

TRANSNATIONAL STUDENT MOBILITY

Nezahat Güçlü*

ABSTRACT: The primary purpose of this paper is to discuss perspectives on international students and the approaches to the understanding the context of international student flow to higher educational institutions of "developed countries." These issues have been investigated from individual, social, economic and political perspectives.

The first, I reviewed the historical perspectives of international study and international student movements across national boundaries. A considerable amount of research was done in the 1960s in the international student migration. The researches focused on issues related to cross-cultural experiences and the impact of the migration, both on the students and on the nations affected by the phenomenon. Until recently it was believed that the individual students, the home countries, and the host countries could all benefit, if policies relating to international study provided selected students with a well-designed educational experience. But in the 1980s, international study has become to be seen as being fraught with complex and negative outcomes and is often associated with cultural dependency, cultural imperialism and cultural alienation.

In the past-war period, developing countries, the government leaders and elites have adopted three influential perspectives, Modernization theory, Human Capital theory, and Screening Hypothesis, on economic development in framing their educational policies. They have chosen, as foundations of their national development, a qualitative transformation of their societies along the lines of Western science and technology and a rapid quantitative expansion of educational opportunities. They see education as an important factor in helping them move from a "traditional" towards a "modern" economy. Unfortunately, the impressive claims about the quantitative and qualitative gains of education, expressed in the theories of education and development, have had drastic effects upon the Third World countries.

KEY WORDS: International Study, International Student, Transnational Student Mobility, Students of Migration, Higher Education

ÖZET: Bu makalenin temel amacı, yabancı ülkelerde eğitim yapan öğrenciler ve gelişmiş ülkelerdeki yüksek öğretim kurumlarına yabancı öğrenci akışını açıklayan yak-

laşımları tartışmaktır. Bu konular, bireysel, sosyal, ekonomik ve politik yönlerden incelenecektir.

Önce, yabancı ülkelerde öğretim, yabancı öğrenci hareketliliği, tarihsel açıdan incelenecektir. Uluslararası öğrenci göçüyle ilgili olarak 1960'lı yıllarda pek çok araştırma yapılmıştır. Bunlar, hem öğrenci hem de ülke açısından göçün etkileri ve kültürler arası deneyimler üzerinde yoğunlaşmıştır. Son zamanlara kadar, seçkin öğrencilerle iyi düzenlenmiş eğitim ortamının sunulduğu yabancı ülkelerde öğretim yapmanın öğrenci, öğrencinin ülkesi ve okuduğu ülke açısından bir çok yararları olduğu düşünülmekteydi. Ancak 1980'lerde, yabancı ülkelerde yapılan eğitimin, kültürel bağımlılık, kültürel emperyalizm, kültürel yabancılaştırma gibi bir takım olumsuzluklar ortaya çıkardığı anlaşılmaya başlanmıştır.

II. Dünya Savaşı sonrasında, gelişmekte olan ülkelerin liderleri ve elitler, eğitim politikalarını düzenlerken ekonomik gelişmeyi temele alan Modern Teori, İnsan Kaynakları Teorisi ve Eleme Hipotezinden etkilenmişlerdir. Bu liderler, ulusal gelişmenin temelinde, Batı'daki bilim ve tekniğin alınarak nitelikli bir toplumsal geçişin sağlanması ve nicel olarak eğitimsel fırsatların genişlemesi gerektiğini düşünmüşlerdir. Onlar geleneksel ekonomiden modern ekonomiye geçişte eğitimin oldukça önemli bir etken olduğunu görmüşlerdir. Gelişme ve eğitim teorilerinde ifade edilen eğitimin nicel ve nitel amaçlarıyla ilgili bu etkileyici iddialar maalesef, Üçüncü Dünya Ülkeleri için geçerli olmamıştır.

ANAHTAR SÖZCÜKLER: Yabancı Ülkelerde Öğretim, Yabancı Öğrenci, Uluslararası Öğrenci Hareketliliği, Göçmen Öğrenciler, Yüksek Öğretim.

