Academic Internationalism: U.S. Universities in Transition

a report on consultations convened at the Social Science Research Council, New York City, 14 & 17 October 2008

Mitchell L. Stevens
Stanford University*

Cynthia Miller-Idriss
New York University†

March 2009

*School of Education, CERAS 236, Stanford, CA, 94305;
mitchell.stevens@stanford.edu

†HMSS/Steinhardt, 246 Greene Street, 3rd floor, NY NY 10003;
cynthia.miller.idriss@nyu.edu

Project Contact Person:
Holly Danzeisen, Project Coordinator
danzeisen@ssrc.org

Introduction

Despite wide consensus among higher education leaders that U.S. universities are undergoing a process of "globalization," there is little agreement about just what globalization means, what propels it, or what intellectual, political, and ethical consequences it will bring for American higher education. There is little systematic empirical research on the range of things often described by the term globalization: the proliferation of satellite campuses and cooperative agreements between schools; the growing scale and complexity of student flows across national borders; the diffusion of institutional and curricular norms; and the "internationalization" of instructional programs, to name just a few. Whatever its content, there is no clear social science research agenda or intellectual framework for assessing the globalization of U.S. higher education. Consequently, scholarly discussions of the topic are often anecdotal, conjectural, and highly polemical.

A research project currently underway at the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) offers occasion to place this predicament into historical and institutional context. Funded by multiple grants from the U.S. Department of Education International Research and Studies Program, the project is a mixed-methods study of how American universities currently organize research and instruction regarding several adjacent world regions: the Middle East, South Asia, Russia/Eurasia, and Central Asia. The specific foci of the project are (1) the relationship between area studies programs and centers, disciplinary departments, and larger internationalization initiatives on U.S. campuses; (2) the varied relationships that social science and humanities faculty have with area studies initiatives; (3) the role

of language instruction generally, and specifically Title VI-funded language instruction, in the organization of university-based research and teaching; (4) how the study of trans-regional and trans-disciplinary phenomena is accommodated within an academic infrastructure organized by region and discipline. These foci informed the design of the inquiry from its inception in 2005 and continue to guide the project (see Appendix 1 for an overview of the project's history, methodology, and data; see Appendix 2 for profiles of senior project personnel). Additionally we have become convinced that the data generated by this research provide an incomparable opportunity to take stock of current relationships between American universities, specific world regions, and an increasingly interconnected global higher education universe.

It is with this conviction that we convened two consultation meetings with senior faculty and administrators from universities from across the United States at the SSRC headquarters in New York City on 14 & 17 October 2008 (see Appendix 3 for a list of meeting participants). At each meeting we provided attendees with a broad introduction to the project's scope and design; a glimpse of empirical findings from preliminary analyses of our data; and an overview of the theoretical equipment we are using to connect our findings with larger discussions about U.S. universities' international activities more generally.

We here provide a brief summary of the initial project and the discussions of it in New York; outline the benchmark insights that will inform our analysis going forward; and sketch our ambitions for the future of the project. This report is decidedly brief. Our hope is that it serves as a catalyst for continuing conversations

begun in October and expanding them to larger audiences. All comment is welcome.

The Project and Its Context: Two Waves of Interest in Regional Studies

In 2005 the U.S. Department of Education awarded the first of two competitive research grants to the SSRC to investigate the organization of area studies centers at U.S. universities receiving funding under Title VI of the Higher Education Act, the omnibus federal funding legislation that has been variably reauthorized for fifty years.

Initially authorized through the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and conceived during the height of the Cold War, Title VI provided the first federal funding for area studies centers and represented what we might call a "first wave" of national security-related funding for the development of regional expertise in American higher education. Within a few years, Title VI re-emerged as part of the Higher Education Act of 1965, but its mandate remained the same: to create language and cultural experts in particular world regions, world affairs, and international studies. [1]

Today, Title VI specifically funds instruction in foreign languages and research on world regions considered important for the promotion of U.S. national interests. During the decades since the inception of the legislation and with the

[1] The federal funds came on the heels of an organized effort by major U.S. foundations, including the Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford Foundations, to fund the creation and expansion of regionally-based centers that would produce linguistic and cultural specialists in world regions deemed to be of import to U.S. security interests. See Biddle 2002. Hall & Tarrow 1998 provide a succinct overview of the history of first-wave area studies.

continued encouragement of leading philanthropic institutions, funds awarded to universities under Title VI seeded the development of administrative units devoted to the study of particular world regions. Area studies programs, as they came to be known in the 1970s, owe much of their existence to institutional initiatives evolving out of Title VI support (McCaughey 1984).

By the 1990s, however, the entire academic phenomenon of area studies was widely perceived to be in crisis. The end of the Cold War led many scholars to question the extent to which U.S. global political interests had defined world areas as academics had come to know them. At the same time intellectual developments in the humanities, especially, called into question the notion that cultures, nations, or world regions could appropriately be conceived as coherent units. By the end of the twentieth century, it appeared that area studies was being replaced by approaches favoring the "global" or "international," as dozens of new campus majors in fields such as global public health, international education, international affairs, global studies, international conflict resolution appeared throughout the U.S. academy (Miller-Idriss & Anderson 2008).

