International Students in NASPAA Programs: Identification, Needs, and Program Response

by
Catherine Lovell
Jeffrey A. Raffel
Richard Ryan

NASPAA/AID Working Paper #11

NASPAA

Suite 520 • 1120 G Street, N.W. • Washington, D.C. 20005

PN-AAT-685
41943

International Students in NASPAA Programs:

Identification, Needs, and Program Response

Catherine Lovell
University of California
(Riverside)

Jeffrey A. Raffel
University of Delaware
(Newark)

Richard Ryan
San Diego State University
(Imperial Valley Campus)

May, 1985

Mailing Address:

c/o Jeffrey A. Raffel
Director, MPA Program
College of Urban Affairs & Public Policy
University of Delaware

This manuscript was written under a grant from the U.S. Agency for International Development, Bureau of Science and Technology/Office of Rural and Institutional Development and NASPAA. The conclusions expressed in this manuscript, however, are not necessarily those of U.S.A.I.D. or of NASPAA.

Abstract

Although the number of international students in NASPAA programs has increased greatly over the last decade, little is known about this clientele and how NASPAA programs have responded to them. A 1983-84 NASPAA-AID international student survey, a NASPAA-AID program survey, and the 1984 NASPAA member institution survey provide data for identifying these students, their needs, and NASPAA program response. Factors such as the dispersion of international students, diversity of student national origins within programs, and ethnocentric views of public administration are found to have resulted in an "absence of decision" vis a vis international students. Obstacles to more appropriate program responses and suggestions for NASPAA and program action to better serve the needs of international students in public affairs and administration are presented.

International Students in NASPAA Programs: Identification, Needs, and Program Response

Introduction

The number of international students attending U.S. universities has increased greatly over the last decade.[1] This presents both opportunities and challenges for faculty and administrators at universities where international students are in attendance. However, little information has been available about international students attending National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) programs. It is also not known how institutions respond to the particular needs of this growing clientele. A recent report on international students attending U.S. universities indicates that in most cases there is an absence of policy vis a vis international students.[2]

During the 1983-84 academic year, NASPAA sponsored a set of surveys designed to provide members of the association with information about their students from abroad. The surveys sought to establish profile data on these students, solicit evaluations of their educational experiences, and collect information on institutional programs and support services. An analysis of these findings forms the basis of this paper. It is intended that these findings be useful to individual institutions interested in assessing their role in preparing students for public service throughout the world. Also, the survey data suggest specific areas in which NASPAA can support public administration programs in improving the educational experiences of international students--especially those from the Third World.

Origins of the Study

In late 1982, the International Affairs Section of NASPAA began a study of the international students in NASPAA schools and the extent to which the schools are consciously responding to the needs of these students.[3] Underlying the study was an assumption that if the schools of administration are to repond to the needs of students from developing countries, they must examine and evaluate their programs, they must understand the role they are playing in educating development managers, and they must consciously decide whether their programs are currently equal to the task. It was the hope of the International Section that a concerned and active association could encourage and assist the schools if improvement in what is offered to the students appeared to be needed.

The issues that generated the study included general concerns raised to members of the International Section by program directors in the various schools. These concerns pointed to increasing numbers of international students and certain problems with integrating these students into ongoing programs. Some program directors raised problems about English language proficiency, about adequate levels of financial support for the students, and particularly about relevance of curriculum. On the other hand, some program directors and faculty felt that no special attention should be given to the international student, that undue concern would water down or distort curriculum for domestic students.

At the same time as these kinds of issues were being discussed, others in NASPAA schools were becoming increasingly concerned about the responsibility of NASPAA programs in their roles as development management educators. The concerns are particularly relevant for the work that NASPAA has undertaken in its cooperative agreement with the Agency for International Development. The purpose of this AID-NASPAA project is to expand the appropriate use of effective management concepts and technologies in developing countries and collaborating institutions. The cooperative agreement with NASPAA schools assumes a collaborative effort between schools of public administration and AID to understand the educational needs of development managers. The agreement calls for a rigorous process of research on development management needs, development of ways to best satisfy these needs, and provision of technical assistance, training, and dissemination of development management technologies.

Research Questions and Process Model

A fundamental question stimulated this research: To what extent have NASPAA schools recognized and responded to the needs of international students? Out of this grew a number of corollary questions that became incorporated in the questionnaires and analysis.

- First, who are the international students to whom programs might respond? What are their professional needs (e.g., development administration)? What sort of occupational positions will they be returning to?

- Second, how do international students rate their courses in NASPAA

programs? What are the educational emphases of international students and are their educationally related problems in any way unique compared to those of domestic students?

- Third, how universally practicable is U.S. Public Administration? What assumptions are implicit in present program offerings?

- Fourth, how have NASPAA member institutions responded to different curriculum and support service needs of their students from abroad?

- Fifth, what obstacles exist to better serve the international student clientele, and how can these obstacles be overcome?

These questions suggest a prescriptive process model for viewing this subject as a policy issue facing NASPAA member programs. The model is composed of three parts. First, there is problem recognition; this is followed by articulation of a policy response; and finally specific actions are taken at program, university and national levels. It is not assumed that this process will be operationalized wherever international students' needs differ from those of domestic students. The prescriptive model does, however, suggest a rational means for addressing international student problems where there is the ability and the will to do so. It also provides an evaluative framework for analyzing the findings of the three surveys and other sources of data, and it assists in formulating recommendations.

A responsiveness model, then, underlies this research. It is assumed that in the best of circumstances NASPAA programs will recognize the specific educational and ancillary needs of international students and respond with the resources available. The triggering mechanism for the policy process is the recognition of need.

Recognition of Need

A number of factors would be expected to cause NASPAA programs to recognize international student presence and the curriculum and support service needs of this clientele group. First, there are enrollment pressures on programs due to the U.S. "baby bust" making new clientele attractive.[4] With projections of declining enrollments at the college and graduate levels, international students could represent fertile ground for program maintenance. Already there are 338,894 international students enrolled in all disciplines throughout the U.S. This represents only 3 percent of the total enrolled in higher education so there is room for growth. Public administration programs seek to attract students by creating specialty tracks, and this clientele group appears to have specific program interests.

Second, there have been student increases of international students in Public Administration programs bringing the total to approximately 1700 students or between 8 to 10 percent of all NASPAA program enrollments. As these numbers increase and as this clientele group becomes more visible, responses to these students might well be expected.[5]

Third, it can be argued that there is increased realization of the significance of international factors in U.S. Public Administration. These factors include global interdependence of market economies, international competition and regulation, and control of terrorism.

Fourth, the international literature warns of a "management crisis" in the Third World due to rising expectations and population growth outstripping food, housing and health delivery capabilities. The public sector plays the dominant role in seeking solutions, but Third World universities and insti-

tutes are for the most part ill-prepared to supply capable managers.[6]

Fifth, there is a tradition of post-war involvement by U.S. universities in training and educating development administrators. This has been an integral part of this country's foreign aid program in technical assistance and capacity building.

These, then, represent important reasons why a recognition of international student needs would be expected. The presence of an increasing number of international students or a university's recognition of its international role could trigger the policy process resulting in program responsiveness.

Yet it is observed that there may exist equally compelling factors inhibiting NASPAA programs' responsiveness to their international students and to global issues.

First, it may be assumed that international students have needs similar to those of domestic students and should therefore be treated equally. Second, there is a marked lack of current information about international students and their specific problems. Third, the majority of NASPAA member programs have small concentrations of international students diminishing student recognition and the need for institutional response. Fourth, there is an assumption that educational and service specialization is inherently costly and that existing resources cannot be reconfigured to meet international clientele needs. Fifth, there is a preoccupation with teaching and research on domestic topics leaving little room for attention to international issues. Sixth, NASPAA and ASPA have not yet provided leadership on this issue which is national in scope, affecting most Public Administration programs.

In their report entitled, Absence of Decision, Goodwin and Nacht found that policy concerning international students is rarely in place at U.S. universities. Where it does exist, it varies considerably from one institution to the next. The reasons for this are complex and not dependent only on size of international enrollments. The findings discussed in this paper provide measures with which to evaluate NASPAA member institutions on their attention to international student policy.

