INTERNATIONALIZATION STRATEGIES
IN TRADITIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
ACROSS THE UNITED STATES

A Doctoral Research Project
Presented to
Dr. Daniel S. Alemu, Assistant Professor
Doctoral Research Committee Chair
Esteves School of Education
The Sage Colleges

In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Education
In Educational Leadership

Vincent Gerald Porfirio
September, 2012

INTERNATIONALIZATION STRATEGIES
IN TRADITIONAL HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS
ACROSS THE UNITED STATES

We represent to Sage Graduate School that this thesis/dissertation and abstract are the original work of the author(s) and do not infringe on the copyright or other rights of others.

_____   _____

Vincent G. Porfirio   Date of Signature

_____   _____

Daniel S. Alemu, Ph.D.   Date of Signature
Assistant Professor of Education
Doctoral Research Committee Chair

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To an extraordinary cast of characters who have acted as mentors, guides, and, most importantly, as friends in this journey known simply as the doctoral program: thank you.

A special thank you to my committee chair, Dr. Daniel Alemu, my second reader, Dr. Ann Myers, my third reader, Dr. Stephen Danna, and the entire faculty who was principled, pragmatic, and taught me to believe in myself and my abilities. Thank you for believing in me.

A grand thank you to my fellow cohort members who came together as strangers and leave as dear friends and confidants. Thank you.

For her guidance, wisdom, and wit, a special thank you to my coach, Dr. Sally Lawrence.

Special thanks and deep gratitude to Trish Cellemme and Sharon Murray for their tireless support, advocacy, and mentorship throughout the doctoral process.

To the four people who have always been there for me and who have asked me to do nothing less than change the world, I offer my deepest love and devotion and a heartfelt thanks to my parents, Angelo and Gail Porfirio, and my grandparents, Gerald and Audrey Paden. You have taught me to live as big as I dream and for that I am forever grateful.

Finally, a special dedication to my dear friend and cohort member Anthony Clemente: we started this journey together and we finish together. You are dearly missed but not forgotten.

"We are citizens of the world. The tragedy of our times is that we do not know this."

-Woodrow Wilson

ABSTRACT

Higher education in the twenty-first century faces a number of challenges. Higher education executives at the helm of their institutions are tasked with maintaining a competitive advantage in recruiting, retaining, and producing students equipped with twenty-first century skills while simultaneously ensuring their institutions remain viable in an increasingly competitive market. One of the solutions for a number of higher education institutions to meet these objectives is internationalization. Until recently, little attention has been given to the research of higher education executives' perceptions and experiences of internationalization at highly internationalized higher education institutions. This study focused on exploring higher education executives' perceptions and experiences of the internationalization efforts at institutions that have been identified as highly internationalized. This study also sought to identify the internationalization strategies at these institutions across the United States.

Data for this qualitative, grounded theory study was gathered using telephone interviews with fourteen higher education executives at seven highly internationalized higher education institutions across the United States. Findings showed that student mobility was identified as the top internationalization strategy and study abroad was perceived to be most effective. Enhanced cultural competencies of students, faculty and staff, and the competitive advantage of the institution in the academic market were the two value-added benefits identified. The monetary costs associated with internationalization efforts were perceived to be overwhelmingly high. Recommendations include embracing and aligning internationalization efforts to the distinctive institutional characteristics of the higher education institution to foster a competitive advantage.

Key Words: alignment, competitive advantage, executives, globalization, higher education, internationalization, strategies, student mobility, sustainability

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I:

INTRODUCTION

Higher education in the twenty-first century is radically changing due in great part to globalization (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2009). The technology revolution has widened opportunities for agile, effective, and creative educational strategies that are both financially viable and pedagogically sound. With a globe that is continuously flattening and a digitalized landscape that has revolutionized the ways in which we learn and teach, many higher education institutions are embracing stronger and more durable strategies to create comprehensive agendas that capitalize on a transforming world (Friedman, 2005). Higher education executives at the helm of higher education institutions must meet the global challenges and embrace opportunities of the new century.

Higher education executives cannot be passive observers who only witness change. They must be capable partners who develop connections, build diverse strategies, and balance the world of today with that of tomorrow. Institutions of higher education must reflect the world as it is, not as it was. This requires assuming a position in the international community that cultivates a full range of diverse and sustainable partnerships, pursues policies that will mobilize efforts and actions towards both short-term and long-term goals, and successfully meets overriding objectives through tangible results. This is no easy task.

Creating, articulating and setting in motion a robust blueprint for the twenty-first century means enlisting architects who are both principled and pragmatic. The shifting landscape of higher education in the United States has never been more compounded and the call for new strategies and tactics never clearer (Bernhard, 2012; Strauss & Howe, 2007). At the forefront of

these changes is the sheer size and scale of the current higher education academic market. Higher education is among the United States' top service sectors and the numbers underscore the importance of higher education institutions as economic engines in an ailing economy (Institute of International Education, 2012). Higher education institutions in the US have nearly doubled during the new century showing a 64.5% growth over the last decade (American Federation of Teachers, 2012).

The number of public and private higher education institutions jumped from a total of 4,293 during the 2001-02 academic year to the current total of 7,060 in 2012 (American Federation of Teachers, 2012). This unprecedented growth is due to the chartering of new public and private institutions, for-profit institutions, as well as online education platforms that have emerged over the last ten years across the US (Bernhard, 2012). Trends show that online education is a key player in the higher education market and shows no signs of slowing. The existence of nearly twenty-four mega universities worldwide that operate as online education hubs and boast over one million students, speaks to a significant phenomenon[1] (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2009).

Background of the Study

As higher education phases from "brick and mortar" to "click and order" it is clear that traditional higher education institutions will have to find new strategies to successfully navigate uncharted waters (Hammond, 2009). Overall, enrollment in degree-granting higher education

---

[1] The online education sector has been dominated by large-scale "open" universities like Indira Gandhi National Open University in India which accounts for 1.8 million students). The University of South Africa (UNISA) claims to be the continent's premier distance learning institution with approximately 250,000 students. The African Virtual University works across borders and language groups in over twenty-seven countries (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2009).

institutions in the US grew by 9% between 1989 and 1999 and increased a staggering 38% between 1999 and 2009 from 14.8 million to 20.4 million (US Department of Education, 2011). Fall 2011 ushered in its largest class yet: an unprecedented 29.1 million students bringing an increase of 9.3 million[2] from the Fall of 2009 (US Department of Education, 2011; American Federation of Teachers, 2012).

However, a closer look at the numbers indicates clear shifts which have changed the demographics of the students attending all forms of higher education institutions. Empirical data shows that the number of domestic high school graduates who continue on to higher education institutions is beginning to decline (Noel-Levitz, 2008; US Department of Education, 2010). As the number of graduates from US high schools diminishes a very important question surfaces: *who* is the cause for such rapid growth in enrollment numbers?

Foremost, the enrollment of racially diverse domestic students has rapidly spiked since the turn of the century. According to "The American Freshman: Forty-Year Trends 1966 – 2006," which used data based on the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey administered annually, the demographic environment is changing rapidly (Pryor, Hurtado, Saenz, Santos & Korn, 2007). All minority groups have made significant attendance gains, although at varying rates, and are filling the seats at higher education institutions throughout the US.

Currently, the Hispanic population is leading the way for minority students across the US with only 443,000 studying in 1980, 1.4 million studying in 2000, and more than 2.4 million studying in 2009 (US Census Bureau, 2012). Projections indicate that by the year 2025 in the

---

[2] Figure(s) include undergraduate and graduate total enrollment numbers (US Department of Education, 2011; American Federation of Teachers, 2012).

US, nearly one-quarter of the college age population will be Latino (2012). Looking at the data in terms age, the number of students twenty-five years of age and older has dramatically increased since 2000 with the numbers jumping from 2.3 million to 2.9 million in 2009 (2012). The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) forecasts a 9% increase in enrollments of students under twenty-five years of age for 2010 to 2019 (2012). Juxtaposed with that single digit increase is the NCES's projection that the US will see a 23% rise in enrollments of students twenty-five years of age and older during that same period (US Department of Education, 2011). The graying of the American college student is indicative of the pressures on both the US and global economies, the need for new labor skills, demographic changes in family structures, and an ever shape-shifting global context in which the nation finds itself.

International students studying in the US have also helped to catapult the total enrollment numbers. According to the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2012), international students are those "who travel to a country different from their own for the purpose of studying at a higher education institution" (p. 13). International student enrollments have virtually tripled over the last thirty years; from 286,000 in 1980 to approximately 691,000 in 2010 (Institute of International Education, 2012). International students represented 3.5% of all students attending higher education institutions in the 2008-09 academic year (Association of International Educators, 2011). The 2010-11 academic year reached an all-time high of 5% compositional makeup, or 725,277 international students enrolling in American higher education institutions (Institute of International Education, 2012).

The US is also benefiting from recruiting top minds from around the globe and educating them within its borders. Bringing the world's best and brightest students to US higher education is indispensable for research and development (R&D), and for allowing the US to continue to be

a leader in the global knowledge economy; particularly given the ever-decreasing domestic students' enrollment in the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) fields[3] (Miyokawa, 2009; Keeling & Hersh, 2011).

Higher education institutions will have to mirror what is happening both domestically and abroad to remain competitive and relevant in the escalating reality of our new global community. It becomes imperative for higher education institutions to remain flexible and agile to not only tap into new markets of potential students but meet their needs and provide them with tools and skills required to live and work in an increasingly interconnected and interdependent world.

Higher education executives have a profound responsibility. They are tasked with building an ambitious agenda that channels the currents of globalization towards internationalization. As the American college student ages so goes the leadership at the majority of higher education institutions in the US (Cook & Young, 2012). Simply put, higher education is at a crossroads. Higher education executives need to provide the educated citizenry needed to compete globally; this requires rethinking traditional and dated strategies within higher education by a group of individuals who are themselves, for better or worse, traditional and dated.

One of the key strategies that many higher education institutions are embracing is the internationalization of their campus communities. With a growing number of international students looking to achieve a degree in the US, many higher education institutions are finding a competitive advantage in marketing their ability to develop and hone skills and resources needed to compete in a global workforce (American Council on Education, 2012). With a variety of

---

[3] In the 2006 "Programme for International Student Assessment" (PISA) comparison, American students ranked twenty-first out of thirty in science literacy among students from developed countries, and twenty-fifth out of thirty in math literacy.

tactics available to introduce, enhance, and sustain internationalization at a higher education institution, many higher education executives are successfully securing both international and domestic applicants who value global learning.

Study abroad programs and international student recruitment and retention (i.e. student mobility) have long been the core pillars evidenced in a higher education institution's internationalization efforts. These tactics, along with countless other strategies, require a great deal of resources. The ability to convene and connect, energize and update, and create mechanisms to anchor and sustain change that meets the global challenges of today is truly twenty-first century statecraft and is nothing less than what is being required of higher education executives (De Wit, 1995; Horn, Hendel & Fry, 2007; Kehm & Teichler, 2007; Knight, 2004). One of the greatest challenges facing higher education institutions is resource stability and allocation. One of the answers to budget woes and restrictions on funding for many higher education institutions is by way of internationalizing their campuses. In order for higher education institutions to market themselves to the shifting demographics of the twenty-first century they first have to diversify their portfolios and brand themselves as institutions equipped to create and empower the workforce of the future. Internationalization, often times, allows them to accomplish that goal.