The events surrounding 9/11 had a dual impact on area studies. On the one hand, 9/11 further exacerbated a sense of crisis, as opinionated voices in the academy and in government questioned whether decades of federal investment in world languages and regions had adequately prepared the U.S. for new strategic uncertainties. On the other hand, 9/11 spurred what may be regarded as a "second wave" of national security-related interest in particular regions, as the U.S.

government, foundations, and parties within the academy sought to improve knowledge production on the Middle East region as well as on Islam.

This second wave of national security-related interest does not appear to have translated into more support for the existing area studies infrastructure, however. Title VI did not receive substantially more federal funds. Instead the second wave of funding is being channeled through the Department of Defense's Minerva Research Initiative, which will provide up to $75 million for scholarly research on topics designated as key national priorities. The Minerva initiative currently has five priority areas in its call for research, including a focus on the Chinese military, Iraq, Islamic Studies, terrorism, and security and conflict.[2]

This is the political and intellectual context in which the SSRC project team devised its research on area studies programs devoted to the Middle East, South Asia, Russia/Eurasia, and Central Asia and receiving funding under Title VI. The team decided early on to develop a qualitative-comparative study that would accommodate organizational variation and complexity, and to complement this study with two national surveys. Data derived through this mixed-methods design will enable the team to combine fine-grained, cross-sectional portraits of the organization of regional scholarship and instruction at twelve major U.S. universities with a more national picture of area studies programming and students more generally (see Appendix 1 for more details). We are confident that our data will enable us to specify the modal organizational configurations of area studies at

[2]See BAA Announcement Number W911NF-08-R-0007, available at http://www.arl.army.mil/www/DownloadedInternetPages/CurrentPages/DoingBusinesswithARL/research/08-R-0007.pdf. Accessed 7 March 2009.

this point in history. It should also enable us to develop theoretical insight into how universities as organizations manage, refract, and connect intellectual movements and political contexts.

The Consultations

The October consultations were designed to provide participants with sufficient information about the project that they could get a sense of its content and dimensions, while avoiding filling the day with our own voices. Schedules for 14 and 17 October were quite similar and are summarized simultaneously here (see Appendix 4 for a general schedule). In the opening sessions, Seteney Shami introduced the motivating rationale for the project; Cynthia Miller-Idriss reviewed the research design, sampling protocol, and the nature of the collected data. In the late morning sessions, Mitchell Stevens offered a brief survey of how contemporary social scientists theorize higher education generally and university organization in particular. He noted that the great majority of social science on higher education is concerned with educational credentialing, human capital development, and social stratification -- issues only tangentially related to puzzles of knowledge production, organizational dynamics, and their relationship with one another that are at the core of the current project.

In afternoon sessions, Miller-Idriss and Stevens discussed preliminary findings from an initial cursory review of interview transcripts. Based on readings of selected transcripts from three of the university case studies, at least two themes emerged that warrant further analysis. First, there were very evident tensions

among social scientists: between those who prize universal theories and those more given to the study of particular phenomena in specific places. In interviews, social scientists used many different terms to describe this tension, such as "modeling" versus "contextual" knowledge, "functional" versus "regional" knowledge, and research that promotes "immersion in [a] particular place" versus the "analysis of multiple cases with smaller set of variables." Despite a common assertion of effort to blend theory and context, particularly in the study of international settings, the reality appears to be that disciplinary theory and contextual study remain at least somewhat divided within economics, sociology, and political science.

Interviewees often invoked three narratives when explaining this division: (1) area studies is a-theoretical; (2) the disciplines are anti-context; (3) the divide is generational, with a newer generation of scholars seriously attempting to blend theory and context in their scholarship. Determining the extent to which invocation of these explanations parallels the social and organizational position of respondents (i.e., do older scholars explain differently than younger ones? do economists explain differently than sociologists? [see Lamont 2009; Tilly 2006]) is an important question for the project team.

Second, we were struck by the wide variety of intramural administrative units discussed in our interviews. Respondents talked about how the work of regional studies faculty is variably situated in the organization of conventional academic departments, inter-departmental initiatives, programmatically defined centers and institutes, and all manner of directorates and councils. We believe that this variety of organizational forms is politically important. Academic departments

are governance units: departments traditionally have considerable authority over curriculum, hiring, promotion and tenure decisions (Abbott 2002). They also at least conventionally are what we might call administrative "package deals": to create a department is usually to create a major, a graduate program, and enduring faculty lines. Centers, institutes, directorates and councils, by contrast, are considerably more fungible and flexible. They can be opened and closed, expanded and contracted as faculty interest, funding streams, intellectual fashion and administrative priorities change. We believe that the flexibility of what we are coming to call "not-departments" – intramural units outside of the core departmental structure – is what makes them common strategies for regional programming. They are legitimate but also malleable organizational formations that can move easily under changing circumstances. To the extent that not-departments have become ubiquitous features of contemporary U.S. universities, our project could provide a useful window into the organizational dynamics of higher education generally.