This paper reports on the research findings by first presenting profiles of international students and then examining the extent of program responsiveness in terms of curriculum and support services. Further, institutional obstacles to meeting the particular needs of international students are discussed and suggestions are made for improving the responsiveness of NASPAA programs and the association itself.

Data Sources

The data were obtained from three sources. The first data set, which provides a census of international students in NASPAA schools, is based on a series of questions on international students included in the 1984 NASPAA Survey of Public Administration Programs (herein referred to as the NASPAA Program Survey). This set includes answers from 181 schools of the total NASPAA membership of approximately 200.[7] The second set of data comes from a more in-depth survey of 79 of these schools, particularly those with the largest numbers of international students (herein referred to as the NASPAA-AID Program Survey). The third set of data comes from a survey of 377 graduate and undergraduate international students who attended NASPAA schools in all parts

of the country during 1983 (herein referred to as the NASPAA International Student Survey). The total number of international students reported in the 181 schools was 1,647; therefore, the sample of 377 represents about one-fourth of these international students.

Neither data set two nor data set three are "scientific" samples. The sample of 79 institutions are somewhat "self-selected" in that it represents the institutions who could be persuaded to respond. Special efforts were made to obtain responses from the schools with larger international student attendance and responses from nearly 100 percent of the top 10 schools are included. The sample of students was also to some extent "self-selected." Since the universe of students was not known, no sample could be drawn. Every school was asked (repeatedly) to urge its international students to complete the questionnaires, and some students from nearly every school in the country responded. The close congruence between the country representation in the sample and the country numbers reported by the 181 schools indicates that the sample is reasonably representative. Table 1 indicates that the largest proportion of students in both samples come from Nigeria; 8 of the 10 countries with international students in the program survey were in the top 10 of the student survey. It was commonly reported by schools that some students expressed concern about filling out the questionnaires fearing either reprisal from their schools or some other source if they were candid in their evaluations. This has led the research team to suspect that the sample does not contain the students most critical of their programs.

Table 1

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS IN NASPAA PROGRAMS
BY COUNTRY OF ORIGIN

Country	NASPAA General Program Survey (N = 1,647) (Percent)	NASPAA International Student Survey (N = 377) (Percent)
Nigeria	17	23
Taiwan	6	7
Saudi Arabia	4	4
Korea	4	6
Malaysia	3	6
Thailand	3	8
India	2	4
Iran	1	1
Japan	1	1
Sudan	1	1
Other	58	39
Total	100	100

The collection of the student survey data and the institutional sample was accomplished through a decentralized regional network.[8] Each regional coordinator contacted departmental or school representatives to insure participation. It was frequently learned that there was no institutional means for identifying who the international students are at an institution. This is a problem for which NASPAA may be able to suggest a solution: finding member schools with simple methods for identifying these students and disseminating the format to all member programs.

There are other sources of information on international students enrolled at U.S. institutions of which the research team made use. Primary among these is the annual report by the Institute of International Education. The institute's report indicates that public affairs programs gained approximately 500 students between the 1982-83 and 1983-84 academic years. The institute's findings provide additional validation for the NASPAA data on international students' countries of origin.[9] The already cited Absence of Decision also provides comparative information on how universities and colleges are responding to their international students.

International Students in NASPAA Programs

Diversity and Dispersion

The most significant generalization one can make about the distribution of international students across NASPAA programs is that it is unwise to generalize. Widespread diversity and dispersion is the rule.

As Table 2 indicates, 80 percent of the NASPAA programs responding to the questions about international students in their program report having at least one international student enrolled. Slightly over one-third of the programs (36 percent) report only one to four international students. Almost twenty percent report having at least 10 matriculating international students, and these programs account for over three-quarters (78 percent) of the international students reported in NASPAA programs. A small number of programs, 13, have 60 percent of the international students reflecting concentrations of students in schools well known to international clientele.

According to the NASPAA survey, international students are scattered in NASPAA schools throughout the various regions of the United States, although schools in the Northwest (2 percent) and the Southeast (5 percent) have the least international students. The largest number are in the West (about 25 percent), East (24 percent), and North (20 percent). The numbers in the first two regions reflect the presence of the two NASPAA schools with the largest numbers of international students, the University of Southern California in the West with 298 students and the University of Pittsburgh in the East with 170 students. In the West, a number of the California State University public administration programs each have 10 or so students also. In the Eastern region, there are several programs in addition to Pittsburgh with large concentrations of international students including New York University with 77, American University with 49 and SUNY, Albany with 39.

The distribution of international students across NASPAA programs is significant; the variety of countries represented is also considerable. As Table 1 reports the largest contingent comes from Nigeria, followed by Taiwan, Saudi Arabia, Korea, Malaysia, Thailand, and India. In the AID survey, the

Table 2

NUMBER OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS IN NASPAA SCHOOLS

Number of International Students in School	Number of Schools	Percentage of Schools	Number of International Students	Percentage of Students
No response	14	8	?	?
0	37	20	0	0
1 - 4	66	36	146	9
5 - 9	32	18	212	13
10 - 19	14	8	182	11
20 - 29	5	3	115	7
30 - 39	6	3	215	13
40 - 49	2	1	92	6
50 - 100	3	2	222	13
101 - 200	1	1	170	10
201 - 300	1	1	293	18
Total	181	100	1,647	100

Source: NASPAA General Program Survey

sample of 377 students includes individuals from 57 countries from Australia to Zaire. sote that no Latin American country is represented on the lists on Table 1. National diversity within individual NASPAA programs is also the rule. Pittsburgh reported 170 international students from 52 countries, Delaware 19 students from 10 countries, and Syracuse 14 students from 8 nations.

The diversity in country of origin also suggests differences in the level of development of the students' countries. Since a guiding interest of this research was a concern about development management, level of development seemed important in relation to student support, perceptions of curricular needs, and evaluation of programs. Therefore, an analysis of the student responses has been correlated with the level of development of the student's country. The Physical Quality of Life Index (PQLI), which consolidates three indicators--infant mortality, life expectancy at age one, and literacy--into a single composite index having a low of 0 and a high of 100, was utilized as the most useful indicator of level of development. Over 50 percent of the students in the sample came from the least-developed countries (LDCs), those with PQLI scores below 55. There are few students from the world's most-developed countries.[10]

The typical NASPAA program appears to have a handful of international students. These students are likely to come from a variety of less-developed countries. A small number of NASPAA programs are educating the majority of international students and these students have come also from the less-developed countries. Many NASPAA programs have been called on to educate international students but few have been chosen by large numbers.

Profile of International Students

The students in the sample are quite diverse, yet some common threads run through the descriptive information. The students are primarily from LDCs outside of Latin America. More than half are depending at least partially on their own and family funds to complete a U.S. degree program. This increases to two-thirds for the students from the least-developed areas of the Third World. Only one-third are sponsored by their governments, U.S. agencies or international organizations. Most are men. Less than a fourth of all the international students are women, and this decreases to 16 percent when counting just the Ph.D. students. The female doctoral students come primarily from South Asia and the Pacific Basin Regions.

While the origins of international students in NASPAA programs are diverse, and the geographical location of their program dispersed, their educational and career expectations are more uniform. For most of these students, their stay in the United States is a short stop in early or mid-career on the way to a top-level public management position in their home country. Much evidence supports this profile.

The response to the student survey indicated that 71 percent of the 377 respondents are in MPA programs; 19 percent are pursuing Ph.D.s; and only 10 percent are seeking Bachelor's degrees. Three-quarters of the students (73 percent) in the same survey do not report having attended a university or college in the U.S. prior to entering their current programs. Similarly, 70 percent have been in the U.S. for three years or less. Thus, the vast majority of students in NASPAA programs have had quite limited contact with the U.S. prior to their enrollment in their NASPAA program. Furthermore, 62 percent expect to leave the U.S. within two years. In short, international students

in NASPAA programs appear to be primarily short-term visitors, here for the first time, seeking an education before returning home to work. This is true, however, more for students from the most-developed countries; similarly, those from the LDC's are more likely to have been in the U.S. before.