Globally, more than 2.5 million students are studying outside their home countries and estimates predict this number to rise to 7 million by 2020 (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2009). The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO) "2009 World Conference on Higher Education Report" echoed these predictions. The main destinations preferred by international students are the US, United Kingdom, and Australia. The US is the undisputed front-runner with approximately 723,277 international students enrolling in higher

education institutions in 2010-11 (Institute of International Education, 2012). Moreover, international students were estimated to generate billions to the US economy annually (Kelly, 2011). The Association of International Educators (NAFSA) calculates the economic impact of international students and their dependents on the US economy. NAFSA estimated that during the 2008-09 academic year $17.66 billion was contributed to the US economy. The 2009-10 academic year brought a windfall of approximately $18.8 billion (NASFA, 2011). That number has skyrocketed to $21 billion for the 2010-11 academic year reaching an all-time high of international students enrolling in American higher education institutions (Institute of International Education, 2012). International students provide significant revenue not just to the host higher education institutions but also to local economies of the host states.

Revenue is generated for living expenses, including room and board, books and supplies, transportation, health insurance, and support for accompanying family members (Institute of International Education, 2012). California remains the leading host state for international students (96,535), followed by New York (78,888), Texas (61,636), Massachusetts (38,698), and Illinois (33,766). "The Open Doors Report" (2011), a collaborative between the Institute for International Education and the US Department of State, reports that "63% of all international students receive the majority of their funds from personal and family sources" (p. 4). When other sources of foreign funding are included, such as assistance from their home country governments or universities, almost 70% of all international students' primary funding, including tuition, comes from sources outside of the US (Institute of International Education, 2012).

However, changing conditions, current challenges, and major and emerging opportunities are shifting perspectives and reframing educational priorities. With a variety of barriers to entry, including stringent student visa requirements to study in the US, competition from other English

speaking host countries such as Canada, Australia and the United Kingdom (which recruit with support from their governments), and the expense of studying in the US (American higher education institutions are the most expensive in the world), the impediments to recruiting and retaining international students is a challenge (Noel-Levitz, 2008).

Higher education has seen a dramatic shift from what was once a multi-polar to a multi-partner world, where international relationships are no longer unilateral, in which dealings are between one foreign country, but multilateral, in which many stakeholders have to be considered. The US is now both a transatlantic and transpacific nation. Terrorism, cyber insecurity, conflict in the Middle East, ongoing threats of extremism, hunger and disease, global recession and stagnation, economic instability, competing interests for energy and environmental securities, and the widening gap between rich and poor are just a few of the obstacles to both globalization and internationalization (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2009; Clinton, 2012; Friedman, 2005). This is the world in which we find ourselves. The international landscape today is unforgiving.

Even with these remarkable and harsh realities acting as clear disincentives and barriers to entry for prospective globalization at both the macro level and internationalization at the institutional level, many higher education institutions are thriving and adapting to this new world (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Burns & Smuckler, 1995; Christophe & Lee, 2005; De Wit, 2002).

The challenges facing higher education in the new millennium are best understood by looking at the phenomenon of globalization and internationalization (Scott, 2000). Semantics and properly defining these terms has been the subject of great discourse and debate over the past three decades (Cantwell & Maldonado-Maldonado, 2009). Globalization and internationalization have an interconnected and symbiotic relationship, they are however, different. Although often

8

used interchangeably, the difference between the two terms is stark. Knight (2003) draws a clear contrast between the two terms and defines globalization as "the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas across borders" (p. 5). The distinction is important because it allows for a multilayered, multifaceted approach to understanding the macro/micro relationship between the two terms.

For the purposes of this research study Knight's (1993) original definition of internationalization will be used: "the process of integrating an international or intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institution" (p. 3). The original definition is both clear and crisp. However, in certain circles ambiguity still remains and confusion abounds. Terms become interchangeable and used incorrectly. One of the challenges of this study was to successfully distinguish between "globalization" and "internationalization." The other was to operationalize "internationalization" in a way that fully articulates the wide range of tactics and strategies that can be implemented at a higher education institution.

Problem Statement

This study sought to highlight effective internationalization strategies being undertaken at highly internationalized higher education institutions in the US. Although there is a plethora of recent research focused on strategies and tactics little attention had been given to the higher education executives who administer internationalization policies, programs and services. The all-too-thin knowledge base about higher education executives' perceptions and behaviors around internationalization efforts called for further exploration and understanding. Uncovering both the perceived benefits and the costs of adopting specific strategies allowed for a comprehensive approach to internationalization and outlined tactics and strategies that have been successfully operationalized at leading institutions of higher education that had been determined

9

to be highly internationalized. This study acts as both a collection of the most relevant concepts surrounding internationalization today as well as a roadmap for higher education executives to determine both short and long-term strategies that operate in concert with their higher education institutional designs to bring about meaningful and beneficial change.

Moreover, this study defined the role of internationalization of US higher education in the global twenty-first century. The endorsement of global engagement is a specific approach that must acknowledge the strategic challenges and barriers of the international community. However, educational outreach and entrepreneurial ventures coupled with a sound platform for collaboration allows higher education executives to fully capitalize on America's unique strengths while simultaneously elevating individual higher education institution's priorities in unprecedented ways. Higher education has been, and always will be, a key to unlocking a number of the challenges that we face.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this grounded theory, qualitative research study was to explore higher education executives' perceptions and experiences of internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions across the US. The study identified and assessed approaches and methods used by higher education executives at highly internationalized higher education institutions to implement internationalization strategies.

Five research questions were proposed to better understand the approaches taken and the agendas launched. The research questions that drove this study are the following:

1. Which internationalization strategies are identified by higher education executives at highly internationalized higher education institutions?

2. Which internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions are perceived and experienced to be the most effective by higher education executives?

3. What do higher education executives perceive and experience to be the benefits of incorporating effective internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions?

4. What do higher education executives perceive and experience to be the costs of incorporating effective internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions?

5. How similar and different are higher education executives' perceptions and experiences of internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions?

Definition of Key Terms

The following terms are used throughout this study. The researcher's intent of each term should be clear to the reader. Both common and unfamiliar words are defined as:

Competitive Advantage: A superiority gained by an organization when it can offer a service or product at a greater value than its competitors (Campbell & Brown, 2003).

Cost-Benefit Analysis: Method of policy analysis for weighing the worth of a current or future program or project in terms of efficient resource allocation (Campbell & Brown, 2003). For this study an in-depth economic analysis will be forgone and basic and anecdotal

approach will be taken in the form of a narrative description of the perceived and actual

benefits and costs of a specified strategy, policy, program, or initiative.

Cultural Competence (Competency): Ability to interact effectively with other peoples from

various backgrounds, religions, held norms, values, and beliefs in a way that allows for

acknowledgement, understanding, and celebration of differences (Altbach, Reisberg &

Rumbley, 2009; Senge, 2000).

Globalization (Globalisation): An umbrella term used to describe "the broad economic,

technological, and scientific trends that directly affect higher education and are largely

inevitable in the contemporary world" and outside of an academic institutions control

(Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2009, p. 23).

Grounded Theory: Broad research design that is systematic and is "grounded" in the data so that

a theory is generated that explains a particular process, action, or an interaction

(Creswell, 2012).

Higher Education Executives: Includes presidents and chancellors, provosts and executive

academic officers, vice presidents and vice chancellors, deans who have the primary

responsibility of overseeing internationalization efforts in the selected and consenting

"highly internationalized" post-secondary institutions. Titles are based on the institutional

design of the higher education institution.

Higher Education Institution (Traditional): Defined as a tertiary, post-secondary, or third level

education system in the US that is accredited and a degree granting university or college requiring approximately two to four years of study in the arts and/or sciences. These institutions include community colleges, comprehensive universities, liberal arts institutions and research/doctoral institutions (see definitions for each category) (UNESCO, 2011; Carnegie Foundation, 2012). For the purposes of this study the term does not include for-profit or on-line higher education institutions.

Highly Internationalized (Internationalised): Defined as a higher education institution that have

been recognized by all three leading independent agencies in the field of international education: *American Council on Education, Association of International Educators*, and *Institute of International Education*. The academic institutions recognized have all been selected for prestigious awards and invited to act as members of a selective consortium that deems the institutions' executives as experts in the field of internationalization. Additionally, highly internationalized is defined as a "strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate international polices, programs, and initiatives, and positions colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally connected" (American Council on Education, 2012, p. 3).

International Student(s): Those foreign or nonimmigrant students who travel to a country

different from their own for the purpose of higher education study (OECD, 2012).

Internationalization (Internationalisation): The term internationalization is defined as and is

limited to the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education (Knight, 1994).

Student Mobility: The physical movement of students to pursue academic studies in a foreign

country for a predetermined amount of time with the intention of returning to their home

countries. Students undertake two main forms of student mobility: study abroad programs

and international student status. The length of time of study in the foreign country being

the distinguishing variable between the two forms (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2009;

American Council of Education, 2012; Knight 1994).

Study Abroad: Physical act of a student pursuing educational opportunities (cultural immersion,

classroom study, research, internships or externships, service learning) in another country

for a predetermined amount of time.

Significance of the Study

Higher education executives and those interested in adopting internationalization

strategies within US higher education institutions will benefit from this research. Higher

education executives will gain insight into the perceptions, opinions, and experiences of higher

education executives at highly internationalized higher education institutions across the nation.

The study guides in developing strong and durable policies and successful strategies that will

allow higher education executives to introduce, anchor and enhance internationalization efforts at

their institutions. The research will act as a blueprint for higher education executives and is a

valuable introductory document to better understanding internationalization in the US. In order

for US higher education institutions to remain viable stakeholders in the global arena they must

acknowledge and seek to champion both the domestic and international interests of the twenty-

first century (Clinton, 2011). Internationalization becomes the cornerstone in which US higher

education is able to build and construct an indispensible instrument to seize the opportunities of the future.

Organization of the Study

This qualitative research study is comprised of five chapters. Chapter one is an introduction which the purpose of the study, significance of the study and research questions that drove the study are defined and explained. Chapter two is a comprehensive review of relevant literature on theories of internationalization, current and historical roles of higher education executives, and contemporary internationalization strategies and tactics.

Chapter three is intended to be descriptive of the methodology used in this research. This includes information about the sample participants, their selection, the instrumentation and its validity, and the collection method of data for the study. Chapter four presents the findings of this study through analysis of each research question and the data collected. Finally, chapter five provides a summary of the grounded theory developed by the researcher, findings, conclusions, recommendations and recommendations for further study in the area of internationalization of higher education institutions based on higher education executives' perceptions and experiences.

Delimitations of the Study

The research study was designed to include a number of factors that would allow the researcher to have optimal control over the data collection and analysis. The delimitations determined by the researcher included narrowing the scope of the study to traditional higher education institutions. This meant focusing on four specific designs (community colleges, liberal arts institutions, comprehensive universities, and research/doctoral institutions) and not including for-profit or online higher education institutional designs. The study was also limited to higher education institutions geographically located in the US. Three independent firms were used to

select ten higher education institutions and identify them as highly internationalized. The scope and size of the sample was intentional due to the qualitative nature of the study and the curricular design of the doctoral program. Participants were also required to be higher education executives who specifically oversaw internationalization at their higher education institutions.

