

4-1-2003

How International Are the U.S. Jesuit Schools?

Maria Krane

Follow this and additional works at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/conversations>

Recommended Citation

Krane, Maria (2003) "How International Are the U.S. Jesuit Schools?," *Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education*: Vol. 23, Article 5.
Available at: <http://epublications.marquette.edu/conversations/vol23/iss1/5>

HOW INTERNATIONAL ARE THE U.S. JESUIT UNIVERSITIES?

Maria C. Krane

This article addresses the importance of internationalization as a complex phenomenon and provides a preliminary glimpse into the international dimension of Jesuit institutions in the context of U.S. higher education.

Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States rank among the leading institutions in the country -- either at the national or regional levels -- according to the *U.S. News & World Report*¹ magazine. However, with participation in study abroad and a significant international presence on campus riding on the successful internationalization of U.S. campuses, the Jesuit institutions surprisingly lag behind their non-Jesuit counterparts. Of the twenty-eight Jesuit institutions of higher education in the U.S., only two come even close to the national goal of sending ten percent of the student body abroad annually. Research on international education, public opinion, globalization, and, perhaps most importantly, the roots of the Society of Jesus suggest that this should be a serious concern to us. This "conversation" provides an opportunity for us to examine the international dimension of Jesuit institutions and its importance in the context of U.S. higher education.

Engaged in the dialogue of *faith* and *culture*, the early Jesuits understood the importance of foreign language study and cultural immersion. Ignatius of Loyola studied abroad, embraced a diverse curriculum, and interacted with students from different countries; Francis Xavier realized the need to learn and adapt to cultural values for better communication and acceptance; Matteo Ricci studied Chinese before he went to China

and, once there, assumed many aspects of his host culture; Roberto de Nobili learned Tamil and Sanskrit and adopted the Hindu way of life. In Brazil, Jose de Anchieta studied Tupi to better educate and evangelize the natives. As the narrator of a popular videotape on the history of the Society of Jesus concludes, "...and the immersion in cultures other than their own transformed their [the Jesuits'] vision." Their approach to cross-cultural communication was necessary in the world of the sixteenth century; in the increasingly interdependent world of the twenty-first century, should it not be imperative that our graduates have "transformed visions" through the lenses of other cultures?

Today's globalization era requires special cross-cultural knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors. "The inexorable integration of markets, nation-states and technologies to a degree never witnessed before," writes Thomas Friedman in *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*,² "is enabling individuals, corporations and nation-states to reach around the world farther, faster, deeper, and cheaper than ever before, and in a way that is also producing a powerful backlash from those brutalized or left behind by this new system." In their future endeavors, students will also be reaching around the world in unimaginable ways with those inside and outside of the globalization system. And not just the international affairs specialists who receive a fair share of training in foreign languages, area

Maria C. Krane, Ed.D., is Executive Director of International Programs and Adjunct Associate Professor of Education at Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska.



Photo Courtesy of Loyola University, Chicago

studies, or international relations, but "all our graduates will work in a global setting" says Mestenhauser in Mestenhauser and Ellingboe's *Reforming the Higher Education Curriculum*.³ They must also be prepared to work with those who have different values, beliefs, and needs with adequate knowledge and empathy. In an era of highly dynamic and diverse globalization, should not all students engage in intellectual and experiential learning processes in different cultural contexts?

The push for internationalization also comes from prospective students and the public in general. In its recent publication, *Public Experience, Attitudes, and Knowledge: A Report on Two National Surveys About International Education*,⁴ the American Council on Education reports that eighty percent of the public surveyed and more than seventy percent of college bound students surveyed believed they would choose a college or university for themselves or their children on the basis of their international programs. College-bound seniors specifically identified study abroad

programs, opportunities to interact with foreign students, and foreign language and international courses as factors that would influence their decision as to where they would pursue their undergraduate studies. The researchers concluded that "the importance given to international learning opportunities by both students and the public suggests that institutions with robust international offerings will have a competitive advantage in attracting future students." What international learning opportunities are there? How robust should they be?

