clearly more important in making a decision on research topics than among U.S. students, it is evident that prior experience in the world area and field work opportunities are of great importance to both groups.

However, when one looks at specific world areas, one sees the significance of access to an area in the evaluation of the influences. Seventy-four percent of U.S. students in Latin American Studies indicated that experience prior to graduate study was very important in the development of their research topic, as did 61% of those in African Studies and exactly 50% of the students in East Asian and South Asian Studies. Prior experience in Africa primarily took the form of a professional capacity, such as the Peace Corps, whereas the range of opportunities in Latin America is much greater.

By contrast, prior experience was rated very important by only 40% of those in Southeast Asian Studies, 43% in REES and 41% in Middle Eastern Studies. These figures may reflect the more limited opportunities for prior experiences in these areas.

When we turn to the influence of graduate field work opportunities, we see an additional dimension of the picture. Field work opportunity was rated very important by only 27% of the U.S. REES students and 44% of the students in Middle Eastern Studies. Yet, 70% of the Southeast Asian Stduies students rated field work to be very important in the development of their research interests. Field work was also rated as very important by the majority of students in African Studies (53%), East Asian Studies (57%), South Asian Studies (51%) and Latin American Studies (60%). It is evident that field work is highly important to those students with access to it. The lack of such access is correspondingly evident in the responses of those working in areas where field work has been more restricted, such as in the Soviet Union.

Students in Latin American Studies and REES most frequently (50% and 47%, respectively) rate the influence of a professor on their research inter-

ests to be very important. However, in only three areas, Latin American Studies, Middle Eastern Studies and South Asian Studies, did the majority of students indicate that language proficiency is very important in the development of their research interests. The population we surveyed in these three areas was predominantly in the discipline of anthropology, a field in which spoken language proficiency is usually a prerequisite for field work and research.

Notes

[11] *Summary Report 1986: Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities*, Washington D.C.: The National Research Council, National Academy Press, 1987.

[12] op cit. *Federal Support for Training Foreign Language and Area Specialists*. p. 99.

[13] *Open Doors 1988-89*, New York: Institute of International Education.

[14] *Open Doors 1988-89*, New York: Institute of International Education.

[15] Based on enrollment data supplied by CIEE, YFU and AFS, CIEE has produced two illuminating studies on student motivation for study abroad: *A Profile of U.S. Students Abroad—1983* and *A Profile of U.S. Students Abroad—1984/85*. Both studies were authored by Dr. Jolene Koester.

[16] M. Zikopoulos: *U.S. Students Abroad*, New York: Institute of International Education, 1988.

[17] Robert McCaughey, *International Studies and the Academic Enterprise: A Chapter in the Enclosure of American Learning*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.

Chapter 3
Conclusions

How are students recruited into advanced study and research in foreign language and area studies? The examination of this question revealed a number of patterns with both academic and nonacademic components. The students we surveyed described various types of initial exposure to a world area, such as language study, history courses or current events in the area. The catalysts of the origin and development of their interests are often found in a nonacademic context, such as travel or work in the world area. In some world areas the exposure and interest may come as early as high school; in other areas, it may come as late as the first year of graduate school.

In most cases, students contemplate a concentration on a world area by the time they are undergraduates. Student interest in the area, if not yet in a particular discipline, is firmly anchored at that time, The undergraduate period is the pivotal period for the majority of the students surveyed. In pursuing this interest, students gravitate to certain disciplinary concentrations based on the influence of academic mentors and the opportunity to pursue multiple interests in the world area. This tendency is already visible at the undergraduate level.

Understanding the fact that the majority of U.S. students develop an interest in a world area as undergraduates is important for several reasons. First, this establishes the importance of access to language and/or language- and non-language-related coursework at the undergraduate level. Our research shows that undergraduate language- and non-language-related coursework can have a long-term influence on decisions. Second, during college many students decide to work or study abroad. In some cases, the desire for language competency motivates them, on their own, to pursue overseas opportunities. In other cases, interest in current events is the primary incentive to seek language training, coursework or in-country experience. The graduate students interviewed clearly established that college experiences play a key role in future decisions.

Our research indicates, correspondingly, that most decisions to pursue area studies are made prior to graduate school, independently of disciplinary or major requirements. The path into area studies in graduate school is not

direct, and, depending upon a number of factors, this commitment can be developed early in one's academic career or very late. Early exposure obviates the need to compensate later on for lack of foundation in area studies, especially in the languages of the area. M.A. students, especially, attend graduate school for a relatively short period of time, and enter into programs tightly structured in terms of coursework. Often, little time is left to pursue courses outside of the structured curriculum. Therefore, pursuing additional training in languages or important non-language-related courses can be a problem, while previously having such language proficiency and appropriate courses permits them to achieve a more comprehensive grasp of their area.

