

The Role of Land Grant Universities
in International Education

Land Grant Universities

in International Education

Willard W. Cochrane

International Programs

University of Minnesota

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION

Special Report 80

February, 1967

An Address by

Willard W. Cochrane

Dean, International Programs

University of Minnesota

Presented for

Ag Science Week

February 10, 1967

University of Missouri

Columbia

The Role of Land Grant Universities in International Education

Willard W. Cochrane

The involvement of individual faculty members and college departments in international activities at Land Grant Universities is not new. Historically, graduate students in the humanities, history, and social sciences have gone abroad to study and have returned again as faculty members to pursue specific research and writing projects. And many departments, the languages, classics, geography, history, anthropology, political science and economics have concerned themselves totally or in part with subjects dealing with foreign lands, foreign peoples, and international relations. Thus, international education in its many and varied aspects is not something new to faculty members and teaching departments of Land Grant Universities.

But a new dimension has entered the international education picture since World War II. That new dimension takes the form of the direct involvement of major American universities, *as institutions*, in international education. In other words, universities, as universities, are assuming responsibilities and are undertaking activities in international education.

These activities take two principal forms: first, the undertaking of overseas technical assistance, or service, projects; and second, the development of problem, or area, oriented research and teaching centers, often interdisciplinary in nature but not always, on home campuses (e.g. a center for Indian studies, a center for cross cultural communications, a center for animal production in Latin America). Such centers are doing for cross cultural studies, economic and social developmental studies, and area studies what the Agricultural Experiment Stations have done over the past 80 years for teaching and research in domestic agriculture. There have and continue to be serious problems with regard to the development of interdisciplinary centers concentrating on broad problems of an international nature, which we will explore later in this paper, but such enterprises have opened up a whole new dimension in international education in terms of faculty involvement, university administration and the production of new knowledge.

OVERSEAS SERVICE PROJECTS

Involvement in overseas service projects has been relatively easy for Colleges of Agriculture in Land Grant Universities. This is so for a number of reasons. First, there has been a great need for technical assistance in agriculture in the developing nations, hence there have been a large number of requests to Land Grant Universities, backed with hard cash, to undertake overseas service projects in agricultural production and related fields. Second, the idea of providing a service, providing useful information, to farmers in a developing country is compatible with the Land Grant concept of a university and the traditional role of Colleges of Agriculture. Third, it has been easy to convince ourselves, that helping the less developed countries to produce and distribute more food, is in our short and long-run national interest. Thus there has been a strong demand for Colleges of Agriculture in the Land Grant Universities to become involved in overseas technical assistance projects and a willingness on their part to accept those projects.

But generally speaking our overseas agricultural service projects have not met with great successes. The experience gained in developing and undertaking these overseas service projects has been invaluable to the universities involved, but I think that we must all recognize that the achievements of these projects have in most instances been limited first in terms of the agricultural development process in the countries involved and second in terms of the feed back into teaching and research on university campuses in the United States.

Let us consider some of the reasons for our limited success with the agricultural development process abroad. First, we have consistently underestimated the size of the development task and the resources required in the countries that we sought to assist. This miscalculation with regard to the magnitude of the agricultural development task has been a national one involving the electorate, the Congress and the federal government. But the consequences of that miscalculation, namely, a too slow rate of agricultural development, have most commonly been attributed to the agencies actually engaged in technical assistance—in this instance, the Land Grant Universities.

Second, professional agriculturalists typically have had little experience and no training with respect to the problem of transferring agricultural information and technologies across cultural lines; this state of ignorance has tended to lead to non-productive approaches, frustration, and

despair rather than to widespread technological advance. I do not wish to leave the impression that professional agriculturalists have been alone in their ignorance with respect to the transference of new and improved technologies across cultural lines; they have not. Very few professional workers from the United States had any concept of the cross cultural problem when we first began to get involved in technical assistance work. Further, although there is considerable research now going on with regard to cross cultural communications, there is still no systematic body of knowledge to be made available to technicians going overseas to work in a less developed country for dealing with the problem of transferring of information and technologies across cultural lines.

Third, our staffing of overseas service projects until very recently has often been poorly done; and this shortcoming falls directly on the doorstep of the Land Grant Universities. In the early days of technical assistance it was common for a university taking a contract to staff its project with personnel that it hired only for the duration of the project, or with retirees. In other words, we often did not staff overseas projects with regular, tenured faculty; we staffed those projects with what we could find in the open market on a temporary basis. Further, we tended to view the overseas involvement on a short-run basis. This was true both with respect to the duration of the project itself and individual staff assignments. It is true that we got lots of help in thinking about overseas technical assistance work on a short-run, crash basis from the federal government, but administrators in the Land Grant Universities too readily accepted this line of thinking, because it was the easy way to operate.