Limitations of the Study

This educational research study was approached in a detailed, rigorous, and intentional way so that the design of the study and its findings would be generalizable. However, one aspect of the study was outside of the researcher's control. Lower than expected participation in the research study was a direct limitation that the researcher was unable to control. The research study used purposeful sampling to select participants and a small sample was identified from ten higher education institutions that were determined to be highly internationalized. A total of twenty higher education executives were contacted to participate in the study and only fifteen actively participated in the research. Higher education executives not answering, and therefore not participating, in the research study caused for a lower participation rate than originally planned for and was a limitation that was outside of the researcher's control.

CHAPTER II:

LITERATURE REVIEW

Higher education has become a real part of the globalization process (Policy Futures in Education, 2003). Successfully embracing strategies and tactics that will allow a higher education institution to fully incorporate and infuse internationalization strategies across the curriculum and campus is imperative. Three decades of limited research suggested that institutions of higher education could no longer afford to focus merely on a single dimension of internationalization (2003). This chapter is dedicated to the review of relevant literature on internationalization and includes pertinent theories and strategies used to internationalize higher education institutions. Moreover, current and historical roles of higher education executives and their perceptions and experiences will be presented. A number of key texts guided the research study and assisted in composing a comprehensive understanding of what internationalization is and how it has functioned over the years.

Friedman's (2005) work focused on real-world events and outlined the effects of the twentieth century on the twenty-first century. In particular the author highlighted what he called the "flattening" of the globe (p. 2). Friedman (2005) explained how the technology revolution, wedded with a heightened dependence on globalization, caused the flattening of the globe. The focus of the author's work outlined how countries, companies, communities, individuals, and governments and societies can, and must, adapt (Friedman, 2005). The ability for firms in the twenty-first century to be agile and resilient to an ever-changing global landscape became the mantra of the work. The connections and relevance to the internationalization of higher education institutions throughout both the US and the globe was of particular interest.

Defining Internationalization in the Twenty-First Century

As late as the 1980's, internationalization as a term and as a concept referred simply to sending students overseas through study abroad programs to expose them to other cultures (McMurtrie, 2007). Earlier, in the 1960's, international education took on a public-service and research dimension. Today internationalization refers to a complex set of actions, synergies, and partnerships. These tactics cover curricular redesigns and collaboration, student exchanges, foreign language study, joint research and publishing partnerships, public diplomacy fostered by the institutional leadership, and the pursuit of profit through fundraising and recruiting overseas students (McMurtrie, 2007; Merkurev, 1991).

Internationalization and interculturality, as terms to describe specific efforts within education, have also been used interchangeably throughout much of the research and literature (Terri, 2009). Three individuals have had a significant impact on the ways in which we use, understand, and define the term internationalization. They are Jane Knight, Hans de Wit, and, more contemporarily, Peter G. Altbach. The three authors have been active and engaged in the internationalization conversation for some time and have on a number of occasions collaborated on works and argued with one another about best practices and nuanced definitions (De Wit & Knight, 1999; Altbach & Knight, 2007).

All three researchers have made their mark on the semantics of the term and the collective operationalization of putting rhetoric into reality and thoughts into action; and in one instance Hans de Wit decrying that internationalization had officially come to an end (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2010). The term, internationalization, has been used for centuries in political science and governmental relations, but its popularity in the education sector has really

only soared since the 1980's (Knight, 2003). Knight's (1994) definition of internationalization is as follows:

> Internationalization of higher education is the process of integrating an international dimension into the teaching/learning, research and service functions of a university or college. An international dimension means a perspective, activity or service which introduces or integrates an international/intercutultural/global outlook into the major functions of an institution of higher education (p. 3).

Knight (1994) cautioned readers that internationalization meant different things to different people and warned that internationalization was often used interchangeably with the term globalization. Other synonyms were also highlighted, such as international, global, intercultural and multicultural education (Knight, 1994). De Wit's (1993) definition of internationalization was indeed more direct and concise: "Internationalization is defined as the process by which education is developed into a more international direction" (p. 8).

However, something seemed to be missing from de Wit's definition and that was clarity. Knight's (1994) definition gave further meaning to internationalization as a term and allowed for a more comprehensive understanding of what was meant by a higher education institution having an international dimension, something that remained ambiguous in de Wit's (1993) articulation. In 2003 Knight revisited the definition proposed in 1994 and introduced new language that would allow for internationalization to relate to all aspects of education within the context of the greater society. Knight (2004) further argued for a focus on the dichotomy between the institutional level and the national level: "Internationalization at the national, sector, and

19

institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education" (p. 3). The revised definition is dually noted but for the purposes of this research study Knight's (1993) original definition was used.

Internationalization: An Historical Perspective

Many researchers have advocated for internationalization at higher education institutions across the US and the world. Internationalization allowed higher education institutions to educate US citizens who have limited experiences with people and places abroad, add diversity and understanding to the campus community, and assisted in generating revenue by promoting international student recruitment, study abroad efforts, and increased the overall attractiveness of the institution (De Wit, 2002; Noel-Levitz, 2008). In order to chart a map for the future it is critical to understand the past. Part of that greater understanding was born out of knowing how internationalization has come to be defined and the role it has played at higher education institutions. Over the past forty years internationalization of higher education has changed dramatically and taken a number of unique forms (De Wit, 2002). Throughout the 1960's and into the 1980's internationalization was the cornerstone of development and aid at higher education institutions in many developing nations (De Wit, 2011; USAID, 2010). It was not until the late 1980's that a revolution occurred in academia, and in many governmental agencies, which allowed internationalization to shift from internationalization as aid and assistance, to internationalization as the exchange of students and teachers as well as curriculum development (De Wit, 2011). For developed nations like the United Kingdom and Australia, the shift from aid to trade became apparent and internationalization was identified as a financial benefit with a great deal of commercial value.

Additionally, many developed countries and their respective governments wanted to get in on this exchange of people and began to limit scholarships and started charging full-cost fees at public higher education institutions (De Wit, 2011). During the 1990's yet another development occurred. Countries like the United Kingdom and Australia saw great potential in moving internationalization efforts in a new direction. Prompted by the Asian economic crises and continued unrest in the Middle East many countries adopted a competitive strategy of delivering academic services abroad (Kehm & Teichler, 2007). This tactic, known by a variety of monikers (transnational education, cross-border delivery, and offshore education) allowed institutions to introduce and cultivate branch campuses and franchise operations in various regions. This new form of internationalization had been credited with switching the emphasis on the movement of students to the movement of programs and curriculums (Kehm & Teichler, 2007). The overarching strategy allowed institutions that were facing a decline in international students to tap into new markets with the "underlying assumption that 'if they do not come to us, why do we not go to them'" (De Wit, 2011, p. 18). This model has been very successful and the US has taken the lead in developing educational opportunities in a wide array of geographical locations. Today, in the second decade of the twenty-first century, there are American higher education institutions overseas in thirteen countries and that number continues to expand (Noel-Levitz, 2008).

The twenty-first century started with a prolific act that directly impacted internationalization and globalization. The tragic events of September 11, 2001 have forever changed the way in which the US interacts with the rest of the world and has had a direct and continued impact on international student enrollment domestically, and study abroad and other international ventures globally. In the aftermath of September 11, international student

enrollments slowed dramatically in the US, and the number of international students actually saw a dip from 2002 through 2006. The 2006-07 academic year had a modest rebound, and the recovery has grown stronger each year with 2012's numbers at an all-time high. The US continues to struggle with striking a balance between access and security when it comes to allowing students to study both within and outside its borders (Miyokawa, 2009). Terrorism and other forms of violence have also hindered the international community's ability to attract and retain various constituencies of students. However, strides are being taken to allow for continued growth in the area of internationalization. The European Union (EU) introduced The Bologna Accord in 2010 which has allowed European students greater flexibility and mobility when it comes to attending higher education institutions throughout the region (Noel-Levitz, 2012). Allowing students the ability to cross borders more easily has been a tremendous opportunity for the EU and its citizenry.

Since the 1990's three countries have dominated efforts for internationalization at their higher education institutions: the US, Australia, and the United Kingdom. All three nations have successfully excelled in recruiting and retaining international students to their shores. Coupled with international student enrollment are the offshore activities the higher education institutions in these nations are able to conduct. The results are a more competitive and commercial approach to internationalization efforts both domestically and abroad. With a growing world population[4] and new technologies continuously shrinking the globe and allowing for increased access to higher education the road ahead looks long, unending, and certainly uncharted.

---

[4] In October 2011 the world population reached 7 billion (UN, 2011).

Theoretical & Empirical Issues Regarding Internationalization

Altbach's (2002) seminal work was beneficial because it outlined potential downsides to internationalizing a higher education institution; this being one of the few voices dedicated to discussing barriers and obstacles to the process of internationalization. Altbach (2002) outlined a number of key challenges that included the ambiguity surrounding the standardization of programs and accreditations for international programs. The author also dedicates research to the "unpacking" of the realities of internationalization and the effects these efforts have had on developing nations and the free market (Altbach, 2004). These considerable disadvantages were in stark contrast to the majority of the literature that praised internationalization efforts. Altbach (2002) argued that operationalizing and implementing internationalization efforts successfully at most higher education institutions was difficult but necessary. Higher education executives have to fully comprehend the limitations of their institutions, resources, and overall abilities before crafting a strategic plan or undertaking specific strategies.

Svensson & Wihlborg (2010) presented a multidimensional argument for the importance of a collaborative approach between internationalization of a higher education institution and the globalization of a country as a whole. Here the distinction between the two terms became paramount (Knight, 2004). The authors argued that at both the national and institutional levels it was critical that there be an alignment of policies and principles for a higher education institution to successfully internationalize (Svensson & Wihlborg, 2010). The research also further explored how internationalization strategies being undertaken at an institution were often directly influenced by political, economic and organizational restrictions; the result was often a constriction on pedagogical considerations and academic freedom (2010). Svensson &

Wihlborg's (2010) work was in many ways connected with Senge's (2000) work with the importance placed on aligning systemic operations towards common goals and outcomes.

Finally, the Institute of International Education's (2011) "Open Doors Report" allowed for a longitudinal exploration of the trend-lines of internationalization within US higher education. The report, which has been collecting data since 1954, has received support from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs and the US Department of State since 1972. The study (2011) gave quantitative data on a far reaching range of topic areas. This include data for both the US and various other key stakeholders around the world. Data sets specific to the US outlined top states hosting international students, top higher education institutions hosting international students, study abroad trends, leading study abroad destinations of students, and international student trends (2011). The report was referenced by both the US government and by many scholars working in the field of internationalization and globalization.

Internationalization Strategies

As early as 1919 many researchers, higher education executives, and a handful of agencies were sounding the call for better resources and tools to assist them in fully understanding internationalization in higher education (Institute of International Education, 1919; Knight, 1994; De Wit, 1993). Burns & Smuckler (1995) provided some instructive insights regarding recommendations for a research agenda designed to further internationalize higher education in the US. The authors called for the development of "data banks and other statistical information, specific surveys on emerging trends, impact studies and evaluations, and in-depth, social science-based examinations of a topic over the course of several years" (Burns & Smuckler, 1995, p. 2). The authors also heralded the need for specific research topics and priorities, including: "(1) future private and public sector needs; (2) current status of

24

internationalization; and (3) connecting current status to future national needs" (Burns & Smuckler, 1995, p. 4).