Guiding Insights

We view this project as a prism for appraising the organization of the U.S. university as it transits between two important epochs: a post-WW II period in which the United States built the largest and most widely emulated national higher education system in world history; and a post-Cold War period in which American universities ambitiously seek clients, resources, and prestige internationally. This intellectual ambition may seem unduly large, relative to the scale of our current empirical

investigation; yet it has been born out of necessity. Consonant with a wider scholarly consensus, we find the tools currently available for understanding higher education to be constraining.

Remarkably, U.S. higher education remains without a political theory, theory of knowledge, or organizational sociology that might help scholars formulate the kinds of questions our empirical inquiry raises, namely: what were the relationships between the state, the philanthropic sector, and universities that produced the area studies infrastructure of the twentieth century U.S. university (but see Ruther 2002)? Why did U.S. universities opt for new organizational units for area studies rather than seeding the production of regional knowledge within disciplinary departments? Why is there wide variation in the extent to which humanists vs. social scientists invested in the area studies infrastructure, and why were some social scientists much more enthusiastic about area studies than others? Such questions push the limits of both empirical and theoretical knowledge of U.S. higher education.

While excellent work on higher education may be found within the disciplines of economics, sociology, and history as well as by scholars in the field of education (and we note the great paucity of work on higher education by political scientists and anthropologists), such inquiries have not been synthesized into a coherent body of knowledge. The empirical problems central to this project exist at the interstices of traditional disciplinary purviews. To pursue our study of the current fate of area studies satisfactorily, we need to know how national geo-political interests were implicated in the initial formation of area studies; how

universities worked out funding, administrative, and curricular arrangements for area studies programs *vis a vis* disciplinary departments and professional schools; the various kinds of knowledge produced by area studies scholars, and its relative portability and prestige across organizational, intellectual, and national boundaries; the role of philanthropic foundations and private donors in shaping the definition and funding of regional scholarship; and the relationships between intellectual, organizational, economic and political change in American higher education more generally. In short, we view our project as an opportunity for integrating disparate scholarly research on higher education, but also as an obligation to do so. We will pursue this effort with five basic analytic tools of social science.

First, we presume that government interests are implicated in the formation and fate of universities' international initiatives and the construction of knowledge about "the global." While this may seem like a simple, even obvious notion, in fact the character of the relationship between the U.S. state and higher education is both complicated and under-theorized. This stems in part from the complexity of the U.S. state (with its multiple jurisdictional levels and funding streams) and its higher education system (with its commingling of public and private funding streams, clients, and authority relations). We suspect it also is a consequence of U.S. higher education's official autonomy from government despite its deep reliance on government funds for tuition subsidies, research, and even general operating expenses – a deep contradiction that may have dissuaded systematic critical scrutiny (Stevens, Armstrong & Arum 2008). Whatever the causes and of course with some exceptions (Jencks & Riesman 1968; Kerr 2001; Ruther 2002), U.S. higher

education is virtually without a sustained political analysis. While our project can hardly correct this omission it will at least refrain from continuing it.

Second, we presume that the composition of resource flows supporting universities generally, and universities' international initiatives in particular, have direct and indirect implications for the character of research, curriculum, and delivery of institutional services of all sorts. Once again it may seem that we are stating the obvious; yet we note that the old adage to "follow the money" has not been as central to theorizing higher education as it should be (again there are exceptions, most often among economists and historians (e.g., Garvin 1980; Clotfelter 1996; Gumport 2000; Geiger 2004; Thelin 2004).

Third, we presume that the relationships between academia and the larger world are reflexive: professional scholars define what counts as knowledge about the world while, simultaneously, world affairs shape scholarly agendas and the political economy of universities. Wars, ecological crises, and social movements created new fields of academic inquiry throughout the twentieth century; the coalescence of fields such as international politics, climatology, and post-colonial studies also influence how the contemporary world is understood (see also Giddens 1990). Knowledge production is never outside of time or context.[3]

Fourth, we presume that ideology – by which we mean the official stories universities tell about themselves and their missions – matters for the unfolding of higher education history. Official stories are not epiphenomenal. Universities are inherently meaningful organizations, and the ways in which university and political

[3] Thanks to Jeremy Adelman on this point.

leaders define their institutions affects what taxpayers, parents, and philanthropists will pay for; what jurisdiction congressmen, regulators, and program officers will cede; and what foreign governments will encourage and patronize.