1. INTRODUCTION

An important element to understand in any consideration of international study is that it takes place in a context of global economic, technological, and political inequality. The context of inequality is particularly dramatic precisely where the largest flows of students takes place – between the Third World countries and First World countries.

Third World refers to countries that are variously labeled "underdeveloped", "poor", "backward" and "Southern" countries and First World refers to countries described as "developed", "industrialized", "rich", "advanced" and "Northern" countries in international studies [1]. The First World countries in-

* Assist. Prof. Nezahat Güçlü, is a university teacher, working at the University of Gazi, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, in the fields of Educational Administration, Supervision, Planning and Economics of Education.

variably receive positive labels and are placed at the top of the international hierarchy while the Third World countries occupy the lower positions in much of the development literature [2, 3].

Third World nations look to the developed nations as models of how to modernize. The norms and values learned during overseas study as well as technological knowledge are brought home. International study, as a phenomenon, is therefore a relationship of considerable inequality [2]. Research indicates that there are a myriad of push and pull factors involved in international study [4, 5, 6].

The paper examined historical perspectives on international students and three theories of international economic development have sought to rationalize the phenomenon of transnational students mobility and to justify it as inherently beneficial for the development of Third World: the Modernization Theory, the Human Capital Theory, and the Screening Hypothesis. But a second set of theories views transnational students mobility in conflict or critical perspectives it as a continuing manifestation of cultural dependency of the Third World periphery on the First World center. These theories are the Neo-Marxist Theory, the World System Theory, and the Dependency Theory.

2. Historical Perspectives on International Students

Historically, international study is recognized as a tradition and practice inherited from ancient Greece times [7]. There is evidence of organized efforts of cultural and educational borrowing in the early Christian era. This activity was accelerated in modest proportions during the centuries following the fall of the Roman Empire [8]. The Roman Empire's struggle with Christianity and the inroads of tectonic and Hunnish tribes in the fifth century A.D. led to a temporary decline in student travel which, however, revived in the ninth century and brought scholars from England, Italy, Gaul, and Spain. The expansion of knowledge and the intellectual revolution during the 12th century led to an "institutional revolution" [9: 369]. It was during this period that the present concept of curriculum, examinations, commencement, and degrees became a part of the institutionalization of education. Paris emerged as the new center of learning, Bologna as the center for study of law, and Salerno as the center for the study of medicine. An exodus of international students took place from Greece to these centers during the 12th century [9]. The next major migration of international students occurred in the beginning of the 13th century, when

Oxford emerged as the new center of learning, closely followed by Cambridge [10].

There were a variety of reasons for the international travel of students, in addition to the desire of learning and specialized knowledge. These included the wish to see the world, to experience adventures, to gain social prestige and economic position, to change fortune. Then as now, these were important motives for travel. During the 14th and 16th centuries, the two liberalization forces -- Renaissance and Reformation-- gave rise to new motives for student travel--mainly to search for humanistic studies. Many scholars continued to travel to other nations to acquire and exchange knowledge by various means [11].

The 17th century brought many enlightening conceptions, such as international ideals, universal toleration and world peace movements, universal language and the pursuit of the rule of international law. Scientific societies and academies, organized with international membership, favored transnational and transcultural contacts through traveling scholars and students [12].

In the 19th century, German universities became the new center of learning. Many international students, especially from U.S. and Britain were eager to attend German universities to study physical sciences, medicine, and other subjects because these universities had developed unique standards of instruction and scholarship. During this period it is estimated that some 10,000 Americans were enrolled in German universities [11].