Even before researchers and higher education executives had labeled internationalization as such, the desire for information and data pertaining to the topic has been demanded. So what are the strategies being used by US higher education institutions to internationalize their campus communities? Foremost, it is important to understand that the majority of US higher education institutions and their executives are coordinating some form of a tactic or strategy around internationalization whether they realize it or not. Programs like study abroad and international student recruitment and retention (i.e. student mobility) are occurring at various degrees throughout higher education institutions in the US and these two strategies were pointed to by much of the literature as key indicators of internationalization efforts (Altbach, 2012; American Council on Education, 2012). However, higher education institutions and their executives have a wide array of tactics and strategies to select from to effectively tap into the global intellectual commons and reap benefits. Strategies for internationalizing a higher education institution vary depending on the institutional design and structure, geographical location, and the overall mission of the academic institution (Altbach, 2012).

De Wit (1995) detailed the internationalization process both in the US and abroad by way of an anthology of key works. De Wit (1995) summarized the conceptual and regional aspects of strategies of internationalization resulting from workshops and discussions held by leading researchers who authored works detailing internationalization efforts across the globe. The focus of much of the research and findings dealt directly with study abroad programs and international student recruitment; the emphasis on student mobility was a major highlight of the work. De Wit

(2008) once again focused on one specific factor of internationalization and that was student mobility.

The American Council on Education's "Mapping Internationalization on US Campuses" 2008 and 2012 editions acted as roadmaps for higher education executives. These studies prepared a comparative analysis between findings collected in 2001 with a more recent 2006 study. Linkages were made between the two data sets and a number of key findings were highlighted and presented in the report. Takeaways from the 2008 edition included specific indicators of internationalization at a higher education institution that ranged from subtle to extreme (American Council on Education, 2008, p. ix). The strategies presented were taken directly from the 2008 edition. The indicators of internationalization according to the report were:

- *Institutional Support*: "including stated institutional commitment, organizational structure and staffing, and external funding" (p. ix);

- *Academic Requirements, Programs, and Extracurricular Activities*: "including foreign-language requirements and offerings, international/global course requirements, education abroad, use of technology for internationalization, joint degrees, and campus activities" (p. ix);

- *Faculty Policies and Opportunities*: "including funding for faculty opportunities and criteria for promotion, tenure, and hiring" (p. ix);

- *International Students*: "including enrollments, recruiting targets and strategies, financial support for international students and programs and support services" (p. ix).

The list was neither ranked nor exhaustive. Moreover, the four categories presented are broad and each encapsulates a number of strategies introduced to capture the complexities of effective internationalization. The 2012 edition (American Council on Education) expanded on these four categories and presented six key focus areas that allowed for "comprehensive internationalization" by way of interconnected targets for introducing policies and programs (p. 4). The six target areas were as follows:

- *Articulated Institutional Commitment*: "Mission statements, strategic plans, and formal assessment mechanisms" (p. 4);

- *Administrative Structure and Staffing*: "Reporting structures and staff office configurations" (p. 4);

- *Curriculum, Co-curriculum, and Learning Outcomes*: "General education and language requirements, co-curricular activities and programs, and specified student learning outcomes" (p. 4);

- *Faculty Policies and Practices*: "Hiring guidelines, tenure and promotion policies, and faculty development opportunities" (p. 4);

- *Student Mobility*: "Study abroad programs, and international student recruitment and support" (p. 4);

- *Collaboration and Partnerships*: "Joint-degree or dual/double-degree programs, branch campuses, and other offshore programs" (p. 4).

Both editions of the report (2008; 2012) highlighted the importance of international students to a higher education institution's internationalization process. International student

enrollments had virtually tripled over the last thirty years; from 286,000 in 1980 to approximately 691,000 in 2010 (US Census Bureau, 2012). International students represented 3.5% of all students attending higher education institutions in the 2008-09 academic year (Association of International Educators, 2011). The 2010-11 academic year reached an all-time high of 5% compositional makeup, or 725,277 undergraduate and graduate international students enrolling in US higher education institutions (Institute of International Education, 2012).

Table 1.

International Student Enrollment in US Higher Education: 1980-2010

1980	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010
286,000	387,000	453,000	515,000	565,000	691,000

Note. Adapted from the "2012 Statistical Abstract: The National Data Book," 2012, US Census Bureau (USCB).

According to Childress (2009) little is known about institutional plans for internationalization. Moreover, a unified approach to crafting, assessing and implementing a strategic plan specific for internationalization had not yet been widely accepted. Childress' (2009) article presented the results of a study conducted with the American Council on Education's "Center for International Initiatives" on the "types, prevalence, development, implementation, and monitoring of internationalization plans at member higher education institutions" (p. 23). The work highlighted the importance of academic institutions crafting a strategic plan in order to design, drive and evaluate internationalization at a higher education institution. Coordination of a guiding document was vital, it was argued, to the success of

internationalizing a higher education institution. Childress' (2009) findings were startling in that many member institutions did not have a comprehensive strategic plan to address specific institutional needs. The study did, however, identify five overarching benefits and functions of internationalization plans: "An internationalization plan serves as a (a) roadmap for internationalization, (b) vehicle to develop buy-in, (c) mechanism for explaining the meaning and goals of internationalization, (d) medium for interdisciplinary collaboration, and (e) tool for fund-raising" (Childress, 2009, p. 12). The use of a strategic plan focused solely on internationalization was an important concept that was a constant theme throughout the literature (Altbach, 2012; Knight, 1994; De Wit, 1995).

Bruce (2009) constructed, through his research, another onramp for higher education executives to drive towards implementing internationalization within their higher education institutions. Grounded in the literature, Bruce's (2009) study proposed a research model that operationalized institutional design of higher education institutions in two distinct, but interconnected, categories: "1) organizational structures, which includes leadership, staff, administrative units, and the concentration of structures and 2) international networks, which includes the type of international network and the network size" (Bruce, 2009, p. 4).

According to Bruce (2009) there were four key areas of organizational structures that allowed for internationalization efforts to be introduced and sustained: "1) the presence of a specialized leadership for championing internationalization processes, 2) the presence of shared governance that provide oversight to internationalizing efforts, 3) adequate staffing levels, and 4) the size of the international network" (p. 7).

Bruce (2009) further recommended policy implications and opportunities for higher education executives. The author suggested that higher education executives focus on two critical dimensions to secure progress in the international agenda of higher education institutions. Bruce (2009) wrote:

> First, they need to focus on generating positive routines and capabilities that help institutions to respond more effectively to international pressures. Second, they need to put in place adequate organizational structures that help these routines to generate and to entrench in the core of the organization (p. 23-24).

Putting in place adequate leadership structures for higher education executives, such as an individual charged with overseeing internationalization efforts at the executive level, was critical to informing and identifying gaps in the strategies and tactics that a higher education institution was putting in place. For Bruce (2009), the solution to the findings of the gap-analysis was policy recommendations. According to the author, in order to have a fluid and sustainable process the need for buy-in and engagement at the executive level was paramount.

Cummings & Finkelstein (2012) investigated the classroom and detailed the importance of faculty buy-in and curriculum design. These factors acted as a melting pot where an international dimension could be found in the pedagogy. The authors argued that throughout much of the US faculty were not embedding intercultural appreciation in their teaching and research when compared to their foreign counterparts (Cummings & Finkelstein, 2012). Cummings & Finkelstein (2012) explored the reasoning behind the disengagement of US faculty who did not see their work as internationally linked.

Cummings & Finkelstein's (2012) article suggested that internationalization in teaching activities may be linked to attitudinal characteristic of those in the classroom. The relevant findings in the authors work were that they offered a strategy that could be used to increase faculty engagement. Cummings & Finkelstein (2012) argued that two key tactics could be used to fuel faculty interest in internationalization: collaborative publication with foreign faculty and teaching abroad. Higher education executives that garnered resources towards this end, argued the authors, would see increased participation of the faculty in the overall internationalization of a higher education institution's classrooms (Cummings & Finkelstein, 2012).

Schoorman (2000) took another approach to providing a roadmap for institutions that relied on three areas of focus: "(1) university services; (2) curriculum development; and (3) co-curricular engagement" (p. 10-13). Much like Childress' (2009) work, Schoorman (2000) championed the need for internationalization to be fully woven throughout the academic fabric of a higher education institution. The reach and scope of the international dimensions at the institution should be widely and constantly felt by all constituencies of the higher education institution's campus community. This meant that the services provided, the teachings, and the extracurricular activities were all united around a common front of international and intercultural understanding (Schoorman, 2000). This was no easy feat. Schoorman (2000) presented a top-down approach to achieve these goals. Schoorman (2000) argued that without the support from the higher education executives and those making the decisions on campus this could be a daunting task. However, the author did argue that activating the students, faculty and the alumni base could have a powerful impact on creating change throughout a higher education institution (Schoorman, 2000). By engaging key stakeholders and converting them to shareholders,

Schoorman (2000) presented a guidepost for enacting and anchoring change at a higher education institution.

A greater focus on the use of communication and information technology to internationalize higher education institutions has also taken place since the 1990's (Thune & Welle-Strand, 2005). With a technology revolution that has allowed for the instantaneous crosspollination of ideas and information, higher education institutions can benefit from harnessing these communication platforms towards their long and short term goals. Utilization of virtual environments (VEs) and online learning modules to reinforce internationalization on campuses have been seen as a cost-effective strategy (Roth, 2010). However, research conducted that studied the intersection between internationalization and information technology has shown that although communication technology can aid in the process it is by no means a driving force for successful integration of internationalization of a higher education institution's campus community (Thune & Welle-Strand, 2005; Roth, 2010). The use of social media sites were excellent and efficient recruiting tools, however, online forums and virtual classrooms actually created barriers. According to researchers, social media was a superficial approach to intercultural understanding and engagement, and did little to fully embrace and disseminate multicultural perspectives and ideas at the core of internationalization efforts (Thune & Welle-Strand, 2005; Roth, 2010).

The use of technology as a developing mechanism for global engagement was not fully understood or effectively utilized (Britez & Peters, 2010; Dunn & Marinetti, 2007). These claims, at first, seem counterintuitive, but as Friedman (2005) pointed out, the technology revolution throughout the twentieth and twenty-first centuries was still developing and systems were continuously learning and relearning ways to use new technologies effectively.

Altbach & Knight (2007) collaborated and discussed the differences between globalization and internationalization as being interconnected and related, but not the same thing. The motivations for internationalization were also discussed and this allowed for an in-depth analysis of the benefits of internationalizing a higher education institution. These benefits included an "obvious commercial advantage, knowledge and language acquisition, enhancing the curriculum with international content, and many others" (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 12). Specific initiatives such as "branch campuses, cross-border collaborative arrangements, programs for international students, establishing English-medium programs and degrees, and others" were also discussed at length (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 12-13). The article outlined a list of internationalization efforts that a higher education institution could adopt and include in their strategies.