Fifth, we follow classic insights of organizational sociology and *make no presumptions* about the precise nature of the relationships between formal political structure, resource flows, expressed ideological commitments, and the day-to-day unfolding of university life and higher-education history. U.S. universities are the paradigmatic loosely coupled organizations: they have extraordinarily diffuse systems for making decisions; they have multiple and often contradictory expectations from consequential outsiders; and much of their activity is symbolic (Cohen, March & Olsen 1972; Weick 1976, Meyer & Rowan 1977). We do not, therefore, expect that universities will have coherent definitions of "globalization" or coordinated strategies for managing this phenomenon. Instead we expect to find considerable discussion, argument, and conflict among intramural parties with different stakes in organizational change.

Going Forward

Our colleagues offered a wide range of advice for how we might proceed with our inquiry. We summarize their key suggestions by outlining a series of goals for the project going forward.

Goal 1: Learn our data well.

This project generated copious amounts of data – we estimate some 10,000 pages of interview and fieldnote transcriptions as well as data from surveys of graduate students and area studies program directors (see Appendix 1 for more detail). While our research faces the limits of all cross-sectional designs, the uncommon detail of our evidence should enable us to develop good synthetic pictures of the organization of area knowledge on flagship U.S. campuses. This is work that, to our knowledge, has not yet been accomplished in any field.

Because the data were collected by several researchers, knowledge of it remains diffuse among members of the project team. Our very first task, then, is to invest the several months of full-time work it will require to simply read and learn all of the material we have at our disposal. This effort already is underway.

Goal 2: Develop useful knowledge.

During the consultations, several of our colleagues encouraged us to prioritize the goal of generating knowledge that can be of use to administrators and faculty leaders responsible for "global" initiatives. We were reminded multiple times of just how little systematic information there is about the variety of internationalization efforts throughout the U.S. academy. We share this conviction about the importance of producing knowledge relevant to institutional planning and policy.

One short-term goal will be to develop a typology of the strategies pursued by universities in their organization of area studies at present. There are multiple models for organizing regional inquiry, but not a limitless number. The

specification and comparison of these models will be a useful service to scholars and administrators alike. A related line of work will be to specify how the universities we studied organize their internationalization efforts. Again there are multiple but not limitless ways in which universities are seeking to redefine relationships between area studies programs and disciplinary departments; between area studies and "global" initiatives; between on-campus endeavors and satellite ones. Our project can provide university planners with a picture of the variety of means available for "globalizing" at the present moment.

Second, we plan to investigate the implication of language instruction in doctoral research across the social sciences and the humanities. We are impressed by how often, in our interviews, humanists stressed the germinal importance of language instruction for doctoral training, and how often social scientists spoke of language acquisition as a high cost of regionally oriented study, even a prohibitive barrier to it. We suspect that faculty members' different relationships to language instruction may be a key to understanding the ongoing scholarly controversy about the value of area studies programs generally. Our data give us novel perspective on the politics of doctoral-level language training in the U.S. academy that should be useful for program directors, department heads, and language instructors.

A third avenue toward producing useful knowledge would be to map the range of intellectual and organizational resources that U.S. universities have at their disposal as they increasingly court students and development dollars from overseas. We are struck especially by an exquisite paradox of the current moment, in which a growing number of U.S. universities are making dramatic expansions into the

Middle East, often funded by regional governments, at the same time that many Americans are suspect of governments in this region and their investments in the U.S. (e.g., patronage by foreign nationals of regional programming and endowed chairs within U.S. universities). Our data should enable us to contribute to increasingly urgent puzzles of administrative strategy: what intellectual resources do U.S. universities have to offer potential students and donors in the Middle East and elsewhere? How might intellectually substantial links be made between flagship campuses and overseas satellite programs? What are the intellectual and ethical challenges that emerge from these new partnerships?

A fourth possibility for developing useful knowledge in the short-term is to use our data to report on the consequences of the 9/11 tragedy and its political and cultural sequelae for those who study the Middle East. Our fieldwork suggests that the working conditions for those studying the Middle East were affected significantly by this turn of history: visa restrictions have caused a variety of problems for faculty, visiting lecturers, and students from the Middle East; some scholars noted ominous shifts in their campuses' intellectual climate; others experienced great surges of grassroots interest in Middle East scholarship and found many new opportunities for public service.

<u>Goal 3: Ask large, hard questions that can be answered by empirical evidence – and not necessarily only the evidence we have in hand.</u>

Even while we will use our research to address practical issues facing U.S. universities, we are committed also to raising large questions about the relationship

between U.S. universities and the world at this point in history. Our colleagues in the consultations have encouraged this, particularly in light of the uncommon breadth and richness of our empirical material. Below are some of the questions on the horizon of our inquiry. We realize that our data will not enable us to address all of these questions – but they do enable us to raise and frame them.

Q1: How, to what extent, and why, did the first and second waves of national security-related funding for regional studies come about? How did federal government officials, philanthropic agencies, and university leaders assemble area studies over the past fifty years?