It appears that graduate students are aware of both the disciplines and the professors that welcome area studies and, in fact, have already been attracted to such disciplines at the undergraduate level. The majority of our students stated that their discipline "very much" encourages an area studies concentration. This appears to be true as much for foreign students as it is for U.S. students. The result is a heavy concentration of area studies faculty and students in a few disciplines at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. As indicated earlier, the recruitment process into area studies is one that tends to clone students in these "core" disciplines.

Foreign students have come to the United States for graduate education with a similar range of disciplinary preparation. Those coming from the world area on which their graduate studies are focused may have a significant advantage in the form of fluency in a language of the area and familiarity with the field. The demands and requirements of graduate training will nevertheless be as influential on the development of their curriculum and ultimate research concentration as they are for the U.S. students, particularly because the foreign students are as interested in the academic job market as their U.S. counterparts.

The fact that there are more foreign graduate students working in the field of economics in an area studies program may be instructive. It may reflect the fact that these students have been able to combine the requirements of area studies skills with those of the discipline they have chosen, primarily because they already have language and area skills before they arrive. They have, in effect, a head start. U.S. students, as their professors before them, have to "catch up" and, in doing so, have perhaps less flexibility to choose and mix their disciplines. This is particularly pertinent in the nonwestern world areas, where access to the areas is more limited than in Western Europe or Latin America.

What we have learned about the recruitment of students into area studies tells us something not only about the students who have chosen area studies, but also about the students who have not. In identifying the various influences and catalysts that lead students to concentrate in area studies, we know that there are more students exposed to these influences than those

who actually wind up in area studies programs. We also know that the curricular requirements can screen out students who do not pursue area studies in traditional disciplines.

If we wish to broaden the base of both foreign and U.S. advanced area studies students in terms of both disciplinary representation and research interests, particularly when it comes to nonwestern area studies programs, there needs to be more opportunity, particularly for U.S. students, to become acquainted with world areas at an early stage so that the students can get "hooked" early and pursue potential interests over a longer period of time. Access to foreign language instruction beyond the dominant languages at the secondary level is vital. Opportunities for foreign study at the undergraduate level are expanding a good deal, but the range of areas and disciplines involved in such programs less so. There is no doubt that students interested in area studies will seek out opportunities where they exist. However, that search may lead to certain curricular barriers for students in fields of study that heretofore have been less closely connected with area studies at the undergraduate or graduate level. We need to create more bridges of opportunity for students in a broader range of fields, such as engineering, communications or economics in order to make it possible for them to pursue their discipline and combine it with an area studies concentration, particularly at the undergraduate level.

Faculty involvement in such cross-fertilization efforts is essential. Without it, students are forced to create their own connections between their disciplines and area studies, often at a preclusive cost of both time and money to themselves.

As we have seen, foreign language and area studies is a bridge-building enterprise, reaching across disciplines and faculty. In most area studies programs, the disciplines involved are limited to a few in the social sciences and humanities. Disciplinary boundaries grow more rigid at the graduate level. The incentives and rewards for working in area studies programs, particularly for faculty, are not readily supported by the traditional academic structures.

Such problems can be overcome with long-term support for undergraduate area studies programs, particularly in the nonwestern areas. The importance of the Title VI undergraduate programs is evident and should act as a guide for potential supporters from the private and nonprofit sectors. Other examples of successful efforts include the Thomas Watson Fellowships, which provide for a year of independent study following college. A recent review of this program shows that students choosing to go abroad sought out the opportunity due to the influences of undergraduate study programs foreign language study, mentors during college and their interest in current events. The Watson Program exemplified the benefits of being able to pursue an interest in a world area within a framework which permits exploration from any disciplinary background.[18]

Another successful initiative is the Japanese Science and Technology Program at MIT, which encourages Japanese Studies coupled with engineering and related disciplines. Similar efforts now exist for students in Business Administration. The key to the success of these programs remains the effectiveness of the professors who encourage or discourage the students on their way through the academic pipeline. It is vital that faculty have the opportunity to encourage interdisciplinary studies both on and off campus by recruiting both students and their fellow faculty members. This is the most important link in the chain of area studies. The more opportunities faculty have to encourage such interdisciplinary bridge-building, the more they will be able to energize the talent among the nation's next generation of area studies experts.

The potential of drawing a broader range of students into foreign language area studies is greater today than even a decade ago. Having seen the set of influences that initially captures the interest of some students in world areas, we know that students from a variety of disciplines and backgrounds are exposed to the same influences during their educational careers, particularly at the beginning of and during the undergraduate experience. We need to recognize an opportunity and take full advantage of it.