Knight's (2011) more recent work focused on the development of education hubs throughout Asia. The author investigated the area of education and research moving across national borders. Knight (2011) pointed out that the most recent development in the world of internationalization was the emergence of higher education hubs. The term education hub was being used by countries who were attempting to "build a critical mass of local and foreign actors—including students, education institutions, companies, knowledge industries, science and technology centers—who, through interaction and in some cases colocation, engage in education, training, knowledge production, and innovation initiatives" (Knight, 2011, p. 3).

Knight (2011) explored the recent development of higher education hubs in six countries and questioned whether this was simply a fad, the latest branding strategy, or an innovation worthy of investment and serious attention.

Knight & Morshidi's (2012) recent work further investigated the complexities and challenges of regional higher education hubs with a specific focus on the increased activity in Malaysia. Knight & Morshidi (2012) pointed out that the race to establish regional higher education hubs was a recent development in cross-border higher education. Various forms of higher education hubs were being developed and Knight & Morshidi (2012) dissected three unique types: "the student hub, the training and skilled workforce hub, and the knowledge/innovation hub" (p. 9). Higher education hubs appeared to be the latest development in the second decade of the twenty-first century. As countries take a more advantageous and strategic approach to creating competitive and financially stable higher education institutions within their borders the question of viability will be at the forefront.

Britez & Peters' (2010) argued for the construction of an alternative higher education institution tasked with the sole responsibility of creating globally aware students. This required the creation of alternative higher education institutions that focused on internationalization and the global context. In this newly designed environment students would have a higher education institution to attend that was fully concentrated on internationalization strategies. Therefore, Britez & Peters (2010) explained, the creation of a distinctive higher education institution was one strategy that would allow a higher education institution to brand itself in a unique and dynamic way. This also gave a higher education institution a competitive advantage when it came to recruiting both domestic and international students.

An important assertion proposed by Britez & Peters (2010) argued for higher education institutions that were designed in a way that allowed for global engagement and had internationalization as the core pillar in both its strategic plan and actions and guiding principles. The creation of this type of institution required a great deal of coordination, passion, drive and

determination. Britez & Peters (2010) concluded that a highly internationalized higher education institution does not currently exist. However, it had been argued (Altbach, 2011; American Council on Education, 2012) that a small number of higher education institutions were utilizing their resources to create "cosmopolitical" higher education institutions that Britez & Peters (2010) described.

Highly Internationalized Higher Education Institutions

A small number of higher education institutions throughout the US were embracing seamless curriculums, accelerating innovation in multiple industries, enabling the cross-pollination of ideas, leveraging key resources and private-public partnerships, and elevating development and information sharing. All while accomplishing this against an ever-changing global backdrop. These organizations have shed their rigid ideologies, aging infrastructure and old formulas. They have enhanced processes and relationships that narrow areas of disagreement and widen avenues of cooperation. Higher education executives at these institutions have launched broad-based agendas that focus on the urgent, the important, and the long-term and exercised leadership to establish confidence and seek global engagement (Altbach, 2004; Britez & Peters, 2010; Burns & Smuckler, 1995; De Wit, 2002; Edwards, 2007; Hanson & Meyerson, 1995; Harris, 2008; Lee, 2008; Roth, 2010; Stier, 2004; Wright, 2009). This new world is seemingly full of possibility and the global arena appears charged with new ways to access high quality and low cost collaborations and initiatives in higher education.

A number of professional organizations have been formed with the sole purpose of investigating internationalization in higher education and providing mechanisms for institutions to create and deepen broad-based agendas for reform and refinement. These organizations include the American Council on Education (ACE), International Association of Universities

(IAU), Institute of International Education (IIE), and the Association of International Educators (NAFSA)[5]. These independent agencies have hosted countless forums and conferences, administered surveys and site-visits, and produced reports and advisory boards that have aimed to assist colleges and universities in their pursuit of internationalization. Higher education executives who were interested in advancing globally-focused priorities and were committed and open to the future of internationalization efforts at their higher education institutions often turned to these professional organizations for guidance and support.

Krane (1994) created an index to measure internationalization at liberal arts colleges in the US based on eleven specific indicators which included study abroad, international students, international movement of faculty, and higher education executives' international expertise. The data collected was triangulated against six independent agencies that ranked and evaluated various dimensions of the eleven indicators being researched (Krane, 1994).

Edwards (2007) studied the phenomenon of higher education around the world following the American educational model. The article explored the internationalization approaches undertaken at Harvard University and Yale University to uncover strategies taken at two of America's most renowned and revered higher education institutions. However, the recommendations shared were specific to the two institutions studied. The generalizability of the research became questionable due to the institutional designs of the two Ivy League[6] institutions.

---

[5] Originally established as the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers in 1948 (NAFSA, 2012).

[6] Ivy League is the name generally applied to eight US universities (Brown, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Princeton, and Yale) that over the years have had common interests in scholarship as well as in athletics (Woodward, 1936).

Horn, Hendel & Fry (2007) ranked the international dimensions of top research higher education institutions in the US. Like the work of Christophe & Lee (2005), this study presented an analysis of the relative internationalization of research universities in the US. Nineteen indicators of internationalization were linked to student characteristics, scholar characteristics, research orientation, curricular content, and organizational support. These variables were identified and used to select higher education institutions for the ranking. Index scores were then used to rank seventy-seven higher education institutions that enrolled undergraduate students across the US (Horn, Hendel & Fry, 2007). The study's findings have not been widely accepted and many of the higher education institutions scoring towards the top of the index were not considered adequate examples of highly internationalized higher education institutions by other researchers (Altbach, 2012).

De Wit (2009) organized various assessment pieces ranging from the American Council on Education's (2008) "Internationalizing the Campus" and NAFSA's (2010) "Accessing Best Practices in Internationalization" (ABPI) along with an annual report entitled "Internationalizing the Campus: Profiles of Success at Colleges and Universities since 2003." De Wit's (2009) research attempted to create a universal assessment template that could be used by higher education institutions around the world. Knight (2004) pushed back and argued that a one-size-fits-all assessment approach would not work. Knight (2004) argued that different nations have unique needs and therefore a standardized assessment tool would not rank or rate institutions appropriately or fairly.

The Institute of International Education's (2012) "Open Doors Report" also ranked higher education institutions based on the number and percentage of international students enrolled. According to the report the University of Southern California is the leading host

institution for the tenth year in a row, with 8,615 international students in 2010/11 (2011).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign hosted the second highest number of foreign

students (7,991), with New York University a close third (7,988). Altbach (2012) also identified

top higher education institutions in a newly released ranking report. It is in this report that

Altbach (2012) once again focused on student mobility; this becomes the main mechanism of

measurement in creating a classification system that identified highly internationalized higher

education institutions.

Wright (2009) explained that the sustainability of internationalization strategies was vital

to the long-term success of higher education institutions that have been regarded as highly

internationalized. To fashion long-term initiatives and policies researchers and higher education

executives have argued that specialized operations do not work; instead, an integrated approach

has been argued (Wright, 2009). The integration and alignment of internationalization strategies

and tactics on a systemic scale requires that an innovative and comprehensive blueprint be

created and followed by the higher education institution and its higher education executives

(Wright, 2009). This point is taken further by Yao (2009), who investigated study abroad

programs at research focused higher education institutions in the US. Yao (2009) makes clear

that study abroad programs must be successfully coordinated with the other operational aspects

of the higher education institution in order to be successful. Strategies that stand alone, or that

are not fully integrated into the curricular and operational aspects of a higher education

institution, were not nearly as effective (Wright, 2009; Yao, 2009).

Higher Education Executives' Perceptions

Across the US, higher education executives are vigorously exercising new partnerships,

effectively embracing efforts to bridge gaps in understanding, and radically internationalizing

their campus' communities. These higher education executives are spearheading new investments through comprehensive strategies with a central goal of securing a comparative and competitive advantage.

Cook & Young (2012) authored an every-few-years profile of demographics and other characteristics of higher education chief executives that offer a longitudinal analysis spanning from 1986 to 2012. The key findings of the 2012 edition, which surveyed 1,662 chief executives, showed that presidents and chancellors were getting older with the average chief executive at sixty-one years of age; up from sixty years of age in 2006 (Cook & Young, 2012). Diversity at the chief executive position was also lacking with the majority (86%) of presidents and chancellors being White, male, socioeconomically upper-middle class and heterosexual (Cook & Young, 2012).

The role of the chief executive as institutional leader and visionary in shaping internationalization at an institution has never been more important as we enter into the next decade of a new century. Interdisciplinary, cross-border research and discovery are now the norm and a new, clear expectation have been made that students will be prepared to live, work and contribute to an interconnected world (National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 2004). Sullivan's (2011) research investigated higher education executives' perspectives on internationalization on a global scale. Three hundred and fifty higher education presidents, vice-presidents, and deans from thirty-three countries and sixty-five institutions participated in the study (Sullivan, 2011). The study found that higher education executives were most invested in planning and operational strategies. These concerns outranked student education and teaching, and faculty development. The research also highlighted the fact that the majority of participants found a lack of economic resources as the greatest perceived barrier to

39

internationalizing their institutions (2011). Understanding how higher education executives and

their institutions balance the world of today with that of tomorrow through concrete and

complementary strategies was at the heart of Sullivan's (2009) research study.

The Institute of International Education's (2011) "Eight Common Perceptions from

University Leaders" highlighted the need for a more comprehensive approach at the executive

level of a higher education institution. The report presented some key takeaways that are critical

to developing understanding and buy-in from the top. One of the common issues that many

higher education executives struggled with was in adequately defining internationalization

(2011). When higher education executives are unable to comprehend the mission being put forth

they became trepiditious. If a concept is misunderstood or not understood it becomes very

difficult to operationalize and mobilize efforts to achieve short and long-term goals. These key

findings highlighted the importance of garnering support from the higher education executives of

an institution before embarking on an internationalization effort (Institute of International

Education, 2011).

Boards of Trustees take on a very distinctive role at an institution of higher education as

well. Scott (1991) pointed out that the members of an institution's board can leverage operational

areas to raise the institutional priority for internationalization. Scott (1991) outlined a strategy in

which engaging the board appropriately and strategically could allow both top-down and bottom-

up efforts to come to fruition. Locating cheerleaders on the board that would go above and

beyond to allow the higher education institution to internationalize itself is a powerful way for

new shareholders to be identified and activated (Carver, 2006; Houston & Eadie, 2002).

Tinkham's (2011) doctoral dissertation aimed to uncover a link between a higher education executive's international experiences, or "competency," and their willingness to internationalize a higher education institution (p. 2). The research found that executives who traveled abroad and had intercultural experiences were more likely to bring those perspectives and knowledge back to their institutions and incorporate them into professional practices that were seen as both enriching and empowering by participants (2011). Tinkham (2011) did warn, however, that the "American historical record shows a lack of political will for global education and a tendency towards insularity, resulting in underdeveloped global perspectives among Americans" (p. 2).

Knight (2011) cautioned higher education executives against the desire to internationalize a higher education institution in order to create a global brand. Awareness of intended and unintended consequences of internationalizing a higher education institution for the purposes of competitiveness, rankings, and commercialism was detrimental to the true mission of internationalization in which cultural competencies and valuable experiences were to take precedence. Knight (2011) outlined five myths that higher education executives have come to understand as implicit assumptions for developing internationalization policies and programs. The article underscored the belief that financially driven models can undermine internationalization strategies and lead to unintended consequences (Knight, 2011). In fact, Knight (2011) specifically warned against measuring the benefits of internationalization quantitatively and stated that this was a common element of all five myths discussed in the article.