Motivations for travel varied from a desire for learning for the sake of learning to the desire for travel, from a search for specialized knowledge to the ambition for distinction and promotion. The two principal motivations for study abroad by the end of the 18th century were a desire to acquire knowledge and a desire to develop contacts with other peoples and mores. In the 19th century new motivations for study abroad emerged as a result of the industrial and scientific revolution, a new distribution of political power, and the changing patterns of international relations following the French Revolution. The desire for specialized knowledge was prompted by the changing patterns of work [13].

As the earlier periods, in the twentieth century, students travel abroad to acquire knowledge and skills to avail of the opportunity for personal growth in maturity or self-confidence, for cultural enrichment, to broaden ones perspective on international affairs, and to provide insights about one's

own country. Though the primary objective at the individual level continues to be the acquisition of knowledge, new motivations, namely political, social, and economic, have been added. These motivations have created a "mixture of purposes: knowledge of U.S. and its way of life takes precedence over strictly academic or educational considerations" [13: 34].

3. Theoretical Explanations of Transnational Student Mobility

The flow of students from one nation to another has been examined in terms of a "push-pull" model [14]. In such a model the flow of students going abroad is a function of the combined "pull" factors and "push" factors as influenced by "intervening obstacles." In other words, the transnational mobility of students is affected by factors which hold or repel on the home side, factors which attract or repel on the host side or destination, and factors intervening which facilitate or inhibit the sojourns [15].

Many developing countries, is responsible for "pushing" the students from the home country to the developed countries in research of job opportunities and adequate research facilities. It views education as an aspect and function of national development.

First, rapid development among the countries of the North (such as the United States, West Germany, and Japan) is attributed to the great progress these countries have made in the field of science and technology. Such economists as Denison [16] and Schultz [17] argue that for the Southern countries to reach the "take-off stage," they must develop the industrial sector by an important role in economic development and, hence, most Western universities have structures their higher educational systems to prepare students in science and technology. Countries of the South have attempted to follow this approach by adopting policies of scientific and technological education [1]. Second, study abroad has been encouraged as a means of importing technology, especially the very expensive technology which the developing countries cannot afford. The technology is imported when some of the international students return to their home countries and occupy positions of responsibility either in the public or the private sector. A third set of push factors consists of a number of political, economic and academic circumstances often cited by students immigrating for study or work to the developed countries. Political instability and frustration with the existing political structure are the major political factors that push students from their home countries, for instance, Thailand and parts of Africa [18]. Cummings [19] has pointed out that students from Hong Kong "may choose to study over-

seas because they fear the consequences of the expiration in 1997 of the British treaty with China concerning governance of Hong Kong' [19: 244]. Other push factors also found to be positively related to international student migrations; economic growth, scarcity of scientific and technological facilities, existence of high quality education, former colonial ties [20]; decreasing relative costs of U.S. higher education [21]. Push factors also include obstacle to admission to native universities created by limited openings or by social discrimination; lack of training facilities in the subjects which native students wish to study; the perceived or actual poor quality of the instruction which is actually offered; and the hope that foreign training will better equip one in competition for prestigious positions or for successful emigration [6].

Two other personal reasons that pull students to America are the attractive job opportunities and higher standards of living. According to Spaulding and Flack [22], students from developing countries come to the United States for a variety of reasons: (a) easier admission to academic institutions of host countries; (b) scholarships and travel grants awarded by governments and academic institutions of host countries; (c) getting education that is not available for them at home; (d) gaining an opportunity to see the world; (e) acquiring prestige through a degree from a U.S. institution.

Pull factors serve as incentives for the selection of any country as the place to undergo training. Included among these are cultural and linguistic similarity, the availability of scholarship, the fit between the potential host's educational system and system of the home nation, political ties, and the direct cost of schooling [6].

Intervening Obstacles are those factors which are assumed to constrain and shape movement regardless of the strength of the push and pull factors. Intervening Obstacles is the common governmentally promulgated restriction or even probation on transnational student mobility. These may be created by actions of government on both the host and home side [6: 67].