Career expectations are reasonably high since they are based on previous work experience and the shortage of professionally educated personnel in the Third World. About a third (35 percent) expect to have a job in top management within five years. Two-thirds have had prior administrative work experience, and almost 22 percent had already worked as administrators for ten years or more. A very small number (6 percent) expect to pursue a career in teaching. The majority of Ph.D. students anticipate working in government or private consulting. Included in the student survey, for example, was a Principal Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of the Budget of a nation, and the Chief Personnel Officer of an African country's port authority.

It is clear that international students are strongly practitioner-goal oriented and most bring administrative experience to the classroom. The presence of these administratively knowledgeable students presents an opportunity for dynamic classroom discussion if their inherent comparative perspective is welcomed.

The emphasis on the MPA degree fits with the student profile of early to mid-career practitioners on their way to assuming more responsible administrative and policy making positions. There is minimal emphasis on obtaining doctoral degrees to bolster the teaching capacities of Third World universities. There appears to be a continuing assumption that practitioners from LDCs can be served by U.S. educational institutions.[11] At this point, self-sufficiency in public administration education is not being pursued, judging from U.S.

enrollments.

This section has answered some basic questions about who the international students are, where they are enrolled, where the students are from, and what their educational and occupational goals are. The next two sections focus on needs of international students and institutional delivery in two areas: (1) the formal program curriculum, and (2) support including financial, social and language services.

Formal Education of International Students

Focus of Study

The major focus of most of the international students in NASPAA programs is general public administration according to the student survey. Thirty percent of the respondents selected this alternative (Table 3). Another 12 percent selected human resource management/personnel, and the same percentage selected financial management. Thus, a majority of international students can be seen as focusing in the core areas of public administration.

Some international students emphasized development administration (14 percent). Others were more interested in policy analysis (12 percent) and planning (10 percent). The remaining 10 percent was scattered in areas like operations research, urban affairs, and functional emphases (e.g., health).

Expectedly, the major focus of international students is related to their immediate degree objective. Master students, who comprise the bulk of international students in NASPAA programs, were the most likely to report general public administration as their focus (Table 3). Ph.D. students were more

Table 3

FOCUS OF STUDY BY DEGREE OBJECTIVE

Focus of Study	Bachelors (N = 22) (Percent)	Masters (N = 204) (Percent)	Ph.D. (N = 47) (Percent)	Total (N = 273) (Percent)
General Public Administration	14	36	13	30
Development Administration	0	11	26	14
Financial Management	14	15	6	12
Human Resources	23	11	13	12
Policy Analysis	9	10	19	12
Planning	0	10	11	10
Other	40	7	12	10

Source: NASPAA International Student Survey

likely to report their focus as development administration or policy analysis. The few undergraduates surveyed were more likely to report human resources as their area of concentration.

Analyzing these responses by level of development, it was found that interest in policy analysis increases and development administration, human resources management/personnel, and financial management decrease with increasing levels of development (Table 4). The focus on planning also wanes somewhat as level of development increases. The interest in general public administration holds relatively steady across PQLI levels. Those from the most-developed countries are by far the most likely to select an area of focus not represented by this list (e.g., legal administration). Presumably, they are more likely to be shaping their own unique program.

Thus, while the focus of study of international students differs to some extent by level of development of country of origin and degree objective, core public administration appeals across the board. How these courses were evaluated by the students is the next topic of discussion.

Student Assessment of Courses

Steadily increasing enrollments of international students and the apparent continued reliance on U.S. institutions to educate career administrators are part of the overall pattern of contentment expressed by students in their detailed assessments of course offerings. Table 5 summarizes the results of the question concerning the utility of the courses.

Table 4

FOCUS OF STUDY BY LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT

Level of Development - Physical Quality of Life Index

Focus of Study	30- (N = 98) (Percent)	31-55 (N = 103) (Percent)	56-77 (N = 74) (Percent)	78-89 (N = 57) (Percent)	90+ (N = 33) (Percent)	Total (N = 365) (Percent)
General Public Administration	24	35	23	35	36	30
Development Administration	17	15	15	12	6	14
Financial Management	16	12	12	9	0	12
Human Resource Management/ Personnel	14	15	11	11	0	12
Policy Analysis	8	13	10	18	21	12
Planning	13	5	19	2	6	10
Functional Emphasis (e.g. health)	2	6	3	2	[illegible]	3
Operations Research	0	4	1	1		1
Urban Affairs	0	0	1	4	0	1
Research Methodology	0	0	0	2	0	0
Other	5	0	5	4	27	6

Source: NASPAA International Student Survey

On a scale of 1 to 5, 5 being most useful when they return home, the mean course score was 4. Planning courses were rated the highest in utility (4.4). Development administration (4.2) and human resource personnel courses (4.2) were also highly rated among those courses that many students had taken. Computer science and Management Information Systems (4.1) were highly rated but appreciably smaller numbers of students had taken a course in these areas. Operations research (3.8) and functional emphasis (3.8) courses were rated relatively poorly but here again few respondents had taken these. It is noteworthy that students elected to write in their preference for internships and field experiences (3.9) under "other".

Another perspective on course rating is provided by looking at the level of development (PQLI) of the students' home countries. Table 5 also includes these results. The immediate conclusion is that students from less-developed countries were more likely to rate courses highly. Whereas about 40 percent of those from the least-developed countries gave their course a "5", under 20 percent of those from the most-developed countries did this. It is unclear whether this difference relates to satisfaction, cultural attitudes about criticism, or a misunderstanding of the questionnaire instructions (i.e., how could 40 percent of courses be the "most" useful). Perhaps international students, especially from LDC's, were unwilling to be openly critical because of a perceived fear of reprisal.

It is clear that international students who responded to the NASPAA survey were quite positive about the courses taken to date. But how appropriate were the courses available to them?

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE CITING COURSE AS MOST USEFUL BY LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT

Course	Level of Development - Physical Quality of Life Index						Mean Usefulness Value (1=least 5=most)
	30- % (N)	31-55 % (N)	56-77 % (N)	78-89 % (N)	90+ % (N)	Total % (N)	
General Public Administration	37 (38)	43 (52)	33 (30)	29 (21)	14 (13)	36 (154)	3.95
Planning	43 (20)	52 (29)	50 (23)	70 (13)	33 (5)	52 (90)	4.42
Financial Management	50 (27)	29 (35)	55 (27)	19 (18)	0 (16)	38 (123)	4.12
Development Administration	58 (28)	39 (24)	44 (25)	70 (15)	20 (8)	49 (100)	4.20
Human Resource Management and Personnel	40 (35)	36 (56)	46 (37)	27 (27)	22 (14)	37 (169)	4.22
Policy Analysis	40 (32)	46 (32)	26 (27)	31 (20)	10 (17)	30 (128)	3.96
Research Methodology	44 (24)	44 (20)	42 (26)	13 (9)	20 (6)	36 (85)	4.14
Operations Research	67 (5)	33 (4)	33 (4)	33 (5)	0 (5)	31 (23)	3.77
Functional Emphasis (e.g. health)	0 (8)	63 (11)	38 (10)	25 (5)	22 (15)	31 (49)	3.79
Urban Affairs	17 (8)	33 (8)	30 (11)	25 (5)	0 (5)	23 (37)	3.99
Computer Science and MIS	100 (5)	100 (8)	91 (12)	100 (9)	78 (4)	96 (38)	4.12
Others (internships, field experiences)	78 (30)	86 (40)	83 (29)	87 (23)	1 (13)	82 (135)	3.93

Source: NASPAA International Student Survey

Development Related Topics

Students were asked to indicate which courses they had completed had covered any of a variety of development-related topics. This list of twelve topics, developed from the recent literature on development management, included: definitions of development, development economics, management of change, development project design, implementation, evaluation, and human resource development in LDC's.[12] Over 40 percent of the respondents indicated that none of the topics directly relevant to development had been covered in any course they had taken. The most frequently checked topic was development project design and the least checked was human resource development in LDC's. Only one-third (33 percent) had taken courses which made any reference to development project design and about one-fifth (18 percent) had been enrolled in courses which touched on human resource development in LDC's.

The lack of development topics is not a surprising finding given the small number of international students at most schools and the domestic focus of U.S. Public Administration. The question raised is the degree of export utility of these courses. The reported lack of development coverage appears to be at odds with the high ratings given these same courses especially by students from the least-developed countries. The responses to a follow-up question shed some light on these mixed results.