Benefits & Costs of Internationalization

The benefits and costs of internationalizing a higher education institution are multiple and, in many cases, revenue driven. To compete in a global economy that is continuously changing day by day, higher education executives need to take an adaptive and agile approach to sustaining their institutions. Higher education is constantly changing and the ground on which higher education executives stand is continuously shifting. Higher education executives are often running just to stay in place.

According to The Chronicle of Higher Education's "Survey of College Presidents" (2005), chief executives ranked a balanced budget as their number one priority. Cook & Young's (2012) participants placed budget and finance management at the top of the list since the 2001 survey. This ranking has remained unchanged. The sobering reality is that higher education institutions across the US need to secure adequate financial revenues in order to thrive and, in many cases, survive. As new higher education institutions flood the market at record rates many institutions are struggling due to their inability to adapt and change. Negotiating these emerging and newly formed interdependencies demands new modes of operation and leadership (Goodwin & Nacht, 1991).

According to Stejar's (2011) findings the financial benefits of adapting new strategies to internationalize higher education can create successful economic engines for not only the educational institution but also the broader community. Lee (2008) explored the emergence of the entrepreneurial institution and the changing expectations towards higher education under new economic and social circumstances. Knight's (2011; 2012) recent research expanded globalization into internationalization by looking at educational hubs and the impact(s) these new higher education institutions could have on a nation's economy.

Globally, more than 2.5 million students are studying outside their home countries and estimates predict this number to rise to 7 million by 2020 (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2009). The US alone opened its doors to approximately 723,277 international students enrolling in higher education institutions in 2010-11 (Institute of International Education, 2012). Moreover, international students were estimated to generate billions to the US economy annually (Kelly, 2011). The 2010-11 academic year brought a windfall of approximately $21 billion to US higher education institutions (Institute of International Education, 2012). International students provide significant revenue to the host higher education institutions.

Table 2.

Top US States Hosting International Students

Rank	State	2009/10	2010/11	% Change
1.	California	94,276	96,535	2.4
2.	New York	76,146	78,888	3.6
3.	Texas	58,934	61,636	4.6
4.	Massachusetts	35,313	38,698	9.6
5.	Illinois	31,093	33,766	8.6

Note. Adapted from "Student Mobility and the Internationalization of Higher Education," 2012, Institute of International Education (IIE).

Revenue is generated for living expenses, including room and board, books and supplies, transportation, health insurance, and support for accompanying family members (Institute of International Education, 2012). California remains the leading host state for international

43

students (96,535), followed by New York (78,888), Texas (61,636), Massachusetts (38,698), and Illinois (33,766). And it should be noted that almost 70% of all international students' primary funding, including tuition, comes from sources outside of the US (Institute of International Education, 2012).

Harris (2008) discussed some of the problems that arise when the focus of internationalization becomes associated with an economic rather than a cultural imperative. This was a key finding in the review of literature because the study focused on benefits and costs and the financial (i.e. economic) benefits have been the main recommendation of many researchers for further investigation. Little research has been done on the topic of intangible benefits and costs of internationalization.

Jiang (2008) argued that the internationalization of higher education was becoming increasingly dominated by economic imperatives that focused on exporting education and generating income from overseas students. This economic and financial gain was adversely affecting the quality and effectiveness of programs, policies, and strategies put in place. According to Jiang (2008) the competitive model was eroding the quality of programs and services. These concerns have been voiced by other researchers as well (Altbach, 2010; De Wit, 2012; Healey, 2008; Knight, 2011).

Campbell & Brown (2003) gave a working definition of cost-benefit analysis and defined it as "the ability to appraise prospective projects and policies from a public-interest viewpoint regarding how benefits measure up against costs and who receives the benefits and who ends up paying for the costs" (p. 1). The definition went on to state: "benefits and costs include favorable and unfavorable effects, also tangible and intangible effects" (Campbell & Brown, 2003, p. 2).

44

Cost-benefit analysis is often used to determine the size and scope of a project, program or policy that will be undertaken.

Altbach (2009) placed the key drivers of mobility of Chinese and Indian students into a basic economic model: supply vs. demand. On the supply side, two drivers were "increasing prosperity, which enabled the ability to afford foreign education, and rapid expansion of the system of higher education at the expense of quality" (p. 11). On the demand side, two drivers are "universities' aggressive approach to recruiting students to compensate for budget cuts and access to a wider range of recruitment channels and service providers" (p. 11). According to Altbach (2009) India remained largely a market of graduate students sensitive to local economic conditions. A shift in undergraduate higher education enrollment of international students from India in the US could have unprecedented financial benefits. Not only do a number of reports highlight the importance of China and India in the higher education market but Altbach (2009) used economics to further drive home the point that international student enrollment will continue to play an important role in the actions and strategies of higher education institutions and their leadership ("Open Doors Report," 2012; "Mapping Internationalization on US Campuses," 2008; 2012).

The majority of international students studying around the globe are from China (157,558) with India a close second (103,895) (Institute of International Education, 2012). These populations have had a direct impact on the national and state economies as well as the higher education institutions that welcome them to their campuses and classrooms (Altbach, 2009; O'Neill, 2001).

Table 3.

Top Places of Origin of International Students

Rank	Place of Origin	2009/10	2010/11	% of Total	% Change
	World Total	690,923	723,277	100.0	4.7
1.	China	127,822	157,558	21.8	23.3
2.	India	104,897	103,895	14.4	-1.0
3.	South Korea	72,153	73,351	10.1	1.7
4.	Canada	28,145	27,546	3.8	-2.1
5.	Taiwan	26,685	24,818	3.4	-7.0

Note. Students from the top five places comprise 53.5% of all international students. Adapted from "Student Mobility and the Internationalization of Higher Education," 2012, Institute of International Education (IIE).

O'Neill's (2001) report focused on four future economies that were believed to impact the global marketplace by 2050: Brazil, Russia, India, and China (BRIC). China and India, it was argued, will dominate the supply-side of goods and services, while Brazil and Russia will capture the market for producing raw materials by 2050. The BRIC emerging economies were forecasted to create a paradigm shift in the global commons. This mid-twenty-first century shift would undoubtedly cause unprecedented changes to higher education and international student recruitment and retention (O'Neill, 2001).

Miller & Robbins (2004) pointed out the main mechanisms used to frame benefits-cost analysis was Economic Efficiency. According to the researchers, Economic Efficiency looked to

ensure that the benefits of a project exceeded the costs of that project (Miller & Robbins, 2004). The authors go on to define intangible benefits and costs and explained that they are "identified as the outcomes that cannot be quantitatively measured" (p. 127). Instead, intangibles were seen as qualitative factors such as personal feeling and emotions, public perception and public relations, and societal and cultural norms and values. They were generally categorized as emotions, attitudes, and perceptions. Intangible benefits and costs were almost always represented in a narrative form because of their qualitative nature (Campbell & Brown, 2003).

Obstacles & Barriers to Internationalization

There are a number of barrier and obstacles to successfully internationalizing a higher education institution. Beyond the many challenges facing globalization in the twenty-first century, higher education institutions have specific barriers and impediments to deal with when looking to internationalize.

International students face several challenges in their pursuit of academic study at US higher education institutions. Studies have shown that these challenges come from different sources: "students' inadequate English proficiency; unfamiliarity with American culture; lack of appropriate study skills or strategies; low social self-efficacy; financial difficulties; and separation from family and friends" ("Mapping Internationalization on US Campuses," 2008, p. 34). Other barriers included climate and environmental adjustments, homesickness, discrimination and feelings of depression that can be triggered by feeling isolated or facing a lack of cultural sensitivity by Americans (Lee, et al., 2007). These challenges can act as a major barrier to entry for international students looking to study within the US. Maslow's (1943) well-known and widely-cited needs hierarchy underscores the importance of meeting basic human needs essential to overall development, growth, and well being. Beyond the higher education

47

institution's support, there are a handful of government agencies positioned to assist international students with their access and orientation to the US (EducationUSA, USAID, US State Department).

In terms of student mobility—specifically international student recruitment and study abroad—a major barrier to entry is indeed physical: national security measures and new travel and study protocols (Miyokawa, 2009). The Student and Exchange Visitor Program (SEVP) is designed to help the Department of Homeland Security and US Department of State monitor international students studying domestically. An international student's information is maintained in the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) database. SEVIS is an internet-based system that maintains information on international students (F and M visa), exchange visitors (J visa), and their dependents (F-2, M-2, and J-2) (US Department of State, 2012).

Additionally, many higher education institutions require prospective international students to sit for language test prior to admittance: IELTS, TOEFL, DELF or DELE.[7] Often international students find their language ability inadequate for the purpose of understanding lectures and seminars ("Open Doors Report," 2012). Hanson & Meyerson (1995) focused on issues of curriculum design and the major concerns that arose when international students were studying in the US and unable to understand the pedagogical delivery due to language barriers. Hanson & Meyerson (1995) articulated critical issues facing higher education institutions

---

[7] International English Language Testing System (IELTS), Test Of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), Diplôme d'études en Langue Française – Diploma of French as a Foreign Language (DELF), Diplômes d'Espagnol comme Langue Etrangère – Diplomas of Spanish as a Foreign Language (DELE).

seeking to internationalize the curriculum and design sustainable and effective programs and services for international students.

Misconceptions, lack of understanding, and simple confusion have historically acted as the greatest barrier to internationalization within higher education (Stier, 2004). Often divergent understandings of the term internationalization have caused higher education executives to shy away from taking on projects or implementing new policies. Stohl (2007) wrote about the impact faculty can have on the development and sustainability of internationalization tactics in higher education. One of the major challenges outlined in the article was faculty's noninterest in, nor commitment to, internationalization. Stohl (2007) offered higher education executives leadership and accountability as solutions. Creating mechanisms that allowed the higher education executives of institutions to consider a risk and reward structure would dramatically influence the faculty culture (Stohl, 2007). This would require a shift from the traditional departmental leadership to that of higher education executives' leadership in curriculum design and teaching. Stohl's (2007) model appears punitive and draconian—loss of autonomy in the classroom and department and a structure that is based on risk and reward. However, the literature continued to drive institutions towards comprehensive and fully aligned models.

Dewey & Duff's (2009) research also focused on faculty views on internationalization in higher education. The article presented internationalization as both an idea and an agenda (Dewey & Duff, 2009). The role of faculty as key participants in initiatives to internationalize academia was investigated. The work addressed the roles, responsibilities, and problems faced by the faculty on an operational level. This case-study compounded around the importance of engaging faculty in the decision making process and allowing them freedom when it comes to designing curriculums, assessments and best practices.

49

De Wit & Knight (1999) discussed the need for quality assurance and assessment when developing a strategic plan and introducing internationalization tactics at a higher education institution. The authors discussed how sensitive an assessment and evaluation approach have to be given the diversity of higher education institutions by design. De Wit & Knight (1999) also discussed the challenges of ensuring quality in internationalization, and provided a framework to assist institutions in designing and reviewing their own strategies and policies. The text also introduced the Internationalisation Quality Review Process (IQRP), "a unique practical tool for institutional leaders and managers who wish to develop the international dimension of their programmes and services" (De Wit & Knight, 1999, p. 7). The IQRP was an evaluation tool that requires higher education executives to identify key indicators in order to complete a gap-analysis of the internationalization dimensions present at their higher education institutions.