By Host Country: The U.S. officially seems neither to favor or disfavor the flows in general terms, even though it may discriminate in particular sources. The Committee on Foreign Students and Institutional Policy [23] observed that the U.S. federal government seems to have less an official policy toward foreign students than an informal view of the worth of maintaining an open doors policy. A policy of noninterference and ideological support by government

has been espoused on the grounds that it is in America's national and international interests.

Nevertheless, The U.S. government has erected some barriers to study in this country, both through official means and by neglect. The Committee on Foreign Students and Institutional Policy [23] notes that the U.S. national government's comparatively small-scale sponsorship of students coming from abroad has gradually weakened further over the last decade or so. Interestingly, this did not stop the overall growth of the foreign student population in the U.S., since many of those arriving during the recent decade came from nations with new found-wealth. Moreover, recent changes in funding requirements work-study opportunities, and visa eligibility, and the ease with which visas can be adjusted have all combined to erect new obstacles to the attendance by international students at the American colleges and universities.

By Home Governments: Home country policies toward international study likewise vary considerably worldwide and can facilitate, inhibit, and shape outgoing flows of students. Moreover, they often are the most unstable and unpredictable of the forces underlying transnational student mobility, because they are linked to shifts in regime and ideology [6].

Most nations do not pursue policies or take postures which restrict the outflow of students completely. Instead, the government intervenes to erect or remove obstacles for some and not others. Thus, governments limit the choice of country and/or the institution in which their outgoing students may study. They may sponsor large numbers of students for study abroad, while limiting study abroad to those who are sponsored.

The end result of these restrictions may be changes in the volume, but more often the effect is felt mainly in the composition of the student population going abroad. Especially for Less Developing Countries, faced as they are with internal limits on their training institutions, education abroad offers a ready means to fill gaps, enhance existing manpower, and more quickly build domestic facilities. The government therefore asserts its control over study abroad to ensure conformity to its particular developmental and ideological objectives and to regulate the use of scarce societal resources [6].

3.1. Equilibrium Approaches to Transnational Students Mobility

The "push-pull" model that are supposed to bring about equilibrium in the global demand and supply of manpower. Technically qualified students move

from a low-wage country which has a surplus supply of trained manpower, to the a high-wage economy, where demand exceeds the supply of such labor [24]. This movement of labor will continue until, on a global level, income disparities come closer to equilibrium. Transnational of students is thus supposed to bridge the gap between the rich and poor and to lead to international development and cooperation.

Transnational student mobility for advanced training in science and technology is justified as being necessary for the Third World countries or for individuals from such countries. Such an assumption of a link between education and development is typically Eurocentric and ethnocentric. The three theories used to justify transnational student mobility are Modernization Theory, Human Capital Theory, and Screening Hypothesis. These approaches are elaborated below.

3.1.1. Modernization Theory

"Modernity" in the social terms of Max Weber as the process of the differentiation of science, morality, and art into autonomous spheres. "Modernization is the fulfillment of each of these spheres and their incorporation into the lifework, the full development of each sphere and the subsequent transformation of daily life on the basis of that perfection [25: 19]. However, Galtung stated [26: 98) that the contemporary critique of "modernity" points to its inbuilt tendency to overshoot, to overgrow, to result in 'over-centralization', 'over-planning'.

According to Eisentadt cited in Peet, [27: 24], a leading exponent, Modernization Theory is interested in elaborating the differences between traditional and modern societies in terms of their positions on various indices of modernity or development, and to the extent to which they approximate the model of modern industrial society. Modernization Theory attempt to explain the process by which countries achieve modernity. While modernization is assumed to be a "spontaneous and irreversible process inherent in every society" [28: 210], it also needs an external stimulus. Since Western countries were the first to modernize through mechanization and industrialization, a "backward" country at the periphery could closely imitate the development process of an economy at the center by restructuring itself along the lines of science and technology [28].