Notes

[18] M. Simon, M. Harmon and J. Pedulla, *Final Report: Interviews with Watson Fellows*, Boston: The Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation and Educational Policy, Boston College, 1987.

IIE RESEARCH SERIES

Readers of this IIE Research Report may be interested in earlier titles in the series. They are available through the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). ERIC identification (ED) numbers are provided to assist in ordering. Call, fax or write to the following address for price and order information:

EDRS/CBIS Federal Inc.
7420 Fullerton Road, Suite 110
Springfield, VA 22153-2852
1-(800) 443-3742

Additional single copies of this report can be ordered directly from IIE if accompanied by a check for $4.00 for postage and handling. Orders should be directed to:

IIE Books, Institute of International Education,
809 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017-3580

Report 1
ABSENCE OF DECISION:
Foreign Students in American Colleges and Universities
Craufurd D. Goodwin, Michael Nacht
(ED 232 492)

Report 2
BLACK EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA:
The Current Situation
David Smock

Report 3
A SURVEY OF POLICY CHANGES:
Foreign Students in Public Institutions of Higher Education
Elinor G. Barber
(ED 240 913)

Report 4
THE ITT INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM:
An Assessment After Ten Years
Marianthi Zikopoulos, Elinor G. Barber
(ED 245 635)

Report 5
FONDNESS AND FRUSTRATION:
The Impact of American Higher Education on Foreign Students
with Special Reference to the Case of Brazil
Craufurd D. Goodwin, Michael Nacht
(ED 246 710)

Report 6
INTERNATIONAL EXPERTISE IN AMERICAN BUSINESS:
How to Learn to Play with the Kids on the Street
Stephen J. Kobrin
(ED 262 675)

Report 7
FOREIGN STUDENT FLOWS:
Their Significance for American Higher Education
Elinor G. Barber, Editor
(ED 262 676)

Report 8
A SURVEY OF POLICY CHANGES:
Foreign Students in Public Institutions of Higher Education 1983-1985
William McCann, Jr.
(ED 272 045)

Report 9
DECLINE AND RENEWAL:
Causes and Cures of Decay Among Foreign-Trained
Intellectuals and Professionals in the Third World
Craufurd D. Goodwin, Michael Nacht
(ED 272 048)

Report 10
CHOOSING SCHOOLS FROM AFAR:
The Selection of Colleges and Universities in the United States by Foreign Students
Marianthi Zikopoulos, Elinor G. Barber
(ED 272 082)

Report 11
THE ECONOMICS OF FOREIGN STUDENTS
Stephen P. Dresch
(ED 311 835)

Report 12
THE FOREIGN STUDENT FACTOR:
Their Impact on American Higher Education
Lewis C. Solmon, Betty J. Young
(ED 311 836)

Report 13
INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OFF-CAMPUS:
Foreign Students and Local Communities
Mark Baldassare, Cheryl Katz
(ED 311 837)

Report 14
MENTORS AND SUPERVISORS:
Doctoral Advising of Foreign and U.S. Graduate Students
Nathalie Friedman
(ED 295 541)

Report 15
BOON OR BANE:
Foreign Graduate Students in U.S. Engineering Programs
Elinor G. Barber, Robert P. Morgan
(ED 295 542)

Report 16
U.S. STUDENTS ABROAD:
Statistics on Study Abroad 1985/86
Marianthi Zikopoulos
(ED 295 559)

Report 17
FOREIGN STUDENTS IN A REGIONAL ECONOMY:
A Method of Analysis and an Application
James R. Gale
(ED 331 404)

Report 18
OBLIGATION OR OPPORTUNITY:
Foreign Student Policy in Six Major Receiving Countries
Alice Chandler
(ED 312 981)

Report 19
SPONSORSHIP AND LEVERAGE:
Sources of Support and Field of Study Decisions
of Students from Developing Countries
Alan P. Wagner, Elinor G. Barber, Joanne King, Douglass M. Windham
(ED 331 405)

Report 20
PROFITING FROM EDUCATION:
Japan-United States International Educational Ventures in the 1980s
Gail S. Chambers, William K. Cummings
(ED 320 488)

Report 21
CHOOSING FUTURES:
U.S. and Foreign Student Views of Graduate Engineering Education
Elinor G. Barber, Robert P. Morgan, William P. Darby
(ED 325 026)

Report 22
DARING TO BE DIFFERENT
The Choice of Nonconventional Fields of Study by International Women Students
Nelly P. Stromquist
(ED 332 633)

Institute of International Education
809 United Nations Plaza
New York NY 10017-3580