Goodwin & Nacht's (1991) book was a call to action for US higher education institutions. The text investigated the numerous challenges and barriers that stand in the way of successfully internationalizing a higher education institution. The authors did, however, caution readers that not attempting internationalization tactics would have far more devastating effects on the institution. Goodwin & Nacht (1991) are among the earlier researchers who cautioned the field of higher education that internationalization was vital to the survival of many institutions.

Summation

The world is changing. Due to this fact, institutions must change. As external pressures compound on US higher education a new era of academia is born. Progressive, diverse, and multi-lateral approaches that are complementary and work to unite various partners around common concerns will be a core strategy to negotiating this ever shape-shifting global system. Fiscal restraints coupled with strained tangible and intangible resources make it virtually

impossible for higher education institutions to remain isolated from the larger global community. However, pursuing internationalization efforts irresponsibly can lead to negative repercussions and further marginalization in terms of financial loss.

Comprehensive understanding of the benefits and costs of specific applications and informed decisions that lead to effective internationalization of a higher education institution are critical to successfully driving growth and meeting outlined deliverables. Identifying the perceptions and behaviors of higher education executives at institutions that are determined to be highly internationalized will allow for a better understanding of the risks, rewards, challenges, and opportunities of effectively internationalizing a US higher education institution. Navigating the often uncharted waters to successful internationalization requires a keen understanding of competing interests, limited resources, misconceptions, and the calculated distinction between headlines and trend-lines.

CHAPTER III:

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this grounded theory, qualitative research, was to explore higher education executives' perceptions and experiences of internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions across the US. The study identified and assessed approaches and methods used by higher education executives at highly internationalized colleges and universities to implement internationalization strategies.

Five research questions were proposed to better understand the perceptions and experiences of higher education executives at highly internationalized higher education institutions across the US:

1. Which internationalization strategies are identified by higher education executives at highly internationalized higher education institutions?

2. Which internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions are perceived and experienced to be the most effective by higher education executives?

3. What do higher education executives perceive and experience to be the benefits of incorporating effective internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions?

4. What do higher education executives perceive and experience to be the costs of incorporating effective internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions?

5. How similar and different are higher education executives' perceptions and experiences of internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions?

Design

The research project was a qualitative study that relied on an inductive style. The study incorporated grounded theory to derive a general theory of the perceived effectiveness, costs, and benefits of internationalization strategies that were grounded in the views of the participants. Specifically, the study used a systematic design in grounded theory which emphasized open, axial, and selective coding for the data analysis. This design was selected due to the fact that it was suitable for beginner researchers, allowed for a more structured approach, and segmented data into categories that could be related or analyzed separately.

Ten higher education institutions were identified as being highly internationalized for the study. Three independent agencies (American Council on Education, Association of International Educators, and the Institute of International Education) that recognize higher education institutions for effective internationalization strategies were the data sources for identifying the sample. Data collected was analyzed in order to highlight and compare similarities and differences of the strategies used by the selected highly internationalized higher education institutions.

The researcher used purposeful sampling to identify and interview two participants from each of the ten settings and gather data regarding the executive's perceptions and experiences of the internationalization strategies found at their institution. Prior to conducting the interview, the researcher analyzed public data specific to internationalization efforts at each site by perusing publicly accessible information on the institution's website. The triangulation of data collected

from both the interviews and institutional websites allowed for a greater examination of the evidence collected and assisted in building a coherent justification for themes and patterns that constituted the open, axial, and selective coding presented in the research study (Creswell, 2009).

Participants & Setting

The target population for the research study was higher education executives who had primary responsibility for overseeing internationalization efforts at US higher education institutions identified as highly internationalized. Depending on the management structure of each institution, these higher education executives included presidents and chancellors, provosts and executive academic officers, vice presidents and vice chancellors, and deans. The higher education executives' main work function was overseeing internationalization efforts at the selected institutions. The higher education executives participating in the study had direct control over the implementation of internationalization strategies at their higher education institutions.

A subset of ten higher education institutions were identified as highly internationalized. Over forty higher education institutions were awarded prestigious honors for exemplifying internationalization strategies on their campuses by three independent organizations. These institutions were recognized for their exceptional internationalization practices and initiatives. The selection process was rigorous and based on a committee review of applications and nominations. The subset for the study included only ten of the higher education institutions because they were formally recognized by all three independent organizations for their efforts. These ten higher education institutions were located in geographically diverse regions across the US and each higher education institution was located in a different state. Four institutional categories were then created based on the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the Carnegie Basic Classification of Institutions of Higher Education

guidelines. The selected higher education institutions included: one community college (Institution A); two comprehensive universities (Institutions B & C); three liberal arts institutions (Institutions F, G & H); four research/doctoral institutions (Institutions D, E, I & J) (OECD, 2010; Carnegie Foundation, 2012).

The ten chief executives (i.e. president/chancellor/provost—depending on the management structure of the institution) of each of the highly internationalized higher education institutions were contacted by email. The researcher asked the chief executive to identify two higher education executives with primary responsibility for internationalization implementation at their higher education institution (Appendices A, B, G & H). These higher education executives were to be in charge of resource allocation, staffing, decision making and have direct oversight of internationalization efforts at the higher education institution. The higher education executives were also required to be part of a leadership team that had been recognized for their efforts in successfully adopting, securing, promoting, and sustaining internationalization tactics and strategies at their institutions. Names and contact information for each participant identified was collected. The two participants were sent emails that include a cover letter (Appendix A) and consent form (Appendix E) requesting their participation in the study. Participants were not compensated.

Of the ten highly internationalized higher education institutions contacted eight of the ten institutions participated in the research study (Institutions A, B, C, D, E, F, G, I). However, one institution (Institution C) only had one higher education executive participate in the study (Participant O). The second higher education executive from Institution C did not respond to the email communications sent and the data collected from Participant O was not used in the study.

The remaining seven higher education institutions and their respective higher education executives' interviews were used for the research study.

Instrumentation

Ten questions (Appendix D) were created by the researcher or taken directly from the American Council on Education's (2008) "Mapping Internationalization on US Campuses: 2008 Edition" which had formally granted written permission to use the survey (Appendices D). A script (Appendix F) was used to standardize the interviews. Telephone interviews were conducted with a total of fifteen higher education executives, two from each of the seven higher education institutions that participated in the study and one participant from the eighth institution. Each telephone interview took thirty to forty-five minutes to conduct. The fifteen higher education executives were interviewed independently. During the telephone interviews no audio recording devices were used and the researcher manually typed responses into a Word Document.

The open-ended questions administered required expert review and Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval (Appendix D). Five higher education professionals with at least three years of direct work experience in international higher education reviewed the interview questions for clarity and ensured they generated the necessary data/responses to address the research questions. All five individuals were contacted through email and the interview questions were attached as a Word Document (Appendix C) for review.

Reliability

Reliability is the internal consistency of responses. To ensure reliability, data was collected using one standardized method for all fifteen participants: a telephone interview. A

standardized interview script and questions were also developed to ensure repeatability

(Appendix F) of the data collection. Participants were interviewed independently and were able

to opt out of the study at any point without any form of ramification. No monetary incentives

were offered to participate in the study.

Validity

Validity refers to the extent to which a measure truly reflects the phenomenon or concept

under study (Bartz, 1976). To ensure validity participants were given the opportunity to check

the accuracy of the typed transcripts upon completion of the interview (Appendix I). Participants

were given seven business days to review the transcripts. If a response from the participant was

not obtained in seven days it was assumed that the transcript was accurate and the research study

proceeded.

Data Collection

Participants received a cover letter (Appendix A) outlining the research study and an

informed consent form (Appendix E) confirmed the subject's participation. The cover letter gave

participants the opportunity to learn more about the research and the expectations for partaking

in the study. Upon receipt of the informed consent form by the researcher, the participants were

emailed the ten interview questions to review prior to the interview. The researcher also

collected publicly accessible data from the institution's official website that pertained to the

highly internationalized higher education institution's internationalization initiatives.

Telephone interviews were then conducted and participants were asked the ten questions.

A script (Appendix F) was used to standardize the interviews. The telephone interview took

thirty to forty-five minutes to conduct. The fifteen subjects were interviewed independently.

During the telephone interviews no audio recording devices were used and the researcher manually typed responses into a Word Document.

Participants were emailed the typed transcripts of the interview responses in the form of a Word Document to verify accuracy (Appendix I). When the researcher was not contacted within seven business days of sending the typed transcripts it was assumed that the documents were accurate and the study proceeded as planned.

The study was confidential and real names were not used in recording or reporting the data; pseudonyms have been used for both the academic institutions and the higher education executives that participated. To maintain confidentiality, the data was stored on a password protected computer in a locked office on The Sage Colleges' Albany campus and all data was destroyed by being deleted and then deleted from the Trash Bin after the doctoral research study was completed.

Data Analysis Techniques

Grounded theory drove the research study and data analysis. The study derived a general theory of the perceived effectiveness, costs, and benefits of internationalization strategies that was grounded in the views of the participants. Specifically, the study used a systematic design in grounded theory which emphasized open, axial, and selective coding for the data analysis.

Publicly accessible data from the seven participating institutions' official websites that pertained to the highly internationalized higher education institution's internationalization initiatives was collected. Data from the fourteen interviews (the fifteenth interview was discarded as outlined in the research design to ensure validity and reliability) was collected, transcribed, coded and then analyzed. Phase one of coding the data included a process called

58

open coding in which initial categories were formed by the researcher. Specific categories were identified: study abroad, international students, faculty experiences, curriculum design, living-learning communities, strategic plan, assessment, cultural competency, competitive advantage, enhanced, and expert.

The second phase, known as axial coding, required the researcher to select an open coding category to place at the center of the process of exploration and then relate that category to the others (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). Student mobility (which includes study abroad and international student recruitment and retention) was used as the axial code and the other categories were analyzed through that relationship.

In phase three, known as selective coding, the researcher wrote a theory that allowed for the interrelationships between the axial code (i.e. student mobility) to be related to the other broad categories identified by the researcher and the phenomenon studied (Creswell, 2012). Coding the data allowed the qualitative data to be quantified and better understood by the researcher. The data analysis allowed for a theory to be developed by the researcher based on the answers from the open-ended questions in the interviews and the public data collected on the highly internationalized higher education institutions that participated in the study.

CHAPTER IV:

DATA ANALYSIS

In order for traditional higher education institutions to provide the skills and resources to build effective twenty-first century learners ready to compete in a global market, higher education executives will need to identify and implement effective tactics and strategies. Creating dynamic and innovative institutions that are fully equipped to take on the challenges of the flattening world of tomorrow requires higher education executives who can move their academies a frontier forward and create nimble, adaptive, and flexible institutions that celebrate, embrace, and anchor internationalization in multifaceted ways. This national study responded to those assertions.