The actual fashioning of study abroad programs/experiences is very much a product of the 20th century. From the first decade of the 20th century, the new distribution of political power has tended to divide the world into "advanced" and "retarded" co-

ountries. Western Europe and America have been perceived as reaching a "high stage" of technical and scientific development, whereas the rest of the world is seen as "retarded" and hence largely dependent on these advanced countries. It was in response to this trend that migration of students to Western Europe and America began in the late 19th century [13].

Education in the developing countries are considered to be the most important tool in the modernization and the development of the economy. It is hoped that investment in education will increase productivity, and provide the credentials necessary for economic development. The developing countries have adopted these beliefs and invested heavily in the education sector at the cost of other needs [29].

Transnational student mobility, in this context, can be seen as being crucial to the development process, because such a radical restructuring needs a work force trained and educated in disciplines emphasized in the developing countries.

3.1.2. Human Capital Theory

Human capital theory explains how a trained work force can help in the development process. Historically, land and capital were seen as important factors in economic development, but this theory emphasizes, in addition, the quality of the workers (judged by increased productivity), which could be improved by increasing their educational level. Education thus became a part of the development debate [30]. Harbison & Myers [31] in *Education, Manpower and Economic Growth* claimed that the need of the developing countries for graduate training in technical fields of specialization to be able to adapt scientific and technical discoveries and innovations from developed countries to their own economies and industries.

The forces impeding the more rapid "development" of the Third World countries, however, are cultural, social and political, as well as economic. Their traditions, values, institutions and political structure often restrict economic growth. University training, including graduate education in structural fields of specialization (economics, humanities, political science, sociology, management, public administration, and education), is one the necessary factors to encourage structural changes in social, economic, political and administrative structures needed for the progress of Third World countries [32].

Such a pattern of "development" required a management characterized by the utilization of qualified professionals in many disciplines. Because of the

lack of such human resources, the Third World countries had to redefine their labor force needs. They had to look abroad for the opportunity to study. The U.S., obviously, was the developed country which offer the most educational facilities, especially at the graduate level [33].

3.1.3. The Screening Hypothesis

This hypothesis is a complement to the human Capital Theory in arguing that education increases the GNP of a country, not by increasing the productivity of labor but merely by providing the credentials for higher incomes. Education often serves as a screening device because employers use educational qualifications of their prospective employees as an indicator of their "trainability". Transnational student mobility, in this context, is seen as a beneficial process that provides students credentials (i.e. foreign degrees), on the basis of which employers pay them higher wages, thus spurring further development. The educational policies of the developing countries promote credentialling in science and technology [34].

3.2. Conflict or Critical Perspectives of Transnational Student Mobility

The perspectives of international economic development described above have helped the Third World to justify the phenomenon of international students movement to the North as being inherently beneficial for the development of the Third World countries. As a counterpoint to these approaches, the other approaches described below have focused on the conflict or critical approaches to transnational of students mobility on the Third World countries.

3.2.1. Neo-Marxist Theory

Human Capital Theory views each student and worker as protocapitalist, and avoids mention of structured inequality, cultural differences, social-class, hierarchies, and class conflicts. Moreover, it generally assumes social consensus concerning the national ideology, the legitimacy of the social hierarchy, and the allocation of rewards and resources. As such, human capital theory is anathema to U.S. Marxists and socialists who reject the notion that educational innovations, reflect responses to the market's demand for technically defined skills [35: 382].

Neo-Marxist theory attempt to fill a vacuum created by the positive analyses of international students which do not explain the close relationship between the structure of schools and the social-economic structure of the society. Bowles & Gintis [36], proponents of a Neo-Marxist approach, assert that the

schools replicate and perpetuate the dominant capitalist structure of the economy.