There is some excellent prior scholarship on this question (e.g. McCaughey 1984; Ruther 2002; Biddle 2002), but this knowledge base is small compared with the enormity of the scholarly puzzle, and to our knowledge our project is the first to link the first and second waves of national security-related funding together. The United States created "area studies" as it was known for several academic generations; there is at present no national consensus on just how regional knowledge should be encouraged, organized, and funded. Looking back at how area studies was developed in the twentieth century, and at whether and how the first wave of national security-related funding is connected to the current, second wave, may provide clues about how the relationship between the American university and the world is being re-narrated at this moment in history. Our data do not include historical material; however colleagues at the consultations suggested that we will be able to describe the organizational infrastructure that remains from the earlier

policy epoch: to show the kind of academic internationalism left to the present by the recent past.

Q2: What is the balance between humanities- and social scientific scholarship in area studies? To what extent, and why, are scholars from the humanities the preponderant players in area studies? Which social scientists have been more and less reluctant players in area studies, and why?

Historical factors related to the shift in the social sciences toward "scientific" approaches -- i.e., the search for universal, value-neutral models in the study of social and human life (Steinmetz 2005) -- and away from the context-driven approach in area studies (Graham & Kantor 2007) -- explain part of this dilemma, but leave open many questions. Our research allows us to examine how scholars at leading departments of economics, sociology, and political science as well as a range of faculty across area studies appraise the regional and the global. In addition, interviews with vice-provosts of international affairs (and related titles) will provide a window into whether and how context-driven versus theory-generating knowledge is variably valued in the academy, and what the potential consequences of such variation are.

There is a general consensus across the U.S. academy that most sociologists and economists, and a large proportion of political scientists, have been reluctant internationalists: skeptical of area studies programs in particular and of the goal of producing regionally specific knowledge more generally. Available data on cross-listings of academic courses and on joint and affiliated faculty appointments will enable us to investigate empirically whether this is in fact the case. Our interviews with social science

department chairs at a plurality of major universities will give us purchase on how social scientists think about and give meaning to regional knowledge. Michèle Lamont's recent work on cultures of academic evaluation will inform our thinking here (Lamont 2009). Additionally we suspect that the great prestige given to quantitative forms of evidence in American social science is part of what makes many social scientists wary of regionally specific knowledge. The dream of comparability that attends numerical representations of social phenomena may conflict with the priority given to regional specificity among area studies specialists (Stevens 2008; Espeland & Stevens 2009). We wonder also if facility with statistics and large-N numerical data sets is a kind of Esperanto of the American social sciences – a language, of sorts, which unites those who are fluent in it while excluding and even rendering suspect those who are not. Our qualitative data should provide us with good purchase on the puzzle of many social scientists' reluctant internationalism.

Q3: What new opportunities does the global university create for scholarship in U.S. higher education generally? What new intramural conflicts does it create? What new ethical problems does it raise?

The rapid expansion of American universities into transnational educational arrangements -- such as the establishment of satellite and branch campuses in the Middle East and elsewhere -- raises both exciting intellectual opportunities and troubling ethical and administrative dilemmas. New "borderless" teaching arrangements -- such as digitized lectures offered simultaneously in, for example, Abu Dhabi and New York -- raise exciting questions about access and opportunity

for students in non-Western countries. But there also are ethical dilemmas for "sending" and "receiving" nations. U.S. universities have only begun to address questions related to the protection of freedoms of expression and religion, the rights of homosexuals and migrant workers, employee unionization, and tenure systems at their overseas satellites. "Receiving" countries also face dilemmas related to new forms of competition with local institutions, the 'Westernization' of curricula and teaching styles, a shift to non-Muslim faculty instructors and student advisors, and an increasing reliance on English-language skills.

Q4: How should we explain the apparent disconnect between area studies scholarship on the Middle East and Asia/Eurasia and university expansion efforts in these regions? How might this disconnect be profitably redressed?

Even the most preliminary analysis of our qualitative data indicates that many current efforts by U.S. universities to "internationalize" their programming are taking place by organizational units far removed from area studies programs in the arts-and-sciences core. A university may, for example, develop an entire branch campus in a Middle Eastern city with no formal involvement by its Middle Eastern studies program. This phenomenon raises a tantalizing puzzle: what is driving the current imperative of "internationalization" on U.S. universities, and where in universities are these drivers located? It may be the case, for example, that the primary driver is tuition dependence: universities view overseas initiatives as new markets for students. If this is the case, area studies programs may be perceived as

less viable marketing instruments for universities than their professional degree programs.

Our working hypothesis is that the imperative of internationalization has multiple drivers, only some of them intellectual. This produces contradictory growth incentives and perverse coordination problems, such that institutional expansion in particular world regions may counteract the state of academic scholarship on those regions. Again, our interviews with a plurality of intramural players should enable us to map such conflicts.

Q5: What are the continuities and differences between the "internationalism" of the Cold War university and the "globalism" of the post-Cold War university? Is this periodization reasonable and useful?