What it Means to be International

The signing of the Fulbright Act in 1946 gave impetus to what Groennings said in *Group Portrait: Internationalizing the Disciplines*⁵ was "becoming one of the most powerful substantive developments in the history of American higher education": internationalization. Although "powerful" and "substantive," the phenomenon is still not sufficiently understood, systematically developed, and appropriately supported on every campus. The list of studies, reports, books, conferences, and speeches on internationalization is growing, but the academic community continues to grapple with adequate definitions, rationales, objectives, processes, and optimal levels.

What is, after all, *internationalization*? In the context of a university, internationalization is the process of creating a variety of initiatives believed to help students attain global competence.⁶ A typical definition of global competence includes descriptors such as knowledge of world issues and interdependence, interest in current events, functional foreign language ability, cultural empathy, and facility in cross-cultural communication.⁷ Campus initiatives that foster global competence fall into three main areas: a curriculum with global perspectives,

opportunities abroad for students and faculty, and a significant international presence on campus. Permeating these three areas is the study of culture -- the development of knowledge of and empathy for different histories, values, and ways of communicating. The literature on international education describes how international initiatives can contribute to the education of globally competent students.

The curriculum is at the heart of the international dimension. Although different universities and colleges will adopt international curricula appropriate to their missions, those will traditionally include foreign languages, area or international studies, and perhaps international relations where possible. For the non-majors, general education or the core curriculum includes courses with international content. Researchers

INTERNATIONALIZATION
IS THE PROCESS OF
CREATING A VARIETY OF
INITIATIVES BELIEVED TO
HELP STUDENTS ATTAIN
GLOBAL AWARENESS

like Dobbert and Mestenhauser argue in *Reforming the Higher Education Curriculum* that this is not enough. Dobbert⁸ believes the role of the university curriculum is to prepare students and faculty for extended experiences abroad where most internationalization skills can be learned. Mestenhauser⁹ makes the case for the study of culture as an instrument for our better understanding of "the transfer of knowledge, the dynamics of culture contact, social change, conformity, identity, and roles. It relates

individuals to institutions and speaks to the division of labor, ways of organizing, and, most importantly for international education, ways of thinking and reasoning."

Through the curriculum students would learn how to learn a culture, how to interact in a culture other than their own, and the observable spheres of culture: informational or factual culture (facts related to the geography, history, and folklore of a society), behavioral culture (a function of basic human needs, the environment, and tradition), and achievement culture (the artistic and literary accomplishments of a society) as explained by Hammerly in *Synthesis in Language Teaching: An Introduction to Linguistics*.¹⁰ But it would be in contact with a culture other than their own that students could further refine their understanding of its non-observable features -- the shared "part of an internal process, i.e., a way of perceiving, interpreting, and creating meaning" Robinson describes in *Crosscultural Understanding*.¹¹

Several quantitative and qualitative studies on the impact of study abroad on participants (especially the very comprehensive Study Abroad Evaluation Project¹² by Carlson, Burn, Useem, and Yachimowicz) confirm its positive contributions towards global competence. Among them, knowledge about other countries, different perspectives on their majors, increased language proficiency, greater sense of independence, tolerance towards ambiguity, as well as greater interest in reflective thought and systematic thinking are noteworthy. Despite the many advantages of a sojourn abroad, too few students take advantage of the experience. To help U.S. colleges and universities encourage greater study abroad participation, task forces and international advisory councils have recommended increased diversity of destinations, participants, and approaches; availability of funds; faculty involvement; and support services.

A significant number of students and scholars

from a variety of countries adds an important international dimension to the campus. Burn warns us, however, that the mere presence of international students does not automatically internationalize a campus (see *Contribution of International Educational Exchange to the International Education of Americans*¹³). It is critical that universities create special programs to encourage greater U.S. and international student interactions. She and others identified three main obstacles to greater international student contributions towards an international campus: (1) their small numbers, (2) the U.S. students' lack of global competence and interest that widens the gap between them and the international students,

and (3) the international students' lack of preparation or willingness to contribute to the education of the U.S. student. The staff that can help remove these obstacles create a fourth obstacle themselves: the overextended international

office staff on most campuses simply do not have time to create new programs to promote greater interaction and learning for both groups.