The role of education in a capitalist system is two-fold. First, it legitimizes economic disparities by representing education as a meritocratic process that fosters and reinforces the belief that economic success is a result of ability and effort, initially evidenced in school. Second, education is a means of integrating individuals into the economic system by providing a work force large enough to satisfy the expanding needs of the capitalists and, at the same time, maintaining a "reserve army" of potential workers to keep wages and workers' demands at a minimum. Levin [37] adds that as the workplace becomes centralized and work becomes fragmented, the schools become a bureaucratic and centralized institution dominated by professionals.

Carnoy [38] argues that the importation of Western educational system into Third World societies has only brought the people out of the traditional hierarchy into a capitalist hierarchy. "Schools transform society from feudalism and traditionalism to capitalism -- which was believed to provide the most perfect form of individual and collective development" [38: 4].

Transnational of student, in this context, becomes a means of perpetuating and reproducing capitalist development in the developing countries. By means of transnational of student, the countries at the periphery are more firmly integrated into the world capitalist system [39].

3.2.2. Dependency Theory

Dependency Theory counters many of the assumptions of Modernization Theory. Modernization Theory originated at the center of the global capitalist system as the un-self-critical celebration in thought of Euro-American material accomplishment. Dependency theory, by comparison, originated in Latin America as a series of critical reflections on the historical experience of the peripheral peoples of the world [27]. Dependency Theory posits a division of the world in terms of a center and a periphery the center of a global economic and political power is the North, comprising the U.S., Western Europe, and Japan, and the periphery is the South, comprising most African, Asian, and Latin American countries. Dependency theory evolved in the 1970's as an expression of the point of view of the South, and was developed by such "dependistas" as Samir Amin, Cardoso, Marini, Andre Gunder Frank, Ali Mazrui, and others [28: 211]. It challenges the notion of development underlying the conventional approaches

and argues that the development of the center necessarily implies an underdevelopment of the periphery. According to this theory, transnational of student movement is a manifestation in the academic world of the cultural dependency of the periphery on the center. Due to the fact that the periphery was deprived of its surplus, development in the center somehow implied underdevelopment in the periphery. Thus development and underdevelopment could be described as two aspects of a single global process. All regions participating in the process were capitalist, but a distinction between central and peripheral capitalism was made [27, 28].

3.2.3. World Systems Theory

World Systems Theory draws on the dependency school but also has antecedents in a version of history named after "Annales" [27]. According to Peet [27: 49], Annales school's intention was to use the comparative method over long sweeps of time to examine differences and similarities between societies. The Annales school's themes are history as social history, especially of the material conditions of the masses, an emphasis on structural factors or relative constants, the 'long term' as a common language for the social sciences and, while this is not a Marxist school of thought, a concern with the relations among economy, society and civilization. According to this theory, isolated and self-sufficient societies all over the world are increasingly being incorporated into a "world system," characterized by the global accumulation and valorization of capital [28: 3]. Such a process of incorporation takes places when peripheral societies internalize the norms and values of a powerful. Mobility of international students are a form of such a process of incorporation by which students from the South internalize dominant capitalistic norms and values. In fact, just as transnational of students is encouraged by countries of the North as a means of reproducing the capitalistic structure, the countries of the South see transnational student mobility as an instrument by which they can move from a peripheral position to a semi-peripheral position in the capitalist world system [28, 1].

4. Conclusion

Transnational flows of student accentuate the Western bias of the academic elites in developing countries and devolve their native cultural roots. The U.S. has evolved in the 20th century as the intellectual center of the world and, therefore, sets academic norms and standards to be the "proper" values to be emulated by the rest of the world.

Besides setting inappropriate standards, the edu-

cation propagated by the developed countries also may be irrelevant for the development needs of the peripheral countries. The skills that students acquire while in a Northern university can only be applied if major changes are introduced in the entire economic structure of the home countries. This is especially true in the case of students returning to their countries with specialized degrees in highly technical fields. A critical element in the relevance of instruction is the way in which knowledge can be adapted to the needs and conditions in developing countries. Jenkins [4: 8] stated that "There must therefore, be an awareness of the constraints of U.S. technology designed to meet the needs of this country, and the limitations which are inherent in the conditions in the developing countries." Transferability of knowledge requires not only the comprehension of that knowledge, but also the ability to make things happen. Even with the most comprehensive preparation, the students returning to make changes in their home countries face a formidable task in which they will need all the preparation possible.