Students were asked in an open-ended question what topics they would like to see included in their curriculum that are not now present (Table 6). The two most frequently cited additions were development (33 percent) and comparative (28 percent) administration. International management was third. Development and comparative were even more frequently cited by students from the least-developed countries (over 40 percent for each topic). Students from

Table 6

TOPICS DESIRED IN PROGRAM BY LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT

Topic	Level of Development - Physical Quality of Life Index					
	30- (N = 78) (Percent)	31-55 (N = 74) (Percent)	56-77 (N = 54) (Percent)	78-89 (N = 46) (Percent)	90+ (N = 25) (Percent)	Total (N = 277) (Percent)
Development Focus	41	38	39	20	8	33
Comparative Focus	42	24	28	7	32	28
International Management	10	20	20	22	16	17
Finance	8	24	9	15	8	14
Personnel Administration	6	10	9	7	4	8
Economics	5	10	2	13	4	7
Computer Science	6	4	9	13	4	7
Functional Issues (e.g. health)	6	12	2	4	4	7
Area Specialization	8	5	6	11	0	7
Human Relations Emphasis	1	7	11	7	4	6
Urban Issues	8	0	24	5	1	4
American	4	3	2	0	16	4
Research	1	3	4	7	0	3
Other	6	4	6	13	16	8

Source: NASPAA International Student Survey

the more-developed countries were somewhat less interested in the subject of development but expressed as great an interest in comparative administration and international management. Interestingly, students were not parochial in their requests for greater coverage of international topics: There was little call for area specialization.

It is clear that the international students would like to focus more on how administration can be applied to their situations. Students express satisfaction with courses they have taken, but they see a need for including the international perspective bypassed by domestically oriented public administration.

Indeed, in response to a question about serious problems encountered in their educational programs, more students (29 percent) cited "difficulty in understanding or relating to American examples in classes" than English language or financial problems. Ethnocentricity of courses was also regarded by students (20 percent) as a serious problem. Europeans were more likely to write in this category as a complaint against lack of reference to other industrial models of development. Given the profile information that many of these students are experienced practitioners, their criticism should be seriously considered.

In the next section, institutional perspectives on enhancing international curriculum resources provide a useful comparison with the just discussed student course requests and assessments. What special offerings have NASPAA programs provided, and what obstacles exist to international curriculum development? The results of the NASPAA-AID institutional survey provide some answers.

Institutional Perspectives on Curricula Needs

An in-depth survey was taken of 79 NASPAA programs including those with the largest number of international students. The schools were asked whether or not they had undertaken an evaluation of their curriculum in the last five years in relation to the needs of students from developing countries. Of the 68 schools responding to this question, only 16 indicated that they had conducted such an evaluation. As a result of these evaluations, 6 programs decided to add more comparative and development issues, 4 decided to increase flexibility in international students' curricula, 2 added or required more English language training, and 4 made other adjustments.

The great majority of schools gave little attention to students from the developing world. According to the handful of schools that commented on this, 3 cited the small numbers of international enrollments and 2 mentioned student satisfaction. Follow-up phone contact and other survey data support the conclusion that these reasons represent the tacit responses of numerous NASPAA programs where no special attention has been given to internationally oriented curricula.

A question asking NASPAA programs what kinds of learning experiences were considered especially relevant for international students generated 47 responses. About a quarter of the schools felt that international or comparative classes (28 percent) and field experiences (25 percent) were most useful. Nineteen percent considered development administration classes most relevant and twenty five percent suggested other types of non-classroom experiences such as internships, work study, and cultural activities as the most important learning experiences. Thus, there was some congruence between the school

responses and the student responses. However, a much higher percentage of the students wanted development administration and believe it to be especially relevant. A significant number of international students also wrote in comments about how much they valued internships, opportunities to work in American organizations, and other field experiences.

Faculty Interests

The 79 schools were also questioned about the interests of their faculty in international studies. Fifty-two of 66 schools said that they had faculty members with significant special interest in less-developed countries. Of the 52 schools, 39 described these faculty interests. Twenty-five of the schools had at least one faculty member who had taught in an LDC. Twenty had one or more faculty members with an expressed interest in development administration, 18 had faculty with a comparative interest, and 16 had at least one faculty member with research experience in an LDC. (Note, several schools had faculty members with more than one interest.)

Forty schools (almost entirely the same schools) reported on the types of experiences their faculties had had in developing countries. One or more faculty members in 18 schools had done research in LDC's; in 17 schools, faculty members had either taught or done a Fulbright in an LDC; and in 12 faculty had served as consultants in developing countries. In only six of the responding schools had faculty members actually worked in a development project. The number of schools reporting faculty with LDC experience (40) is not insignificant since it is about 50 percent of the sample schools.

An additional question about faculty interests revealed some incongruence between student composition and faculty interest in geographical areas. Most reporting schools (N=42) have faculty with a Latin American (21) interest and the least (11) have faculty with a Middle East interest. Seventeen schools had faculty with African interests, and 15 with Asian. The largest contingents of students, however, are from Africa, the Middle East, and Asia, yet the faculty with overseas interest or experiences focus primarily on other geographical areas. This lack of correlation between faculty interests and students' countries of origin is not a major problem as long as comparative and development courses are offered and not area studies. However, problems may exist in coordinating faculty expertise and student research interests, but this is more likely to occur at the doctoral level.[13]

Conclusions

1. From the perspective of the students, the standard core Public Administration courses that they take are highly valued. The students are assuming a great degree of subject transferability since they rate the courses highly based on anticipated utility in their home countries. The students are, however, aware that their learning and, thus, content transferability would be heightened if more comparative, development, and international topics were presented. Indeed, the absence of any topics related to development in 40 percent of the courses that the students completed leads to the demand for inclusion of that emphasis in the curriculum.

It is up to specific programs and their students to decide whether to integrate international topics into each course or to focus coverage in a handful of elective courses. The internationalists among us argue that all public administration students should be exposed to international subjects.[14] However, the tradeoff is less time for domestic subjects, and the glut of U.S. issues makes internationalization of the curriculum an unlikely prospect.

2. For the most part, NASPAA member programs report not having evaluated their curricula in relation to the needs of students from developing countries. Survey data indicate that small concentrations of international students and apparent student satisfaction have minimized the need for program assessments. The 16 schools that did conduct assessments tend to have visible concentrations of international students, and these schools did make program changes.

3. It is clear that there is a high incidence of faculty interest in international topics in schools with significant international student populations. Little is explicitly known about schools not responding to or not included in the in-depth institutional survey. However, follow-up phone contact to all schools frequently revealed at least one faculty member per program who has a special interest in comparative or development administration. The implication is that individual programs may be better staffed to mount courses in these areas than survey responses indicate.

4. Finally, how does information analyzed up to this point mesh with the process model of problem identification, policy formulation and response? First, international student profiles have been developed and students' curricula needs have been analyzed. These students have requested better coverage of international topics, but in most cases the students are not concentrated

in sufficiently great numbers to warrant program response. Indeed, in most programs international students cannot be considered a clearly definable clientele.

Therefore, a policy response appears unlikely for most programs. Response to curriculum needs will take place in Public Administration programs where students have attained visibility. An alternative is for NASPAA to explore means for a concerted response tailored to the decentralization issue. It would then be up to individual programs to draw upon NASPAA suggestions, generated by innovative programs, to fit their particular needs and resource base.

Students' Extracurricular Needs and Institutional Support Services

The formal curriculum serves as the focus of interest to many faculty and administrators, but the "hidden curriculum" and support services are also very important. The hidden curriculum includes those things that students learn outside of the formal program of study; supportive services are necessary for students to exist and devote time to the formal curriculum. The importance of extracurricular experiences to international students is indicated by more choosing "living in another country" (36 percent) over course work (31 percent) as the more valuable learning experience. A Venezuelan student best exemplified the feeling of international students by stating "the education has been important" but "in my opinion the simple fact to be in contact with another culture, another way to do things, will help me when I return..."[15]

International students cannot take social norms, language or even the value of their currency as "givens." Daily problems are magnified for them. While their problems are similar to those of domestic students, the frequent absence of alternative courses of action open to them makes the university their principal source for problem solving. Thus, from the perspective of the international student, the university they enroll in is the major support system for their stay in the U.S.