In our October discussions we were continually struck by the simultaneous continuity and divergence in internationalization efforts by U.S. universities in recent history. For example, Jeffrey Riedinger pointed out that Michigan State University was directly involved in the creation of universities throughout the developing world in the middle decades of the twentieth century (Smuckler 2003; Thomas 2008); only recently, however, has Michigan State built an overseas satellite carrying the MSU name. U.S. universities have long maintained global ambitions and pursued international operations and audiences; still, there is a general sense that the game has changed in recent years. Our interviews with long-term university players, specifically senior faculty and administrators who have lived through and shaped recent higher education history, should give us some purchase

on how the logic of trans-national university operations may have shifted over time. Our work will thus provide clues about shifting relationships between universities, revenue sources, national political objectives, and scholarly developments within the academy.

Goal 4: Continue the conversation

We are eager to maintain a porous conception of this project, in which we receive consistent input from colleagues in our own and related fields at every stage of our analysis. We also would like to use our project as a catalyst for diffuse intellectual and policy exchanges. The puzzle of the changing relationship between U.S. universities and the world is simply too large and important for us to proceed in any other way.

We are pleased that our current funding provides some support for multiple forums for dissemination, and one additional consultation meeting. We will be presenting preliminary findings from the project at several conferences: the 2009 Eastern Sociological Association meetings in Baltimore and the U.S. Department of Education's International Education Programs Service (IEPS) Title VI 50th Anniversary Conference in Washington, DC.

We plan also to augment our current data with international comparisons. A related project to re-evaluate area and trans-regional studies is currently underway in the German academy, under the direction of colleagues at the *Wissenschaftskolleg (WIKO) zu Berlin* -- the Institute for Advanced Study. This project, entitled "Circulation of Knowledge: Transregional Studies" (http://www.wiko-

berlin.de/index.php?id=90&L=1), has similar aims to our U.S. effort, and we have discovered strong mutual interest in linking our shared objectives and work. Seteney Shami and Cynthia Miller-Idriss recently spent several days meeting with colleagues at the Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin about the possibility of developing an international comparison. Shami and Miller-Idriss also presented initial findings from this project at a special lunch meeting in conjunction with the WIKO conference titled "Area Studies Revisited: Transregional Studies in Germany."

These preliminary exchanges have led to an initial plan to collaborate transnationally on a study of trends in regional studies structures and scholarship in Germany, the United States, and the United Kingdom. Both Germany and the U.K. recently increased federal funding for regional studies, which make the two countries intriguing cases for assessing variation in how Western states with imperial histories organize the production of knowledge about the rest of the world. We anticipate a comparative examination of the relationship between national interests and knowledge creation in higher education. Funding proposals for the comparative project will be developed in the coming year.

Perhaps our largest ambition is to develop an ongoing scholarly forum for the observation of U.S. universities in transition. We have become convinced that the myriad initiatives placed under the banner of globalization in the U.S. academy are part of a larger reorganization of relationships between higher education, state and U.S. national governments, and degree-seekers, tuition-payers, and ambitious institution-builders all over the world. Unlike a great many public pundits and more than a few scholars, we do not believe that U.S. higher education is in crisis.

However we do believe it is undergoing a fundamental transition: from an era of growth through national subsidy to one of survival through entrepreneurial activity; and from a long tradition of service to region and nation to one of service to "the globe" – an entity that is easy to define geographically but exquisitely difficult to apprehend as a political, intellectual, or moral whole. We are convinced that our work can inform what is surely among the most important puzzles in the history of American higher education.

Works cited:

Abbott, Andrew. 2002. "The Disciplines and the Future." In *The Future of the City of Intellect: The Changing American University*, ed. Steven Brint, 205-230. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Clotfelter, Charles T. 1996. *Buying the Best: Cost Escalation in Elite Higher Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press/National Bureau of Economic Research.

Cohen, Michael D., James G. March, and Johan P. Olsen. 1972. "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17:1-25.

Espeland, Wendy Nelson, and Mitchell L. Stevens. 2009. "A Sociology of Quantification." *European Journal of Sociology*. Forthcoming.

Geiger, Roger L. 2004. *Reconstructing the University: Worldwide Shifts in Academia in the Twentieth Century*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Giddens, Anthony. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Graham, Loren, and Jean-Michel Kantor. 2007. "'Soft' Area Studies versus 'Hard' Social Science: A False Opposition." *Slavic Review* 66:1-20.

Gumport, Patricia J. 2000. "Academic Restructuring: Organizational Change and Institutional Imperatives." *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning* 39:67-91.

Hall, Peter A., and Sidney Tarrow. 1998. "Globalization and Area Studies: When Is Too Broad Too Narrow?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 44 (23 January):B4-B5.

Jencks, Christopher, and David Riesman. 1968. *The Academic Revolution*. New York: Doubleday.

Kerr, Clark. 2001. *The Uses of the University*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lamont, Michèle. 2009. *How Professors Think: Inside the Curious World of Academic Judgment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

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

Meyer, John W., and Brian Rowan. 1977. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." *American Journal of Sociology* 83:340-363.

