Review of Volume 10(3) of the Journal of Studies in International Education

Natasha Jankowski
Western Michigan University

The following is a summary of Volume 10(3) of the *Journal of Studies in International Education* (2006). This volume celebrates the 10th anniversary of the Journal, as well the 10th anniversary of the Center for International Higher Education based in Boston College. The *Journal of Studies in International Education* has been received international awards from the Association of International Education Administrators and recognition from the Association of International Educators.

This volume focuses upon international data and definitions that the data gathering is based upon. The status of international student data is evaluated in regard to what is available to educators and how reliable that data may be. From this recommendations are provided and other articles promote models and supporting definitions to further the entire picture of international educators, policy makers, and international students. In addition, there is a focus upon understanding the trends in policy based upon cultural thought and data collected.

The first article by Kelo, Teichler, and Wachter (2006) provides an overview of data that is collected, what is not, and what that data shows about international student mobility. The data gathered on international student mobility is used in forming policy at national and international levels in an effort to increase mobility, but as Kelo, Teichler, and Wachter (2006) claim the published data available are not the data needed. They state that there is no consistency in the manner the data is collected

and how it distributed at the national level. Some of the hindrances in mobility statistics are that they do not report on mobility, but use nationality data instead, not all countries collect data or have available data to provide at the national level, and certain students are not counted.

An overview of the methods used to collect mobility data are presented with the problems that come with the methods such as double counting, or not counting part time students (Kelo, Teichler, Wachter, 2006, p. 211). Finland, Germany, and Britain are found to collect the best data and are presented as a best practice for other countries. The article ends with four steps for improvement of data collection and calls for clear definitions of what constitutes student mobility including definitions of inward and outward mobility.

The second article uses an analogy between coal exports in the 19th and early 20th century from the United Kingdom to international recruitment in the late 20th and early 21st century. This is done to help speculate on future trends in international education in the United Kingdom as well as direct and indirect economic flow from international students (Asteris, 2006). The parallels presented are the profound optimism with respect to market growth, that production is labor intensive, that it has a favorable impact on the balance of payment, and it is underpinning economic activity (Asteris, 2006, p. 226-228). There is a desire to constrain public funding of higher

education and as such, the need to attract more international students grows, but the author cautions that what happened to the coal trade could occur to international student recruitment.

The decline in coal trade is seen as echoed in higher education by increased competition from new markets for international students, other countries providing the same service to accommodate students that would normally have studied overseas, and the impact of new technology that results in a slower growth in student recruitment. Asteris (2006) cautions that even if measures are taken to combat the competition, there is nothing that can be done to guard against global shocks such as the Asian financial crisis or 1997-1998 and September 11th, 2001. The final conclusion of this article is that the more importance the United Kingdom places upon international students and educational trade, the greater its vulnerability to market volatility and disruption (Asteris, 2006).

The third article by Deardorff (2006) provides a definition and method of assessment of intercultural competence as agreed upon by a panel of intercultural scholars, and validated by higher education administrators. The outcome of internationalization efforts at universities are considered to be interculturally competent students, yet there is not a definition of intercultural competence or a method of measuring said competence.

Deardorff (2006) studied definitions and assessment methods of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization of higher education. Two models are presented from this study, one a theoretical program logic model, the other a process model. The definition developed from the questionnaire and the panel consensus presents a Western view of intercultural competence. The definition decided upon is more general to allow the definition to work in all institutions and with all students. It was agreed through the Delphi technique that the definition is, "knowledge of others, knowledge of self, skills to interpret and relate, skills to discover and/or interact, valuing others' values, beliefs and behaviors, and revitalizing one's self (Deardorff, 2006, p. 247)."

Four other findings are presented in regard to specific competencies of interculturality. Conclusions based on these findings are that the scholars and administrators presented a definition of components, but components of intercultural competence did not match the definition, that the definition itself needs to continue to evolve just as culture evolves, and that intercultural competence can be measured even though the concept is controversial in institutions (Deardorff, 2006, p. 257-259). From these conclusions, Deardorff (2006) provides eight recommendations for improvement and implications for practice as well as ten questions for further research.

Hunter, White, & Godbey (2006) supplied the fourth article with another attempt to define international concepts. They focused upon trying to get a definition of global citizenship and global competence. A survey was used as well as the Delphi technique which included questioning business leaders, the United Nations, and higher education institutions in order to provide a definition to base curricular development upon. The definition proposed was, "having an open mind while actively seeking to understand cultural norms and expectations of others, leveraging the gained knowledge to interact, communicate and work effectively outside one's environment (House, White, & Godbey, 2006, p. 270)." The question that remains now is whether universities are producing globally competent students. In order to answer this, House, White, and Godbey (2006) provide an historical overview of global competence and provide the case that universities are not preparing students to be globally competent.

There are numerous definitions of global competence, and it is agreed upon that competence is more than just studying abroad or learning another language. The most critical

step in the process is an understanding of a persons own cultural norms and expectations, then being able to explore other cultures with a focus upon world history and understanding of differences. It is this focus that universities need to employ in the development of their curriculum. There is a need for global competence as stated by the authors. As a culture, we need to understand how people will respond to actions taken by the United States and international business growth, thus one definition must be agreed upon.

The last article by Terzian and Osborne (2006) provides an overview of the drop in international students in the United States from 2003-2004. The authors claim that September 11th played a role with the visa restrictions, but state that other factors played into the decline and these can be seen in the post-war limitation of international students during the period of 1945-1960. The historical precedent of political action and Presidential leadership at the University of Florida are discussed as an example of the decline.

The Fulbright Act and Smith-Mundt Act were founded on the belief that international students would promote world peace through an understanding of the culture they studied under. In light of this, visas were allowed only for the duration of study and then it was expected that the students would return to their country of origin. The University of Florida saw a post-war boom in enrollment, as other universities saw at the time from the GI Bill, as such, university boards were not interested in international students as they took up what was seen as valuable space. International student scholarships were limited and allowed no room for influx (Terzian & Osborne, 2006).

In the case of the University of Florida, a new president entered that was very interested in international students and attempted to sway the board, but the state was not committed to international education. There was no support system with advisors or orientation for international students and there was racial discrimination on campus leading to a lack of interaction between domestic and international students. International students that were admitted were expected to return home after graduation as ambassadors, but there was still no institutional support provided for them while they attended.

The same can be seen in regard to the impacts of 9/11, as there was ambivalence towards international students and a concern of using public funds to bring them to the United States to study. Tracking systems were implemented such as SEVIS. This ambivalence and harsh climate for international students coupled with the growing competition for international students outside the United States, led to a decline in attendance that has not been significantly noticeable until 2003. The competing tendencies to promote international students as ambassadors of understanding, goodwill, and peace with the constraints put on their attendance and lack of institutional support have sent conflicting messages (Terzian & Osborne, 2006). These combined show international students great ambivalence and as such help to sway their enrollment elsewhere.