The curriculum, study abroad and international students and scholars are not the only components of internationalization. Their promotion and support come from other activities and groups: the faculty engaged in international activity; faculty and administrative committees whose agendas include international issues; campus lectures and discussions centered on global or culture-specific topics; student associations; the various units within the division of student affairs; and last, but not least, the

office of international programs. The successful internationalization of a campus can only be attained if all of those components have a common, integrated international agenda and systematically follow it.

Measures of Internationalization

According to *Open Doors 2002*¹⁴ e-zine, a national database of international mobility collected by the Institute of International Education, the twenty-eight Jesuit colleges and universities in the U.S. enroll 181,626 students. On average, each campus had a total of 6,487 students, received 339

international students (five percent of the total enrollment) and sent abroad 200 of its own U.S. students (three percent of the total enrollment) this past academic year.

An analysis of the data available in the *Open Doors 2002* e-zine reveals that the

Jesuit institutions do not receive or send abroad as many students as the leading institutions do.

For greater impact on internationalization, the National Task Force on Undergraduate Education Abroad¹⁵ set the critical mass for annual study abroad participation at ten percent of the total student enrollment. Although the national average participation remains at one percent many leading colleges and universities in the U.S. have already attained or exceeded ten percent. Of the Jesuit institutions, only Georgetown (eight percent) and Boston College (seven percent) come close to the national goal.

An optimal percentage for international student representation has not been set. Goodwin and Nacht, however, report in their *Absence of Decision*¹⁶ estimates



Photo Courtesy of Loyola University, Chicago

gleaned from interviews conducted on some twenty campuses located in five different states: "from three to five percent in small, rural liberal arts colleges to thirty percent in graduate engineering departments." Among the Jesuit institutions, three are approaching a midpoint between the two estimates: Georgetown (twelve percent), Santa Clara and San Francisco (both with nine percent). These percentages are impressive as compared to the current percentage of international students of the total U.S. enrollment in institutions of higher learning (four and three-tenths percent). The figures are not as impressive when compared to levels of enrollment reported by leading players in the international arena.

It is a challenge to compare the Jesuits to one another and to compare the Jesuits to non-Jesuit institutions. Besides varying in size, endowment, and Carnegie classification, Jesuit institutions also vary in international activity. Georgetown has the greatest percentage of international students (twelve percent)

whereas John Carroll has the smallest with less than one percent. Study abroad participation also differs from institution to institution. Georgetown reports that eight percent of its students earn credit abroad; Regis, Saint Peter, Loyola Marymount, and Wheeling either had less than one percent participation in study abroad or did not report any activity for the target year. To take into consideration these differences, a comparison of the international activity on leading Jesuit campuses and leading non-Jesuit campuses was made within each Carnegie classification with a Jesuit institution representation. The twenty-eight fall in the following categories: Doctoral/Research Universities (six extensive and one intensive), Master's Colleges and Universities (nineteen Master's I and one Master's II), and Baccalaureate College-Liberal Arts (one). Tables 1 and 2 summarize the figures within each of the Carnegie institutional types for the leading non-Jesuit institution and the leading Jesuit institution.¹⁷

Table 1. U.S. Institutions with the Largest Number of International Students as a Percentage of Total Student Enrollment:

	Leading Institution	International Students
Baccalaureate Colleges—Liberal Arts (Non-Jesuit)	Mount Holyoke College	19%
Baccalaureate Colleges—Liberal Arts (Jesuit)	College of the Holy Cross	1%
<i>Baccalaureate Colleges—Liberal Arts (Jesuit Average)</i>		1%
Master's Colleges and Universities (Non-Jesuit)	Oklahoma City University	27%
Master's Colleges and Universities (Jesuit)	Santa Clara University	9%
<i>Master's Colleges and Universities (Jesuit Average)</i>		4%
Doctoral/Research Universities (Non-Jesuit)	Carnegie Mellon University	28%
Doctoral/Research Universities (Jesuit)	Georgetown University	12%
<i>Doctoral/Research Universities (Jesuit Average)</i>		7%

Source: Institute of International Education Open Doors, 2002, on line (<http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/>)