Miller-Idriss, Cynthia, and Elizabeth Anderson. 2008. "Thinking Nationally About International Knowledge: Area Studies in the United States." New York University: Manuscript.

Ruther, Nancy L. 2002. *Barely There, Powerfully Present: Thirty Years of U.S. Policy on International Higher Education*. New York: Routledge.

Smuckler, Ralph H. 2003. *A University Turns to the World*: *A Personal History of the Michigan State University International Story*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Steinmetz, George (Ed.). 2005. *The Politics of Method in the Human Sciences: Positivism and Its Epistemological Others*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Stevens, Mitchell L. 2008. "Culture and Education." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 619:97-113.

Stevens, Mitchell L., Elizabeth A. Armstrong, and Richard Arum. 2008. "Sieve, Incubator, Temple, Hub: Empirical and Theoretical Advances in the Sociology of Higher Education". *Annual Review of Sociology* 34:127-151.

Thelin, John R. 2004. *A History of American Higher Education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Thomas, David A. 2008. *Michigan State College: John Hannah and the Creation of a World University, 1926-1969*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Tilly, Charles. 2006. *Why?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Weick, Karl E. 1976. "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 21:1-19.

Appendix 1: Overview of Project Methods, Research Design, & Data Collection

From 2005 through 2008, the Social Science Research Council has been conducting a research project on issues of interdisciplinarity and internationalization in U.S. higher education, particularly focused on the role of area studies centers on U.S. campuses. The study is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's International Research and Studies Program. Data were collected in three phases, which corresponded with the academic years 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08. The regional focus of the study varied slightly over the three phases but each year included a concentration on one or more of the following four regions: the Middle East, South Asia, Russia/Eurasia, and Central Asia.

Research Design

The research design was a sequential mixed-methods study involving:

- ✓ 17 week-long site visits to 12 case study universities across the United States during the 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08 academic years;
- ✓ National surveys of students and area studies centers, conducted in 2008
- ✓ Analysis of national database (U.S. Department of Education EELIAS database) of area studies center information, including course offerings and enrollments, faculty appointments, outreach efforts, etc.
- ✓ Analysis of center proposals, reports, documents, and other archival and document-based data (ongoing)

Sites were selected for case studies on the basis of four criteria: (1) presence of funded Title VI area studies centers in the region(s) of interest for each phase; (2) public versus private universities (with an aim toward equal representation in the final sample); (3) degree-granting or non-degree-granting area studies centers (with an aim toward an equal balance in the final sample); and (4) geographic location (with an aim toward broad geographic diversity in the final sample).

Participation in the study was completely voluntary for all participants. An ad hoc SSRC Institutional Review Board approved the study's design, data collection plan, and research instruments. The study was described and announced at multiple conference venues, and recruitment took place through letters of invitation from the Social Science Research Council.

Data collected during the qualitative site visits included **ethnographic observation** of the breadth and depth of activities, programs, events at area studies centers; **interviews** on each campus with Vice-Provosts for International Affairs (or related titles), area studies center directors and associate directors, directors of graduate studies and/or department chairs in economics, political science, and sociology, and other faculty working on regional issues; and **focus groups** with students and faculty. In 2008, a national survey of students working in the regions of interest for this study (Middle East, South Asia, Russia/Eurasia, and Central Asia) was conducted; a second survey of area studies directors was launched at the same time.

Interview questions ranged from specific questions about the operational aspects of area studies centers to broader questions about challenges and issues

related to internationalization on each campus and questions about the study of particular world regions on each campus.

In total, the team conducted over 200 interviews, 31 focus groups, countless hours of observation, and received approximately 250 student survey responses and 30+ center survey responses. The qualitative data has been transcribed and is either coded or is being coded in a qualitative software program. The surveys were completed very recently (as of October 1, 2008) and are not yet analyzed.

Appendix 2: Senior Project Staff

Cynthia Miller-Idriss, Assistant Professor of International Education and Educational Sociology, New York University/Senior Consultant
Email: cmi1@nyu.edu

Miller-Idriss is Assistant Professor of International Education and Educational Sociology at New York University, and is a Senior Consultant for this project. She earned her bachelors degree from Cornell University and dual masters in public policy and sociology and a Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Michigan. Miller-Idriss is the author of *Blood and Culture: Race, Youth, and Belonging in a Re-imagined Germany* (forthcoming from Duke University Press). She teaches courses in research design, qualitative research methods, cross-cultural studies, and education in developing areas.

Srirupa Roy, Associate Professor, Political Science, University of Massachusetts-Amherst/Senior Consultant
Email: roy@ssrc.org

Roy is an associate professor of political science at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst and a former program officer/senior adviser to the SSRC's South Asia Program and International Research Collaboration. Her research and teaching interests focus on the comparative politics of nationalism and state-formation; secularism and religious politics in the Middle East and South Asia; and visual culture/visual politics. She has received fellowships and grants from the SSRC-MacArthur Foundation Program on International Peace and Security; the SSRC's Middle East and North Africa Program; and a Rockefeller Residential Humanities Fellowship from the International Center for Advanced Studies at New York University. In 2006-07 she conducted field research for a new project on media and democracy in India as a senior fellow of the American Institute of Indian Studies. She is the author of *Beyond Belief: India and the politics of postcolonial nationalism* (Duke University Press, 2007) and co-editor (with Amrita Basu) of *Violence and Democracy in India* (Seagull Press, 2006).