Such deficiencies and incongruence in the training leads to what Obah [40] has termed the "culture-concept" gap or what Mazrui [40: 356] has called the "technocultural gap." The education obtained in the developed countries lacks a practical orientation and produces overstrained personnel with not enough practical experience to apply their theoretical knowledge. Due to differences in the training needs of U.S. and the Southern countries, Asian graduates from American universities have not been able to "provide the de colonization of curriculum in developing countries." There is now a degree of cultural dependence on America, which has emerged as the center of the world system [41].

In the post-war period, developing countries, the government leaders and elites have adopted three influential perspectives, Modernization Theory, Human Capital Theory, and Screening Hypothesis, on economic development in framing their educational policies. They have chosen, as foundations of their national development, a qualitative transformation of their societies along the lines of Western science and technology and a rapid quantitative expansion of educational opportunities. They see education as an important factor in helping them move from a "traditional" towards a "modern" economy. Unfortunately, the impressive claims about the quantitative and qualitative gains of education, expressed in the theories of education and development, have had drastic effects upon the Third World countries. These countries have been lured into Wes-

tern ideas of development and have begun to see themselves in uniformly negative terms, as "traditional," "backward," and "underdeveloped" agriculture-based economies, relying on outmode technology. In order to escape these negative effects, the countries of the South have shifted the emphasis of education to science and technology and to disciplines that are in demand in the North. From a global perspective, one of the consequences of this shift is the out-migration of highly qualified scientists and technicians to the developed countries in search of academic and job opportunities.

In contrast to approaches to international economic development - Modernization theory, Human Capital Theory, and Screening Hypothesis - a second set of conflict or critical approaches - Neo-Marxist Theory, World System Theory, and Dependency Theory focused on the negative impacts of transnational students flow on the Third World. They emphasized that transnational students of migration as a continuing manifestation of cultural dependency of the Southern periphery on the Northern center.

REFERENCES

- [1] Rao, S. K. (1989). "The long Shadow of Neocolonialism: Experiences of Asian Students on the American Campus." (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University).
- [2] Altbach, P. G & Wang, J. (1989). *Foreign Students and International Study*. Boston: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, University Press of America.
- [3] Barber, E. G. et al. (May, 1987) Introduction: Perspective on Foreign Students, *Comparative Education Review*, 28 (2).
- [4] Jenkins, H. M. (1983). *Educating Students from other Nations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers.
- [5] Kaplan, R. B. (1983). Meeting the Educational Needs of Other Nations. In (Eds.) H. M. Jenkins, et al., *Educating Students from Other Nations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [6] Sirowy, L. & Inkeles, A. (1985). University Level Student Exchanges: The U.S. Role in Global Perspective. In E. Barber (Ed), *Foreign Students Flows. Their Significance for American Higher Education*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- [7] DuBois, C. (1956). *Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- [8] Deutsch, S. E. (1970). *International Education and Exchange*. Cleveland: The press of Case Western University.