Table 2. U.S. Institutions with the Largest Number of Students Studying Abroad as a Percentage of Total Student Enrollment:

	Leading Institution	Students Abroad
Baccalaureate Colleges—Liberal Arts (Non-Jesuit)	Saint Olaf College	22%
Baccalaureate Colleges—Liberal Arts (Jesuit)	College of the Holy Cross	5%
<i>Baccalaureate Colleges—Liberal Arts (Jesuit Average)</i>		5%
Master's Colleges and Universities (Non-Jesuit)	Elon University	16%
Master's Colleges and Universities (Jesuit)	Loyola College in Maryland	6%
<i>Master's Colleges and Universities (Jesuit Average)</i>		2%
Doctoral/Research Universities (Non-Jesuit)	University of Notre Dame	10%
Doctoral/Research Universities (Jesuit)	Georgetown University	8%
<i>Doctoral/Research Universities (Jesuit Average)</i>		4%

Source: Institute of International Education Open Doors, 2002, on line (<http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/>)

Present and Future Challenges

The tragic events of September 11, 2001 added a sense of urgency to a commitment to international education. The need for the understanding of global issues, foreign language expertise, justification for bringing international students to our campuses, and the value of study abroad are now even more compelling. Nevertheless, concerns about terrorism, the growing unemployment figures, and a plunging stock market are affecting our institutional budgets. Should we continue to support our international agenda?

"Study abroad is more popular than ever," reports the Institute of International Education in its *Survey on the Impact of September 11 on International Educational Exchange, 2002*¹⁸ released last September. The researchers found that forty-five percent of the universities surveyed reported an increase in participation in fall, 2002 as opposed to last year's term. An additional thirty-five percent of the institutions surveyed reported no noticeable change. Responses pertaining to international student enrollment yielded a mixed response. Whereas more than fifty percent of the respondents reported stable numbers or a slight increase, forty-two percent reported lower enrollments. Fears of racial profiling and discrimination, difficulty in securing visas, and stricter immigration regulations (besides the ever increasing cost of education in the U.S.) may adversely affect the continued growth of international student enrollment on our campuses. It is still too soon to determine the effect of 9/11, or most critically, the effect of stricter immigration regulations on fall, 2003 enrollments.

The responses collected by the IIE indicate that this is the time to continue and even increase our support for international programs -- both

study abroad and international student recruitment. In a tighter international recruitment market Jesuit institutions must compete favorably with other institutions by offering scholarships that are at least comparable to those offered by similar institutions of higher learning. Using data collected by the European Council of International Schools,¹⁹ one can calculate that the average aid package offered to non-US citizens by 200 U.S. private universities and colleges was around \$7,000. What is our average?

Maintaining our current levels of support for study abroad and international student programming is not enough. If, on the average, we are sending only three percent of our student body abroad annually, what significant cross-cultural experiences are we providing the remaining ninety-seven percent of our students? What significant cross-cultural experiences are we providing our international students? Are they fully integrated in the academic and social life of the campus, or are they interacting mainly among themselves?

As the national data indicate, the international activity of Jesuit colleges and universities is not commensurate with the high rankings they receive based on variables such as those used by the *U.S. News & World Report*. To become leaders in international education, the Jesuit institutions should increase the study abroad participation and international student enrollment on their campuses. It is true that these are only two of several international indicators. To ascertain the internationalization of the Jesuit institutions, other indicators should be investigated through quantitative and qualitative methods, such as the extent to which the curriculum is internationally integrated, foreign language enrollment and fluency levels achieved, faculty activity in conference attendance and research abroad, active linkages with universities

abroad for different kinds of exchanges, and the financial support provided to carry out all international activities. Most importantly, studies are needed to assess the impact of the international experience (study abroad, interactions with international students, courses

with international content, etc.) on the student.

Non-curricular international dimensions could also add insights to our studies. Currently under analysis is the administration of international programs at Jesuit institutions. To find out how the U.S. Jesuit colleges and universities are organized for the planning, delivery, and evaluation of optimal international programs and services, the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities conducted a survey on current administrative models last fall. The results will be published sometime in early 2003.