Seteney Shami, Program Director, Regional Programs and International Collaboration, SSRC/Project Director
Email: shami@ssrc.org

Shami is an anthropologist from Jordan with degrees from the American University in Beirut and U.C. Berkeley. After teaching and setting up a graduate dept. of anthropology at Yarmouk University, Jordan, Seteney moved in 1996 to the regional office of the Population Council in Cairo as director of the Middle East Awards in Population and the Social Sciences (MEAwards). She has also been a visiting Professor at numerous universities. Seteney joined the Social Science Research Council in July 1999 and her

research interests center on issues of ethnicity and nationalism in the context of globalization, urban politics and state-building strategies, and population displacement and trans-national movements.

Mitchell L. Stevens, Associate Professor of Education and (by courtesy) Sociology, Stanford University/Senior Consultant
Email: mitchell.stevens@stanford.edu

Stevens is a sociologist with expertise in higher education, alternative educational forms, and the quantification of organizational performance and academic accomplishment. His recent scholarship includes *Creating a Class: College Admissions and the Education of Elites* (Harvard, 2007); and, with Wendy Nelson Espeland, "A Sociology of Quantification" (European Journal of Sociology, 2009). He currently is writing a book on U.S. higher education, housing policy, and national rhetorics of welfare provision. Stevens joined the project as a Senior Consultant in spring 2008.

Appendix 3: Participants in the October 2008 Consultations

Tuesday 14 October

Selma Botman, President, University of Southern Maine

Jeremy Brown, Assistant Professor, Department of Education and Human Development, SUNY-Brockport (Statistical Consultant to the project)

Holly Danzeisen, Project Coordinator, SSRC

Diana Davies, Associate Provost for International Initiatives, Princeton University

J. Nicholas Entrikin, Acting Vice-Provost of International Studies, UCLA International Institute

Nick Gozik, Assistant Director of Study Abroad, Duke University (Project Researcher)

Linda Costigan Lederman, Dean, Social Sciences, Professor of Human Communication and Director, Institute for Social Science Research (ISSR), College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Arizona State University

Mary Byrne McDonnell, Executive Director, SSRC

Vasuki Nesiah, Director of International Affairs, Brown University

Jeffrey Riedinger, Dean, International Studies and Programs, Michigan State University

Nancy Ruther, Associate Director, The MacMillan Center, Yale University

Friday 17 October

Jeremy Adelman, Walter Samuel Carpenter III Professor in Spanish Civilization and Culture; Chair, Department of History; Director, Council on International Teaching and Research

Sada Aksartova, American Sociological Association Congressional Fellow

Jeremy Browne, Assistant Professor, Department of Education and Human Development, SUNY-Brockport (Statistical Consultant to the project)

Holly Danzeisen, Project Coordinator, SSRC

Deborah Davis, Professor of Sociology, Yale University

David John Frank, Professor of Sociology and (by courtesy) Education, UC-Irvine

Nick Gozik, Assistant Director of Study Abroad, Duke University (Project Researcher)

Michèle Lamont, Robert I. Goldman Professor of European Studies and Professor of Sociology and African and African American Studies, Harvard University

Gideon Rose, Managing Editor, *Foreign Affairs*

George Steinmetz, Professor of Sociology and German Studies, University of Michigan and the New School for Social Research

Appendix 4: General Schedule of the 14 & 17 October Meetings

While the schedule for each of the two meetings varied slightly, overall both days proceeded as follows:

9:30 - 10:00 AM:	breakfast/informal assembly
10:00 - 11:15 AM	welcome: Seteney Shami
	introductions: project team and guests
	what we did: an overview of conceptualization, design, methods, and data: Cynthia Miller-Idriss
11:15 - 11:30 AM	break/coffee
11:30 - 12:30 PM	thinking the U.S. university: recent empirical and theoretical inquiries: Mitchell Stevens
	14 October: data on internationalization and area studies: questions to consider: Nick Gozik
	group discussion
12:30 - 1:30 PM	working lunch/continue discussion
1:30 - 2 PM	break
2:00 - 3:45 PM	some emergent themes from the project:
	universalism, particularism, and the status of regional knowledge in U.S. universities: Cynthia Miller-Idriss
	the proliferation of forms and funding streams for regional studies and "the global": Mitchell Stevens
3:45 - 4 PM:	break/coffee
4:00 - 5:00 PM	what next: advice from consultants about how to proceed with research and analysis
	14 October: closing remarks by Mary Byrne McDonnell, Executive Director
5:00 PM	adjourn