Problems with Extracurricular Experiences in the United States

While respondents in the sample report that their courses have been quite useful, they also report that they have faced many problems as they have worked to obtain their degrees. In fact, almost every respondent (94 percent) reported at least one "most serious problem or disappointment" in their program experience (Table 7). Each of the potential problems listed in the questionnaire were cited by about one-quarter of the respondents. These included financial problems, lack of social contact with Americans, difficulty in English, time pressure in exams, and difficulty in understanding American examples in class. Problems of ethnocentrism, discrimination, and alienation were cited as additional problems by the respondents. In the following discussion, extracurricular problems are discussed in order of their frequency of citation.

1. Financial Support

Twenty-eight percent of the students cited financial support as a serious problem. Not surprisingly, a greater number of students from LDCs (43 percent) indicated that this is a problem for them. These findings reflect difficulties of means of support--depending on families or governments, variable

Table 7

PROBLEMS CITED BY STUDENTS
BY LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT

Problem	Level of Development - Physical Quality of Life Index					
	30- (N = 90) (Percent)	31-55 (N = 100) (Percent)	56-77 (N = 70) (Percent)	78-89 (N = 57) (Percent)	90+ (N = 38) (Percent)	Total (N = 352) (Percent)
Difficulty with American Examples	21	28	34	46	17	29
Financial	43	26	20	28	11	28
Lack of Social Contact with Americans	23	32	27	23	0	24
Difficulty in English	8	17	27	49	26	23
Time Pressures in Exams	21	21	19	28	17	21
Ethnocentricity*	10	14	7	2	20	20
Discrimination	27	13	7	0	3	12
Alienation	11	11	7	2	3	8
Other*	11	16	11	5	26	13
One or more Problems Cited	92	96	93	96	88	94

*Not listed as alternative in questionnaire.

Source: NASPAA International Student Survey

exchange rates, working while in school and difficulties in finding a job in a foreign culture.

That this is the most frequently cited problem should indicate that not all students are supported by oil exporting nations or by wealthy families.

One-third (33 percent) of the students overall are sponsored by their home government. Although only 21 percent of the least-developed country students are home government sponsored, a few are being assisted by the U.S., international or private foundation sources. The single most important source of support for the majority of students (57 percent) is family or personal funds (thus the need to work) (Table 8).

The findings of the high percentage of the students, particularly those from the least-developed countries (with PQLI's 30 or below), who are coming here with primary financial support from self or family is one of the most startling findings. A very small percentage (only 1 percent) of those students receive aid from international organizations and only 10 percent are aided by the U.S. government. The fact that only 21 percent of those are helped by their own governments is not surprising since some of their governments are among the poorest in the world.

The lack of sponsorship by U.S. AID sources and international organizations is important for schools of public administration. The AID offices are now emphasizing the importance of management skills as essential for development, yet they are not financing students to attend public administration degree programs in the United States. The explanation for this change from some years ago apparently reflects decisions on the part of AID offices to do more short-term training programs, more third country training or education,

Table 8

STUDENT SPONSORSHIP BY LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT

Source of Funds*	Level of Development - Physical Quality of Life Index					
	30- (N = 96) (Percent)	31-55 (N = 103) (Percent)	56-77 (N = 74) (Percent)	78-89 (N = 60) (Percent)	90+ (N = 35) (Percent)	Total (Percent)
Family or Personal	65	42	46	73	71	57
Home Government	21	46	35	17	40	33
University in U.S.	7	12	20	17	23	14
U.S. Government	10	9	7	7	3	8
International Organization	1	3	7	0	9	3
Foundation	0	0	3	0	0	1
Other	7	6	4	5	3	5

*Respondents were permitted to select more than one alternative.

Source: NASPAA International Student Survey

and to focus some resources on developing the countries' own capabilities in public management education. These alternative strategies result partly from the high cost of education in the United States and frustration with the expert drain to the U.S. once students have received degrees here.

Students from the more developed countries are more likely to be sponsored by American universities. A substantial number are receiving university financial aid. As the PQLI index of a student's home country increases, the likelihood of university support increases. For example, while 7 percent of those in the lowest PQLI index are aided by the university, 23 percent of those in the highest category are aided. U.S. government funding somewhat offsets this tendency. Our government is more likely to fund students from the less-developed countries.

For a number of reasons, the financial problems cited here are especially troubling. First, international students, unlike domestic students, are limited in their range of choices and possible types of support. They are ineligible for federal Public Service Fellowships, numerous financial aid and scholarship programs, cannot pay in-state tuition at state schools, and often have visa restrictions prohibiting work for pay.

Second, it appears that American universities are less likely to help those international students most in need. Nor does it appear that our merit as opposed to need-based allocation rules in public service graduate schools are offset by federal assistance. It may be that American universities are providing aid to international students on the basis of merit, but that merit is measured by means which result in aid allocated to those most like us, i.e., from more developed countries. This may be wise policy for any single

institution, but not for our nation since it ignores avowed goals of developing human resources in the poorest countries.

Finally, the risk of NASPAA programs' providing funding to international students is highlighted by the finding that one-third are dependent upon their home government. Since about 20 percent of the international students in NASPAA programs are from Nigeria, which has stopped the flow of funds to the U.S., a current (and perhaps future) problem of major proportions is evident. The problem is especially acute for programs which have put all their eggs in one nation's basket.

2. Lack of Social Contact with Americans

There are difficulties with entering a foreign culture in the best of circumstances. For many students social interaction is further impeded by language difficulties and economic status (as well as race). Again, there was a significant difference among the students who reported this problem: 23 percent of the students from the lowest PQLI nations cited it while none from the most developed countries found this a problem. Overall lack of social contact with Americans was cited by 24 percent of all responding students making it the second most common extracurricular problem.

In response to different survey questions about curriculum, students specifically requested internships as a means of learning about U.S. Public Administration--the work experience making U.S. classroom examples more understandable. Programs may well consider the value of internships to international students. Not only do they bridge classroom and experiential learning, but they provide an introduction to U.S. socio-technical systems and work place cultures. Ordinarily, we make friends at our jobs. The same

possibilities for social interaction become available to international students in internships. Unfortunately, those very things that an international student would benefit from in an internship are the same things that often prevent him/her from being placed: language, culture and work place familiarity.

Finally, schools may want to consider the function being provided by international student centers. Are they presently organized to provide welcome activities for these students, or do they act as a hindrance to students intermingling more with their American counterparts? This may be an unpopular question, but it is necessary to ask if opportunities for social interaction are to be enhanced.

3. Difficulty with English

Nearly as many international students (23 percent) reported this problem as the prior one. What differentiates this problem from all the others is that it is likely the most immediately solvable. Certainly, it is the one thing about which university instructors are quickest to complain.

It is the students from the more developed countries who are much more likely to report language difficulties. These students are frequently Asian and less likely to be from former colonies where English was the language of instruction. Categorizing students by the language base used in education in their home country or by geographic area offers a different perspective from which to examine the problems experienced by international students (Table 9). For example, the Greco-Latins in the sample were most concerned with language as evidence by their concerns about English difficulty and time pressures on exams. (In fact, almost all of those concerned about English were those with

Table 9

PROBLEMS CITED BY STUDENTS
BY LANGUAGE BACKGROUND

Problem	Language Base or Continent				
	Euro-American (Percent)	Greco-Latin (Percent)	Middle East (Percent)	Asiatic (Percent)	African other than Francophone (Percent)
Lack of Social Contact with Americans	0	8	39	26	27
Difficulty in English	7	50	31	34	4
Time Pressures in Exams	14	36	23	19	22
Difficulty with American Examples	21	21	31	38	22
Ethnocentricity*	29	0	4	10	11
Discrimination	0	0	15	5	28
Alienation	7	7	12	5	14
One or more Problems Cited	86	100	100	94	91

*Not listed as alternative in questionnaire.

Source: NASPAA International Student Survey

Greco-Latin, Arabic-Persian, or Asian language bases.)

Many of the problems cited such as social interaction and language are interrelated as is pointed out by a Japanese student who wrote, "Some Americans are very kind, but generally speaking, Americans don't seem to like talking with non-native English speakers."