Through participation in regional and national conferences of international professional organizations, campus faculty, administrators and staff share their research, best practices and accomplishments, and they learn those of other institutions. The ideas and information exchanged help improve and promote one's international education programming and administration while increasing the national and international visibility of one's institution.

Leadership in international professional organizations further enhances this effect. It is important that Jesuit institutions provide an effective voice on significant international issues at all levels. Several Jesuit international administrators are currently present at the discussion table of influential organizations, such as the Association of International Education Administrators²⁰ (AIEA) and NAFSA: Association of International Educators²¹ (NAFSA). Leaders in AIEA include Marian St. Onge (Boston College), Chair of the Research Committee; Maria C. Krane (Creighton), President Elect. Kathy Bellows (Georgetown) is NAFSA's Vice President for Public Affairs; Salvatore Longarino (Fordham) is Chair-Elect, Council of Advisers to Foreign Students and Scholars; and Katherine Hammett (Xavier) serves as Chair-Elect of the Nominations and Election Committee.

Why support the international agenda in this

TO BECOME LEADERS IN
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION, THE
JESUIT INSTITUTIONS SHOULD
INCREASE THE STUDY
ABROAD PARTICIPATION
AND INTERNATIONAL
STUDENT ENROLLMENT
ON THEIR CAMPUSES.

cannot afford not to. The answers given here are from the viewpoint of the researcher and professional in the field. Other articles in this issue approach the question from other perspectives. The conversations resulting from comparing them ought to lead all of us to a better understanding of what is at stake.

ENDNOTES

¹U.S. News & World Report: *America's Best Colleges 2003*, September 2002.

²Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, New York, NY, 1999, pp.7-8.

³The American Council on Education and The Oryx Press, Phoenix, AZ, 1998, p. xxii.

⁴The American Council on Education, Washington, DC, 2001, p.3.

⁵Sven Groennings and David S. Wiley, Eds., *The American Forum*, New York, NY, 1990, p. 11-12.

⁶Maria Carmen Sada Krane, *Development of an Internationalization Index for U.S. Liberal Arts Colleges*. Unpublished Dissertation, 1994., p.11.

⁷The definitions of many authors were reviewed.

⁸Marion L. Lundy Dobbett, "The Impossibility of Internationalizing Students by Adding Materials to Courses," in Joseph A. Mestenhauser and Brenda J. Ellingboe, Eds., *Reforming the Higher Education Curriculum*. The American Council on Education and The Oryx Press, Phoenix, AZ, 1998, p. 67.

⁹Joseph A. Mestenhauser, "Portraits of an International Curriculum" in Joseph A. Mestenhauser and Brenda J. Ellingboe, Eds., *Reforming the Higher Education Curriculum*. The American Council on Education and The Oryx Press, Phoenix, AZ, 1998, p. 31.

¹⁰Second Language Publications, Blaine, WA, 1986, p.513.

¹¹Pergamon Press, New York, NY, 1985, p. 10.

¹²*Study Abroad: The Experience of American Undergraduates*. Westport, CT, 1990, p. 114.

¹³Council on International Educational Exchange, New York, NY, 1990, pp. 27-28.

¹⁴The Institute of International Education's *Open Doors 2002* e-zine URL is <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/>.

¹⁵A National Mandate for Education Abroad. National Association for Foreign Students Affairs, Washington, DC, 1983.

¹⁶Institute of International Education, New York, NY, 1983, p.21.

¹⁷The data used in the construction of Tables 1 and 2 were collected from the *Open Doors 2002* e-zine <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/> the most comprehensive database available on international education activities. Given the fact that AJCU's *Resource Book for International Education* includes data on international students but not on study abroad participation, the *Open Doors* data were used for greater consistency. Enrollment figures not available in the *Open Doors* database were imported from the *Resource Book*.

¹⁸Institute of International Education, New York, NY, 2001.

¹⁹European Council of International Schools--web site: www.ecis.org/colleges/aid.htm.

²⁰Association of International Education Administrators--www.aieaworld.org.

²¹NAFSA: Association of International Educators--www.nafsa.org.



Photo Courtesy of Loyola University, Chicago