Although I judge the last point to be of very great importance in explaining the limited successes of overseas technical assistance projects in agriculture, you will note that I used the past tense in discussing this point in the previous paragraph. I see signs all about me to suggest that we have learned some important lessons with regard to staffing overseas projects and that we are making progress in overcoming our past shortcomings in this respect. More and more institutions are coming to realize that they cannot operate as a hiring hall with regard to overseas projects; if they are going to mount an overseas program which is effective and in which they can take pride, they must staff that program with their best, regular-tenured personnel. Further, the Land Grant Universities are recognizing and are forcing the federal government to recognize that agricultural development is a slow painful process and that most overseas service projects must be of long term duration if they are to leave a lasting mark. In this new, long-term way of thinking, different universities

are experimenting with different kinds of staffing patterns as a means of providing continuity in their overseas programs. There is probably no one best staffing policy for overseas technical assistance projects; probably a desirable staffing pattern involves some short term assignments and some long term assignments.

Let us now turn to the question of feed back to the university. I assume, first, that there is no purpose in a university becoming involved in an overseas project if there is no feed back into the teaching and research of the university from that project. There may be some who wish to debate this point, but I do not; I hold the view that the basic mission of a university is to do teaching and research, hence, the university should undertake projects which contribute to that mission and reject projects that do not.

The reverse flow of scientific experience and systematic knowledge from overseas projects to the Land Grant Universities in the realm of agriculture has been miniscule for several reasons. First, where an overseas project has been staffed with temporary, or non-regular, personnel, it is obvious that the knowledge gained by such persons will not flow into the teaching and research activities on the home campus. Since they are lost to the university upon their return to the States, the knowledge which they bring with them is lost to the university.

Second, since most of the teaching in the international sphere takes place in liberal arts colleges, it is not easy to convert the experiences and knowledge gained by technical agriculturalists into the course content of subjects taught in the humanities or social sciences. Third, since most research in agriculture on the home campus is concerned with domestic agriculture, again the experiences and knowledge gained by a staff member in an overseas assignment is not easily exploited in his research work upon his return to the home campus. Thus, because the technical agriculturalist who becomes involved in overseas technical assistance projects, typically does not teach or do research in subject areas that make use of knowledge gained by him in his overseas assignment, that knowledge typically does not become an input into teaching and research on the home campus.

CAMPUS-BASED RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Increased involvement in campus based teaching and research in international areas on an institutional basis has not been so easy in Land Grant Universities as the development of overseas technical assistance projects. In short, it has not been easy to develop cross disciplinary cen-

ters or institutes in Land Grant Universities which probe in depth such problem areas as economic development or cross cultural relations or area studies.

Considering first the question of research in the technical schools, what agency in the federal government, or what state legislature for that matter, is going to support pure research on the control of animal diseases in Latin America, or on salinity problems of the Indus Plain or water control problems in tropical agriculture. In the main, the federal government has been prepared to support technical assistance projects devoted to the transfer of *existing* knowledge and technologies from the American scene to the less developed countries. But it has not been prepared to support basic research in agriculture and engineering on problems germane to the less developed countries. Hence, research in science and technology in Land Grant Universities that relates directly to the problems of the less developed countries has not taken place.

Next, there is no long tradition of support for research in the social sciences and languages in the Land Grant Universities by the state governments or the federal government. It is true that the federal government through the various National Defense Education Act programs has in recent years supported graduate studies in the languages and in the social sciences, but the level of support for research in the social sciences is still not comparable to that of agriculture or medicine. Thus, it has not been easy to develop either specialized or cross disciplinary research centers in the social sciences and the humanities for dealing with international subjects. Such research centers concerned with international topics that have come into being have been funded in the usual case by a foundation for, say, a five-year period. The International Education Act of 1966 may change all this, but for the present it remains a hope without a single dollar of appropriated funds.

Finally, liberal arts faculty members in the Land Grant Universities have often been reluctant to give up their free enterprise approaches to the seeking of research funds in favor of an organized institutional effort by the university. In other words, there is reluctance among liberal arts faculty members to become a party to something comparable to the Experiment Station in Colleges of Agriculture as a means of seeking and administering research funds. Thus, the preference of many liberal arts faculty members to "go it alone" in the seeking of research support has militated against organized efforts on the part of universities to obtain large scale funding to support organized research on broad problems in the international field.