4. Diverse Problems

Among other life experience problems mentioned by students were discrimination (12 percent) and alienation (8 percent). There was a sharp difference between the reporting of discrimination as a problem by high and low PQLI country students. While only 3 percent of those in the highest PQLI category reported discrimination as a problem, 27 percent of those in the lowest PQLI category raised this issue (reflecting the color basis of this discrimination). One student was disappointed that "discrimination from some of the American professors toward foreign students" exists in "the country of democracy." Also, students from the least-developed countries were considerably more likely to complain of alienation.

It can be argued that when international students discuss their problems, they are evaluating a broader "life in the U.S." experience than when their domestic classmates discuss school related problems. The major difference here is the array of alternatives available to domestic students who are encountering difficulties with school, housing or finances. This is not to say that all international students have more serious problems than U.S. students, rather that they have fewer recourses. Indeed, the university is their primary means for ameliorating problems once they are in the U.S. Since international students value their experiences in this country as much as

their formal programs of study, their citation particularly of social problems such as discrimination should give us major cause for alarm.

Institutional Support Services and Activities

The previous discussion indicated that international students in NASPAA programs report experiencing a variety of problems. To determine what NASPAA programs are doing to solve such problems, reference is made to the general NASPAA survey (N=181) and the NASPAA-AID survey of programs with international students (N=79). It was not presumed that services would be organized in response to students' problems since such problems may not yet be identified.

When the analysis was conducted, 181 schools had answered the NASPAA survey. Of these, 37 had no foreign students. Of the remaining 144 schools, 50 did not answer the question asking about specific special services for international students. It is assumed that either these special international services did not exist either on the campus or in the NASPAA program, or the respondent did not know.

Consistent with other survey findings, the common precondition for special services was the existence of a critical mass of international students. Generally, as the number of these students increased so did service levels. Table 10 correlates the types of services offered with the number of students in a program.

1. English Language Instruction

Table 10 indicates that 10 of the 11 schools with the most international students have special English language programs. In the 10 to 15 and less than 4 international student categories, only 33 percent and 40 percent respectively had special English language offerings. Since one of the most usual complaints of professors about international students is lack of English facility, and since many students cited English as a special problem, this is clearly an area that needs attention in a large percentage of the schools.

2. Special Advisory Services

Table 10 also reports that the schools with the most international students are apt to have special advisory arrangements. As could be expected, a smaller percentage of schools with less than 15 international students and with only 5 to 9 international students have such special arrangements.

Perhaps the second most common complaint of instructors and program advisors is that international students frequently request program waivers during their last semester. They are usually on a fixed stay of short duration (frequently 2 years) and are under pressure to complete the degree requirements in this period. This period of study does not include a semester of remedial courses. Students are assumed to be proficient in English. The problem of time becomes exacerbated if students have been uninformed about program requirements or if they have misunderstood requirements. Eleventh hour appeals are made to faculty and administrators to assist them in graduating on time. Assigning international students to advisers who are familiar with their particular problems could prevent such requests for final semester waivers.

Table 10

SPECIAL SERVICES FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS
BY NUMBER OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS IN NASPAA PROGRAM

Number of International Students in Program (Number of Programs)	Special Services Offered			
	English Language (Percent)	Special Advisory (Percent)	International Student Center (Percent)	Other Services (Percent)
Less than 5 (47)	40	45	42	48
5 through 9 (22)	82	68	68	77
10 through 15 (9)	33	44	56	60
16 through 25 (5)	80	100	80	67
26 through 50 (7)	86	71	71	71
Over 50 (4)	100	100	100	100
Programs responding to the question on services (N = 94)	57%	57%	56%	61%
Programs responding to the overall survey (N = 181)	30%	30%	29%	34%

Source: NASPAA General Program Survey

3. International Student Centers

A surprisingly large percentage of the schools have international student centers on the campus. This most likely reflects the large numbers of international students in other disciplines (e.g., business and engineering). Few departments or schools of public affairs or administration have their own centers. These centers act as a positive resource as long as they do not create an insular social group blocking interaction with domestic students.

4. Additional Findings

A more in-depth survey was taken of a sample of 79 of the NASPAA programs with the largest numbers of international students. Of the 68 valid answers on a related question about special treatment for international students, the responses indicate that in just over half the schools (53 percent) international students are given no special treatment. A quarter (24 percent) of the programs have special English language programs and about 10 percent have other student services.

Conclusions

The importance of the hidden curriculum and support services has been explored. The support services provided by universities, both administrative and social, are part of students' U.S. learning experiences. Financial services, academic advising, housing and part-time job opportunities, social and cultural events constitute significant elements of international students' experiential learning. Universities are not solely responsible for providing satisfactory experiences in each of these areas, but they are seen as the

primary provider and problem solver by many international students.

Improving the quality of university life for international students does not necessitate the investment of additional resources. It may only require recognition of needs, policy articulation, and the reorganization of existing resources. Since recognition of needs is less likely where there are small to medium enrollments of international students, the following conclusions are made mindful of low enrollment situations.

1. The objectives of universities' financial aid programs require examination. If there is interest in assisting students from the poorest countries, financial awards will have to be shifted from students coming from more developed nations or from domestic students. PQLI measures such as the one used in the NASPAA survey of international students could be used to identify potential recipients by country. Then standard financial aid criteria can be applied to determine those individuals most in need of assistance.

Since the majority of students rely on personal and family income as their primary means of support, U.S. and international aid organizations can play a key role in permitting students from low income families to attend U.S. programs.[16] Universities can assist in the process by identifying international students who require financial assistance and by linking them with agency representatives.

2. Improving conditions and opportunities for social interaction between international students and Americans is much less controllable by academic institutions. Complaints of lack of interaction, alienation, and discrimination reflect students' encounters with the environment at large. The widespread existence of international student centers can be seen as an

institutional response more to reduce problems of alienation than to increase the level of interaction with domestic students. U.S. students do not frequent international student centers.

Imaginative responses to ameliorating social interaction and experiential learning warrant NASPAA's attention so ideas can be widely disseminated. Rethinking the role of internships and viewing them as socio-technical experiences is one approach. Students highly rated internships and other types of field experiences (Table 5).

3. English language proficiency, a major factor in classroom learning and social acceptance, is the most manageable problem addressed in this section. It is surprising, then, that programs are not better organized to resolve English language problems. As with other non-program issues, it is not limited only to public administration departments.

English composition, English as a second language, or study skills courses exist at the smallest universities. Public administration departments can make their requirements known to insure that English language proficiency testing and remedial courses are offered each semester.

4. Academic advising and other forms of international student counseling are also served by traditional university delivery systems. Designating a special program advisor need not go beyond present resource availability. A faculty member with an international orientation may be available to act as advisor to international students. If a departmental special advisor is impractical, the department chair can seek arrangements with the university office responsible for international student services.

It is recognized that departments and universities have considerably less influence over the extracurricular experiences of their students than they do over program instruction. Yet, as the discussion above indicates, there are areas where institutions have underemphasized their influence. Generally, this situation exists because NASPAA member institutions have infrequently examined international student service needs.

It can be said that many NASPAA programs have responded, at least in a rudimentary way, to the challenge of educating international students. A majority of NASPAA programs with large concentrations of international students (i.e., more than 15) have reported that they or their schools provide English language services, special advisory services, International Student Centers, and other support services. However, it was also found that many NASPAA programs report providing no special services for international students. About half of those programs with international students appear to lack basic services for this clientele.

Departments of Public Affairs and Administration and universities can play a more constructive role in improving the stay of international students if they examine the attitudes toward international visitors in their own spheres of influence. Are faculty members and administrators aware of the unique position of international students, and are they oriented toward responding to their different needs? For example, efforts to check discrimination against international students could be initiated in the university's housing and personnel offices. If these measures are not costly nor particularly difficult to arrange, why do not more programs insure that some of their support services are attuned to international student needs?

Obstacles to Responsiveness

The surveys have indicated that some NASPAA programs have responded to their international student clientele and others have not. Ir this section, speculation is made as to why some programs respond and what obstacles inhibit others. The basic process model that was introduced earlier in this paper is useful in analyzing key obstacles to NASPAA institutions' responsiveness. First, there is problem recognition; this is followed by policy definition; and finally, specific actions are taken at program and university levels.