- [9] Haskins, C. H. (1957). *The Rise of the Universities*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University
- [10] Rashdall, H. (1963). *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*. Vol.III. Oxford U. K.: Clarendon Press.
- [11] Cieslak, E. C. (1955). *The Foreign Students in American Colleges*. Detroit, MI: Wayne University Press.
- [12] Brickman, W. (1977). *Two Millenia of International Relations in Higher Education*. Philadelphia: Norwood Editions.
- [13] Metraux, G. S. (1952). *Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education*. New York: Social Science Research Council.
- [14] Lee, E. (1966). *A Theory of Migration, Demography*, 3 (1), 47-57.
- [15] Barber, E. G. (Ed.) (1985). *Foreign Student Flows: Their Significance for American Higher Education*. New York: IIE,
- [16] Denison, E. F. (1964). *The Residual Factor and Economic Growth*. Paris, France: OECD.
- [17] Schultz, T. W. et al. (1971). *Investment in Human Capital*. New York: The Mcmillan Company.
- [18] Fry, G. W. (1984). *The Economic and Political Impact of Study Abroad*, *Comparative Educational Review*, 28 (2), 203-220.
- [19] Cummings, W. K. (May, 1984). *Going Overseas for Higher Education: The Asian Experience*, *Comparative Education Review*, 28 (2), 241-255).
- [20] Lee, K. & Tan, J. P. (1985). *The international Flow of Third Level Lesser Developed Country Students to Developed Countries: Determinants and Implications*, *Higher Education*, 13 (6), 687-707.
- [21] Winkler, D. R. & Agarwal, V. (1985). *Foreign Demand for United States Higher Education: A Study of Developing Countries in the Eastern Hemisphere*, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*.
- [22] Spaulding, S. & Flack, M. J. (1976). *The World's Students in the U. S.: A Review and Evaluation on Research on Foreign Students*. Praeger, New York.
- [23] Committee on Foreign Students and Institutional Policy (1982). *Foreign Students and Institutional Policy: Toward an Agenda for Action*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- [24] Burki, S. J. & Swami, S. (1987). *South Asian Migration to the US*, *Economic Political Weekly*, 22, (12), 513.
- [25] Poster, M. (1987). *Critical Theory and Post-structuralism: In Research of a Context*. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press.
- [26] Galtung, J. et al. (1982). *Development Centred on the Human Being: Some West European Perspectives*. In *Different Theories and Practices of Development*. Unesco, France.
- [27] Peet, R. (1991). *Global Capitalism: Theories of Societal Development*. London & New York: Routledge.
- [28] Addo, H. S., S. Amin, et al. (1985). *Development and Social Transformation*. Boulder, Co: Westview Press.
- [29] Elsheikh, N. H. (1972). *Graduate Education for Economic Development: An Evaluation of Patterns and Trends of specialization of Latin American Students in the United States*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Oklahoma State University).
- [30] Becker, G. S. (1981). *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [31] Harbison, F. & Myers, C.A. (1964). *Manpower and Economic Growth: Strategies of Human Resource Development*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [32] Shearer, J. C. (1969). *International Migration of Talent, and the Foreign Student*. Proceeding of the Twenty-Second Meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association.
- [33] Fuenzalida, E. (1980). *Relevance and Development Style*. In H. M. Jenkins (Ed.), *The Relevance of United States Education to Students from Developing Countries*. A Report of the Fourth AID/NAFSA Workshop.
- [34] Thurow, L. (Summer, 1972). *Education and Economic Quality*, *The Public Interest*, 28, 66-81.
- [35] Paulston, R. G. (June/October, 1977). *Social and Educational Change: Conceptual Frameworks*, *Comparative Education Review*, 21 (2/3), 370-395.
- [36] Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (May, 1975). *The Problem with the Human Capital Theory*, *American Economic Review*, 65, 74-82.
- [37] Levin, H. (June, 1979). *Economic Democracy, Education, and Social Change*. Program Report No. 79-B16. Institute of Research on Educational Finance and Governance.
- [38] Carnoy, M. (1974). *Education as Cultural Imperialism*. New York: David McKay Co., Inc.
- [39] Mazrui, A. A. (1976). *A World Federation of Cultures: An African Perspective*. New York: The Free Press.
- [40] Obah, T. V. (Nov 1983). *Prior Knowledge and the Quest for New Knowledge: The Third World Dilemma*, *Journal of Reading*, 27, 129-133.
- [41] Weiler, H. N. (1982). *The Political Dilemmas of Foreign Study*, *Comparative Educational Review*, 28 (2).