So for many reasons, three of which I have developed above, campus based research and development activities as a part of the international dimension of Land Grant Universities has lagged.

ACTION NEEDED FOR INVOLVEMENT

Given the foregoing analysis, what actions must be taken, or policies pursued, by the Land Grant Universities to make their involvement in international education more fruitful? It seems to me that four important developments must take place. First, most international activities in land grant universities are now supported on a short run basis either from grants or contracts. This kind of financial support makes it exceedingly difficult to develop productive, long-range teaching and research programs, staffed by regular, tenured-personnel. Thus, there is an overwhelming need to move those activities in international education that have been judged important to the university over a regular support basis where they can be manned by regular, tenured faculty personnel. A way must be found to fund international activities on a sustained basis.

Second, it is not possible for every Land Grant University to have a capability with respect to every part of the world, and every problem in the international field. Thus, universities must be willing to concentrate their efforts and build their capabilities in certain geographic and subject matter areas. It is hard to make these narrowing decisions in a university faculty because of the wide interests that already exist in most faculties, but it must be done if excellence is to be achieved on international problems.

Given these policy actions it further becomes necessary to develop institutions within the university that facilitate and support work in the defined areas of concentration. In some cases these areas of concentration may fall neatly within existing discipline or departmental lines; in such cases no particular problem arises. But often international problems, hence areas of concentration are interdisciplinary in nature, and in these cases it becomes necessary to build new institutions which receive funds, administer funds and facilitate program decision making. The idea of a Center, that involves a director, a faculty advisory committee, some physical space and graduate students and faculty members doing research under a system of grants, seems to be carrying the day as an institutional arrangement. But we still have lots to learn about developing such Centers and fitting them into established university structures.

Finally, we must make an increased effort to combine research funds with overseas service projects in order that we may build a knowledge and scientific base in the home university in those fields directly and indirectly

related to service projects. This is necessary first to provide the scientific and scholarly back-stopping for the operation of the service project in the field and second to provide lines of scientific and scholarly work into which the returning faculty member can interject and use the knowledge and experience that he gained abroad. I believe that the larger foundations and AID are slowly coming around to this point of view, but it will become permanent policy only insofar as contracting universities make strong efforts to attach a research component to overseas projects, which has the purpose of integrating the work of the overseas project into the research and teaching programs of the university.

Another speaker might list a different set of points on which action should be taken to strengthen and improve the involvement of universities in international education. But I believe that Land Grant Universities will not be able to mount really successful international programs until point one, sustained funding, is resolved in a satisfactory manner. And I further believe that truly great international programs will not come into being in Land Grant Universities until successful action has been taken on all four of these points.

SHOULD UNIVERSITIES BECOME INVOLVED?

But to this point I have simply assumed that Land Grant Universities should be involved in international activities, analyzing past experiences and discussing the need for institutional developments and educational innovations to strengthen the international dimension. The question should be asked, and I will ask it now—"Should universities become deeply involved in international education?" There are limits to how much any institution can do effectively. And perhaps the international dimension in education should be left to the private universities, or to specialized institutions.

For me, however, the answer to the question posed above is clear and straightforward. The answer is yes; the modern, large Land Grant University must become deeply involved in international education.

I base this affirmative answer on two grounds. First, the great issues, the great problems, are now in the international areas, and to avoid involvement in depth in international studies and programs means the avoidance of the great issues. This is true in food and agriculture, it is true in medicine and public health, it is true in communications, it is true in education, it is true in social and economic development, and it is true in politics and government.

If the Land Grant Universities fail to move into international areas

and avoid research and inquiry on the great international issues, then that research and inquiry will be done somewhere else; it will be done in the great private universities and/or specialized institutions and the best people will go where the great challenges are being accepted and the work on the exciting and great issues is being undertaken. In this course of events the great Land Grant Universities would cease to be great, and would become second rate institutions concerned with pedestrian questions by second rate people. I am arguing, you see, that if the great Land Grant Universities are to remain great, they must go into those areas in teaching and research where the issues are challenging and great and to an increasing degree the issues are challenging and great in the international field.