The Threshold Effect and Problem Recognition

Problem recognition is tied to the threshold effect. Table 10 suggests that programs with at least 16 international students are more likely than programs with less students to provide special services to this clientele at their schools. In fact, almost all programs with more than 16 international students have an int ⁻national student center and English as a second language program at their campuses. No relation between international student programs and number of the international students appears to exist below this level, however. This finding is consistent with Goodwin and Nacht's conclusion that

> knowledge and interest in the issue is significant only when the percentage of foreign students within particular departments or schools is in excess of 15 to 20 percent of the student body.[17]

Few programs with less than 16 international students are providing appropriate special services. The data collection telephone calls indicated that many NASPAA programs, large and small, had no idea how many international students they had. The "invisibility" of these students leads to a lack of consciousness concerning them. Faculty and administrators do not know their needs or

preferences; i.e., they do not recognize or understand this clientele group.

Although there are approximately 1,700 international students in NASPAA programs (approaching 10 percent of enrollments), about half of these students are concentrated in a dozen schools. The other half are scattered in small numbers (less than 15) throughout all other schools. Thus, the cumulative population is significant, but the institutional concentration is limited. It is difficult for schools to initiate policy where small groups of students are concerned.

Absence of Decision

NASPAA programs may not want to treat international students as a special clientele to which they should respond. Many faculty and administrators feel that the principle of equality should be followed--all students should be treated the same. American examples, no help in social interaction, examinations with rigid time limits, and other traditional approaches to education may be a policy of equity with unequal results. This is because educational programs and support services are fashioned to serve a domestic clientele and special tailoring is rarely considered. Goodwin and Nacht found that state institutions are more likely to follow this egalitarian model, and variation from it meets opposition from the state legislature and trustees.[18]

Goodwin and Nacht, however, have recently argued that American universities have not responded to international students not because of a conscious rejection of a policy of response, but rather because they have made no conscious decision--there is an "absence of decision."

> Most college and university officials with whom we met place the foreign student low on their list of priorities...
>
> With some notable counter examples, most institutions have not thought through in much detail the economic, educational, political, and organizational issues associated with the presence of large numbers of foreign students on their campuses.[19]

These statements appear to be true for almost all NASPAA schools.

Resources for Policy Implementation

Perhaps many NASPAA programs recognize the need to respond to their international student clientele but lack the resources to affect program and service modifications. Even where policy has been developed, resource shifts, at a minimum, are required. Assigning faculty to teach possibly low enrolled international courses, for example, may be considered an expensive use of personnel. The same holds true to hiring faculty with research interests reflecting students' countries of origin or in assigning special faculty advisers. Economies of scale justifying application of program resources, it may be argued, are only achievable in schools with large concentrations of international students.

Another resource problem exists in the financial aid area. It was found that two-thirds of the international students require family or personal funds to attend school and that the majority of students were from the less-developed and therefore poorer countries. Simply put, many international students need financial aid from NASPAA schools. Yet, many of the major sources of financial aid for NASPAA school students are closed or not as appropriate

for international students. They are ineligible for Title IX Public Service Fellowships and not as likely to be qualified or sought after for teaching, research, or public service assistantships.

Furthermore, the diversity of students makes blanket responses difficult. Almost all schools which have international students have few students from a single country. Variety is the rule.

The use of the process model reveals how policy development can be hamstrung at any phase. This, in itself, is a strong argument for casting institutional responsiveness in terms of a policy process approach. Obstacles can be anticipated and alternative policy approaches considered. Furthermore, the development of institutional-wide policy facilitates the coordination of ancillary services in support of the core educational program. As mentioned in the previous section, English language training as well as social, recreational, and financial aid opportunities are services delivered at the university level.

Where it is difficult to respond to clientele need due to insufficient concentrations of international students, the response must be developed at regional and national levels. This is particularly the case with models guiding international curriculum development and international student services. In conclusion, a number of suggestions are offered for developing policy and specific responses to assist international students attending NASPAA member programs.

Recommendations for Meeting International Student Needs

Action recommendations are derived from our application of the process model. The objectives are: (1) increased recognition and understanding of international students by NASPAA programs, (2) conscious policies to respond to their needs, and (3) the mobilization of resources to carry out appropriate policies.

Recognition

If the initial stage in policy formulation is problem identification, then the NASPAA surveys represent a first step. International students have been profiled along with their evaluations of U.S. educational experiences. Data has also been collected on the resources NASPAA programs can direct toward this international clientele. This is the beginning of a data base. Information is still needed from schools who have not participated in the surveys, and student profiles need to be updated periodically and expanded to include a greater percentage of this clientele group. Basic information on international students was difficult to gather at many schools. Programs require suggestions on how to facilitate international student identification. Briefer, standardized surveys are necessary at the national level. Standardization would assist in longitudinal analysis of international student population trends including shifts in university enrollments and countries of origin.

An immediate result of this research effort was the inclusion of the questions on international students and related NASPAA services in the biennial NASPAA program survey for the NASPAA directory. This should make NASPAA programs more conscious about their international students. But the diversity of international students in NASPAA programs suggest that much of the effort in this area must rest with the individual program.

Schools should recognize and think about the three principal problems reported by the students: financial problems, discrimination and social interaction problems, and problems with the ethnocentricity of class offerings. What sources of funding are available to international students and what is the adequacy of these funds? How conscious and concerned are universities about community discrimination against international students in the local housing market, and what can universities do to foster cross-cultural interaction? To what extent is the curriculum based solely on American experiences?

Almost all of the students reported that extra curricular experiences were among their most important learning experiences, particularly opportunities to do internships and otherwise work in American government organizations. Special attention to facilitating these experiences for international students would certainly be useful. Since these opportunities are a function of the attitudes of practicing administrators, encouraging participation in and by ASPA and other professional groups would be helpful.

Policy Development: A Concerted Response

Many of the NASPAA schools have not responded to the particular problems of international students in their programs because they represent such a small percentage of their total students. But the absence of decisions by NASPAA schools seems less and less defensible as the numbers of international students in NASPAA programs grow.

However, for the near term, the threshold effect will continue to work against the majority of NASPAA programs from assuming the initiative in policy development. Thus, it is recommended that NASPAA, through its Standards Committee and Peer Review Committee, develop guidelines for its member programs. Standards could be set for English language admission requirements, financial aid procedures, and curriculum development. The task is not one of developing policy anew but rather of reviewing policies developed by individual schools. Also, NASPAA may find that some of these concerns have already been addressed by the Institute of International Education, the Commission on International Education, and similarly attuned organizations.

ASPA and its Section on International and Comparative Administration (SICA) and Public Administration Education could also be valuable participants in the policy development process. National and regional ASPA conferences are appropriate forums for the discussion of the issues outlined in this paper.

The level of NASPAA activity on guidelines and the frequency of ASPA conference exchanges will be directly influenced by the amount of interest shown by public administration programs. Those with median range enrollments--5 to 29 international students--constitute almost a third of the NASPAA membership. An even greater number of schools have less than five

international students. The support of schools in both categories may be enlisted if they see this clientele as steadily increasing, and if they view guidelines as assisting them in formulating realistic and achievable policies. Recent reports by the Institute of International Education indicate that international enrollments will continue to grow through the year 2000.[20]

Individual programs do need to realize that there are beneficial reasons for being more responsive to international students. Enrollments are an important consideration, and nationally these students now represent between 8 percent and 10 percent of all NASPAA program students. However, since almost all international students are full-time students while only about one-third of NASPAA students are, perhaps as many as 20-25 percent of full-time NASPAA students are international students. These enrollments are likely to grow if programs are responsive to this clientele group. Instructors can benefit if English language preparation is more effective in easing classroom communication. Program directors could be aided by guidelines for advisory services so that eleventh hour requests for program changes are minimized. Finally, there is the not insignificant appeal that programs may graduate Third World and other international students better able to administer in their home country environments.