A FRESH PERSPECTIVE

The second basis of my affirmative answer is that the teaching responsibility of a large university now requires that it turn out graduates with the capability to work anywhere in the United States or anywhere in the world. The chances are now very great that an engineer, agriculturalist, lawyer, or medical doctor trained in one state will practice his profession in some other state or in some other country. Also he may well, if he is successful, end his career not as a professional worker, but as an administrator. Thus, the successful teaching institution cannot be parochial in its educational approach; the successful teaching institution must prepare its students to go anywhere in the world under a wide variety of conditions and to cope with whatever problems happen to turn up.

There is perhaps a third point that should be made in support of the argument for a full involvement by Land Grant Universities in international education. It is the civilizing and serendipitous effects that flow from a full emersion into a new and strange culture. President Wilson develops this idea in his usual beautiful prose in a recent paper entitled "The University and the World."¹

"Learning to know a culture requires more than visiting. Inter-cultural understanding is often negatively affected by tourism. Real knowledge of other people is likely to be won as a by-product. A part of the folk wisdom I was taught in the home was that you never win happiness by seeking it. You must forget yourself into happiness. The lesson is applicable to our international condition. We don't

¹ Presented at a Conference on Higher Education at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, December 15, 1966.

learn about other people by standing apart and self-consciously observing, or asking. We must forget ourselves and our own habits, losing ourselves in the work and thought of the other society long enough to have experienced some of their pains and felt some of their triumphs. . . .

“If this premise is true, international projects acquire greater significance. The work party of a university engaged in institution building is able to improve the developmental possibilities of a new economy and, as a by-product, increase its own cultural and linguistic sophistication. Once returned to the campus, the engineer or agronomist may be the authority needed to protect us against our too myopic Western European prejudices. He is certain to be useful in helping us better to understand the strengths of his own specialty, because his experience in development adds a new dimension and a fresh perspective for his old profession.”

HOW IS THE BEST WAY TO DO IT?

It may be asked, is the question posed above concerned with whether Land Grant Universities should become involved in international education really a relevant one? Has not the commitment already been made in most cases? The answer to this question turns, I believe, upon your audience. There is, I believe, a question in the mind of certain intrastate groups such as legislatures and economic interest groups as to how deeply a state university should become involved in international education, and how many state resources should be devoted to international education. And since there is a limit to the amount of resources that can be devoted to higher education within a state it is proper that interest and governing groups ask the question—“how much international involvement by our state universities is desirable?”

But, I believe it is also true that the faculties, the administration, and the regents of most large Land Grant Universities have already made a commitment to a deep and extensive involvement in international education. This is true in the old fashioned sense of assisting individual faculty members to go abroad to study and to strengthen courses of study in such traditional disciplines as the languages, geography, anthropology, history, political science, and economics. It is also true in the post World War II sense of involvement on an institutional basis. The relevant question then for those universities that have made a commitment to become deeply involved in international education is —How is the best way to do it?

This basic question in turn breaks down into a series of related questions. What kind of organization within a university should be developed to facilitate and support increased teaching and research in international areas? Should this organization be highly centralized or highly decentralized? What proportion of state support funds should go into international education, if any? Or should international educational activities because of their national implications be supported solely or largely out of federal funds? How can overseas service activities be integrated with home campus teaching and research to strengthen both activities? How are library resources to be developed to a level of adequacy in this vast complex of international education? These and many, many more questions must be asked and answered with respect to the basic question, "How is the best way to do it?"

There may or may not be one best pattern of organization and mix of resources for undertaking a broad scale program of international education in Land Grant Universities. But if there is one best way, I am sure that it is not known at present; there is no existing blue print for building institutions, developing organization, and guiding involvement in international education. This I know from discussing common problems with my counterparts in different Land Grant Universities.

I suspect that we are in a period with regard to international education in the Land Grant Universities comparable to the development of Colleges of Agriculture in the 1870's and 80's. We know that we want such an institutional development, because we are convinced there are important problems in the international area that must be first studied and researched and second taught in the classroom and to adults at home and abroad. But we do not know the best way to go about this institutional building. Some land grant universities are moving very rapidly in the way of institutionalizing international programs and studies; others are moving rather slowly. And none of us knows where we are going to break out of the forest of problems and questions in which we now find ourselves, or in what form. All we know is that we are in a forest and that we are working hard to find a way out.

Based on the faith that we have always succeeded in the past with regard to institution building in the Land Grant Universities, I believe that we will succeed once again. The building of new and relevant institutions to cope with new and significant problems has been one of the strengths of the Land Grant system. And I am proud to be a part of this pioneering effort in international education even though it can be terribly frustrating at times.