Resource Development and Dissemination

NASPAA Activities

NASPAA can aid these schools and individual faculty members who wish help in improving offerings for international students by finding ways to disseminate more actively the results of the work being carried on under the AID-NASPAA agreement. Faculty members as well as deans and directors need to

know about the bibliographies being prepared and the consulting and other international activities being funded. Ways must be found to broaden the circle of faculty members who are given the opportunity to participate in overseas consulting assignments. Many are extremely knowledgeable in substantive management areas. The problem, of course, is how faculty who have not worked overseas before can get that "first experience." Perhaps funding could be sought to send "understudy" faculty along with more experienced consultants on jobs in developing countries so that the number of faculty with relevant experience can widen. After such experiences, classroom offerings will be enriched for both domestic and international students and treatment of international students is bound to change. Real thought must be given to how to enlarge the cadre of internationally experienced faculty both male and female.

NASPAA also could set up some direct curricular development activities. Short workshops for faculty members who wish to enrich their classes with more international and development management content could be organized and funded. NASPAA has recently funded a project to collect course syllabi in international development and comparative administration. The purpose of the project is to stimulate innovative approaches to teaching these topics.[21]

NASPAA might also consider sponsoring a summer institute workshop for international students (perhaps jointly with faculty) where the emphasis would be entirely on development management problems. This could be in Washington and, as one of the members of the team suggested, be built along the lines of the FEMA model. There are numerous consultants and government representatives in Washington who are exceptionally knowledgeable about development problems who could staff such an institute. This institute could supplement the curricular offerings for international students in those schools where their few

numbers makes it difficult for the schools to provide sufficient focus on development management questions.

A special issue of PAR might be devoted to development management and articles by LDC administrators who are graduates of NASPAA programs. The appropriate editor and funding could be sought for such an effort to probe the many issues surrounding the particular nexus of development management needs and U.S. program offerings.

The International Committee could prepare a small handbook for the NASPAA member schools outlining some of the special problems of international students and providing an exchange about how these problems have been met in other schools. Suggestions could be included for dealing with English language problems, special counseling, extra-curricular services and what can best be done at the school level and what at the University level.

Program Activities

Programs can develop specific measures suitable to program size and student needs. There are at least three areas that programs may wish to explore.

First, programs with small enrollments of international students may consider alternative ways to balance student-teacher ratios in international course offerings. Joint offerings with international relations, anthropology, geography, or sector oriented departments--public health, business, and criminal justice administration--may have a broader appeal and attract more students. Also, it is important to remember that not only international students take courses on international topics. Domestic students in private and public management and agricultural science may have vocationally related reasons for

taking at least one international course. Another alternative is for a faculty member interested in the international area to offer directed studies to serve limited numbers of interested students.

Second, programs with no resident faculty interested in international subjects could occasionally invite a visiting professor or practitioner to lecture on comparative and development topics. Faculty on sabbaticals and administrators from international aid organizations--public, private, or non-profit--may be available under special arrangements. Where students are spread throughout a state, arrangements could be made to offer centrally located summer programs or between-semester intensive courses. NASPAA regions, ASPA chapters, and state associations of colleges are examples of co-sponsoring organizations for sharing a visiting lecturer on international subjects.

Third, program directors and faculty advisors could inventory the university services oriented toward international students and make recommendations for responsing to unmet extracurricular needs. Does the university have an office of international student affairs experienced at resolving visa and other frequently encountered problems? Does the English department have instructors skilled in teaching English as a second language, and are there tutors available for additional help? Are the university's social activities planned to facilitate interaction with domestic students or are international students either ignored or segregated? These queries can be extended to other university services such as housing and job finder offices.

Of these three program recommendations, only the hiring of a visiting lecturer requires an expenditure of additional resources. All require a commitment of time and overhead.

All these actions are possible; the questions that must now be faced are how much responsibility does NASPAA and its member programs want to assume, and to what extent will resources be applied to assist international students' education in NASPAA programs?

Footnotes

1. "International Students Studying in the U.S." Higher Education & National Affairs, American Council on Education, Vol. 34, No. 1, January 1985, p. 3.

2. Crawford D. Goodwin and Michael Nacht, Absence of Decision: Foreign Students in American Colleges and Universities (New York: Institute of International Education, 1988).

3. The International Committee of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration especially thanks Wendell Schaeffer and Rudi Klauss of NASPAA for encouragement of the research and Jean Sonner of NASPAA for cheerful logistical support. The Committee also wishes to thank the NASPAA member schools and their deans, directors, and faculty for their industry and patience in answering difficult questions. Appreciation is also extended to the international students who spent important time away from their school work to complete lengthy questionnaires.

4. "Enrollment Declines in Graduate P.A. Schools," PA Times: Educational Supplement 7, No. 21 (November 1, 1984), 1. NASPAA reported a decline of 3,568 students in member programs from 1981 to 1983.

5. Malcolm G. Scully, "Foreign Students Coming to the U.S. at Slower Rate," and "Fact File: Foreign Students in U.S. Institutions, 1983-84," Chronicle of Higher Education (September 5, 1984), 1, pp. 11-22.

6. World Bank, World Development Report 1982 (Washington, D.C.: Oxford University Press for the World Bank, 1982). For the management training

response to these problems see, Samuel Paul, Training for Public Administration and Management in Developing Countries: A Review, World Bank Staff Working Papers No. 584, Management and Development Series No. 11 (Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 1988).

7. NASPAA Program Directory 1984 (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, 1984).

8. The U.S. was divided into seven regions for data collection: North, East, Midwest, Southwest, South, West, and Northwest. In addition to the authors of this paper, research team members included Professors Ed Connerly of Eastern Washington University (on leave with USAID Washington), E. Philip Morgan of Indiana University, Myung Park of Florida International University (on leave at Chungang University, Seoul, Korea), and Richard Vengroff of Texas Tech University (on leave in Senegal).

9. See Scully, and "Fact File" cited above. Seven of the top ten countries of origin reported by the institute appear in Table 1 of this study.

10. For a discussion of the PQLI see James P. Grant, Disparity Reduction Rates in Social Indicators (Washington, D.C.: Overseas Development Council, 1978); and Martin M. Mc Laughlin and Staff of ODC, The United States and World Development, Agenda 1979 (Washington, D.C.: Praeger Publishers for the Overseas Development Council, 1979).

11. The international student population of the U.S. (338,894) continues to be much larger than that of any other country. "Foreign Student Enrollment Declines," PA Times: Educational Supplement 7, No. 21 (November 1, 1984), 10.

12. The complete list of development-related topics is: 1. definitions of development; 2. development economics; 3. development as social transformation rather than merely growth and infrastructure creation; 4. dependency theory and development; 5. development project design, implementation, and evaluation; 6. management of change in a developing country context; 7. cultural and historical constraints on administrative change; 8. problems of technology transfer and adaptation; 9. public enterprise management; 10. project management; 11. popular participation in development planning and implementation; and 12. human resource development in LDCs. Two useful bibliographic sources on these topics are Elisabeth Shields, Social Development Management: An Annotated Bibliography (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, 1982); and Jon R. Moris' insightful book, Managing Induced Rural Development (Bloomington, IN: International Development Institute, Indiana University, 1981).

13. Responses to a final question indicated that 19 of the 79 responding schools have specialized non-degree programs for international students. These are either short-term special functional focus programs or longer term (up to one year) programs with either a development or special management sector focus.

14. Commission on International Education, "What We Don't Know Can Hurt Us: The Shortfall in International Competence" (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1984).

15. NASPAA International Student Survey, 1983-84.

16. On June 14, 1984 a bill was introduced in the U.S. Senate (S. 2768) pro-

viding for an undergraduate scholarship program for students of limited financial means from developing countries. Loans or grants would be made available through the U.S. Information Agency, and public administration was one of the educational fields emphasized in the bill as being critical to Third World development. NASPAA and its member schools may want to consider a lobbying effort in support of this bill.

17. Goodwin and Nacht, p. 40.

18. Goodwin and Nacht, pp. 5-7.

19. Goodwin and Nacht, p. 40.

20. Scully, cited above; and Open Doors 1983-84 (New York: Institute of International Education, 1984). While growth is not as rapid as in the late 1970s, the Institute of International Education reports an increase of international students in public affairs programs from 2,580 (1982-83) to 3,040 (1983-84).

21. For further information about this project, contact Richard Ryan, San Diego State University--Imperial Valley Campus, Calexico, CA 92231.