The purpose of this grounded theory, qualitative research, was to investigate higher education executives' perceptions and experiences of internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions across the US. The study identified and assessed approaches and methods used by responsible executives of these institutions to implement internationalization strategies.

Ten higher education institutions were intentionally identified as highly internationalized. These institutions were selected because they had been awarded prestigious honors for exemplifying internationalization strategies on their campuses by three independent organizations (American Council on Education, Association of International Educators, and Institute of International Education) for exceptional internationalization practices and initiatives. The selected higher education institutions included: one community college (Institution A); two comprehensive universities (Institutions B & C); three liberal arts institutions (Institutions F, G

& H); four research/doctoral institutions (Institutions D, E, I & J) (OECD, 2010; Carnegie Foundation, 2012). Of the institutions selected only seven of the ten participated in the study: Institutions A, B, D, E, F, G, I.

Publicly accessible data was collected from each of the seven highly internationalized higher education institutions' official websites. All highly internationalized higher education institutions that partook in the study had a webpage dedicated to internationalization. All internationalization webpages linked to other institutional webpages and guided online visitors. Three of the seven highly internationalized higher education institutions had the internationalization webpage linked to the institutions' official home page (Institutions D, E, & I). This allowed online visitors to quickly and easily access the internationalization page without having to conduct a search. Only two of the institutions websites had a translation feature that allowed web content to be accessed in a language other than English (Institutions A & I).

Five of the seven internationalization webpages included a stated mission statement specific to internationalization at the highly internationalized higher education institution (Institutions A, B, D, F, & I). The same five highly internationalized higher education institutions included sections of the institutions' strategic plan as it pertained to internationalization and the short and long-term goals of the institution.

The majority (five of the seven) of the websites indicated that the higher education institution had a resource center for internationalization that was either a free-standing building or space dedicated within a student center or student commons (Institutions A, B, D, F, & I). The majority (five of the seven institutions) had a webpage that was solely dedicated to internationalization efforts (Institutions A, B, D, F, & I). The remaining two highly

internationalized higher education institutions' internationalization webpages were combined

with the diversity department of the institution (Institutions E & G). The design of these two

institutions' websites meshed both internationalization and diversity content on one webpage.

The two institutions used a blended design in terms of staffing, facilities, and resource allocation

that brought internationalization and diversity together within one department.

Three of the highly internationalized higher education institutions included information

about a trustee of the institutions' board of trustees (Institutions A, F & I). The trustee members

acted as a liaison between the executive team and the board and focused on internationalization

at the highly internationalized higher education institution. After reviewing the publicly

accessible data presented on each of the seven institutions' websites interviews were conducted

with two higher education executives at each of the highly internationalized higher education

institutions.

Fourteen[8] higher education executives (two from each participating institution) were

selected by each institution's chief executive officer (i.e. president, chancellor, provost, etc.) and

consented to participate in the research study. These higher education executives were in charge

of resource allocation, staffing, and decision making specific to internationalization. They were

also part of a leadership team that had been recognized for successfully adopting, securing,

promoting, and sustaining internationalization tactics and strategies at their higher education

institution.

---

[8] Originally fifteen subjects participated in the research study but the final (Participant O) interview was not
included in the study because a second participant from the higher education institution (Institution C) did not
respond.

Telephone interviews were conducted with the fourteen selected higher education executives. Participants were asked ten questions (Appendix C) that were created by the researcher or taken directly from the American Council on Education's (2008) "Mapping Internationalization on US Campuses: 2008 Edition" which had formally granted written permission to use the survey (Appendix B). The open-ended questions administered required expert review and Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval.

Five research questions were proposed to better understand the approaches taken and the agendas launched by higher education executives at highly internationalized higher education institutions in the US:

1. Which internationalization strategies are identified by higher education executives at highly internationalized higher education institutions?

2. Which internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions are perceived and experienced to be the most effective by higher education executives?

3. What do higher education executives perceive and experience to be the benefits of incorporating effective internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions?

4. What do higher education executives perceive and experience to be the costs of incorporating effective internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions?

5. How similar and different are higher education executives' perceptions and experiences of internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions?

Participant Demographic Data

The participants of the qualitative study comprised of higher education executives who had primary responsibility for implementing and anchoring internationalization strategies and policies at highly internationalized higher education institutions. The fourteen participants used in the study consisted of three females and eleven males. The higher education institutions consisted of one community college (Institution A), one comprehensive university (Institution B), three liberal arts colleges (Institutions D, E, F), and two research/doctoral universities (Institutions G & I) (OECD, 2010; Carnegie Foundation, 2012). All higher education institutions participating in the study were located in different states and none were in the same geographical region of the US. The study was confidential and real names were not be used in recording or reporting the data; pseudonyms were used for both the academic institutions and the higher education executive participants (Participants A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N).

Table 4.

Participant Background Information

_____

Institution:	Design:	Participant:	Participant Title:	Gender:
1. A	Community	H	Chancellor	Male
A	Community	J	Dean	Male
2. B	Comprehensive	K	Provost	Male
B	Comprehensive	L	President	Male
3. D	Liberal Arts	A	President	Male
D	Liberal Arts	B	Dean	Female
4. E	Liberal Arts	E	Provost	Male
E	Liberal Arts	F	Associate Provost	Male
5. F	Liberal Arts	D	Dean	Female
F	Liberal Arts	C	Associate Dean	Male
6. G	Research/Doctoral	N	Associate Vice President	Female
G	Research/Doctoral	M	Assistant Vice President	Male
7. I	Research/Doctoral	G	Dean	Male
I	Research/Doctoral	I	Provost	Male

_____

Operationalizing Research Questions

Each of the research questions developed for the study were designed to gauge the

perceptions and experiences of the higher education executives participating in the study.

Research question one asked "*Which internationalization strategies are identified by higher*

education executives at highly internationalized higher education institutions?" and was linked

to interview question one: "*What internationalization strategies can be found at your institution?*"

The second research question asked "*Which internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions are perceived and experienced to be the most effective by higher education executives?*" and was linked to interview questions two and five: "*Which internationalization strategies do you think are the most effective at your institution? Why?*"; "*Which internationalization strategies do you think are the least effective at your institution? Why?*"

The third research question asked "*What do higher education executives perceive and experience to be the benefits of incorporating effective internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions?*" and was linked to interview questions three and six: "*What are the perceived or actual benefits of the effective internationalization strategies at your institution?*"; "*What are the perceived or actual benefits of the ineffective internationalization strategies at your institution?*"

The fourth research question asked "*What do higher education executives perceive and experience to be the costs of incorporating effective internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions?*" and was linked to interview questions four and seven: "*What are perceived or actual costs of the effective internationalization strategies at your institution?*"; "*What are the perceived or actual costs of the ineffective internationalization strategies at your institution?*"

Finally, the fifth research question asked "*How similar and different are higher education executives' perceptions and experiences of internationalization strategies at highly*

internationalized higher education institutions?" and was linked to interview questions eight, nine and ten: "*Do you think that internationalization efforts have enhanced or hindered your academic institution? Why?*"; "*Do you consider your school to be a 'highly internationalized' higher education institution in the US? Why/Why not?*"; "*Do you consider yourself to be a US expert in internationalization? Why/Why not?*"

The ten interview questions were designed to gather data in order to answer the five research questions posed by the study. The interview questions were expertly reviewed in order to ensure validity and reliability.

Research Question One

The first research question asked "*Which internationalization strategies are identified by higher education executives at highly internationalized higher education institutions?*" The fourteen higher education executives interviewed perceived and experienced student mobility (study abroad/international student recruitment and retention), faculty experiences, curriculum design, and living-learning communities as the top internationalization strategies at their highly internationalized higher education institutions. All fourteen participants identified student mobility (in the form of study abroad and international students) as a strategy at their US higher education institution.

> I think one of the primary ones is our fifty-two year history of study abroad. It's a very extensive program that believes in deep emergence in international programs. Eighty percent of grads will have done study abroad; most for six months. We really were one of the pioneers in study abroad. We are still looked to as one of the leaders for immersive study abroad programs. This is particularly

67

effective because it permeates our campus community (Participant E, personal

communication, February 4, 2012).

Equally important to study abroad experiences for domestic students was the recruitment

and retention of international students. One of the participants discussed the impact of student

mobility at their higher education institution:

Other benefits in terms of having international students here on campus are many.

It allows us to bring the world to this campus. We participate in the US State

Department community college initiative. The US State Department has identified

twelve countries that the US State Department will provide training and for us

that has been in the fields of business, management, and hospitality. We receive

anywhere from fifteen to twenty students from Pakistan, India, Ghana, Cameroon,

South Africa, South America, Guatemala and Costa Rico. These students come

here and are paid by the US State Department and they share their cultures with

us here. This is an example of not so much economic benefit but a real benefit of

presentation of their cultures to the local community (Participant H, personal

communication, April 15, 2012).

Faculty experiences and faculty buy-in was also highlighted by a majority of the higher

education executives interviewed (nine of the fourteen). Cummings & Finkelstein (2012)

detailed the importance of faculty buy-in and curriculum design. Intentionality and compassion

of faculty allow for an international dimension to be infused in the pedagogy of those educators

who are willing to embed their curriculums with internationalization practices and strategies.

Faculty involvement is important in all aspects of education, but it is critical in

internationalization efforts. Participant A, a President at a Liberal Arts College highlighted the partnership by stating:

> I think over time, over the long run, involving our faculty with our international programs has been an effective strategy. Faculty have been the drivers of the original programs dating back to the 1960's or so. We have kept faculty involved (Participant A, personal communication, February 6, 2012).

Faculty, and their ability to infuse internationalization efforts into the classroom, was echoed by Participant G, a Dean at a Research/Doctoral University:

> The [strategies] that are most effective are ones that are tied to the curriculum or they are areas rewarded in the faculty promotion and tenure process. Why? When it's done other ways it's done ad hoc and is much less effective. Also, when it's done through buy-in and in a strategic process we no longer have to depend on faculty champions, but rather on a system that faculty believe in and are rewarded by (Participant G, personal communication, March 20, 2012).

Another higher education executive at the same Research/Doctoral University touted the need for faculty to have the autonomy to create partnerships that allowed for connections to be established on their own, without the interference of the executive team: "I think that top-down efforts have not worked well. Bottom-up efforts are much more beneficial, that allow for passion and creativity, like our Colombia initiative which is a huge success and was driven by faculty" (Participant I, personal communication, April 18, 2012).

Schoorman (2000) championed the need for internationalization to be fully woven throughout the academic fabric of a higher education institution. Schoorman (2000) presented a

top-down approach to achieve these goals. However Participant I stated that a bottom-up effort was more effective.

Curriculum design was also mentioned by half of the higher education executives interviewed (seven of the fourteen). Allowing faculty to develop courses and content linked to students' study abroad experiences, international student populations, and faculty expertise were strategies that higher education executives identified. When prompted about identifying internationalization strategies in the interview Participant H, the Chancellor of a Community College, explained:

> Look at training programs like nursing, emergency medical services, business; we look at how these protocols and trainings, or Customized Contract Trainings can benefit us. We look to this state, Japan, and other areas in Asia that are focused on hospitality; we look at the protocols and the cultural sensitivities that are emphasized. This allows us to offer Customized Contract Trainings and bring resources into the college. This also allows us to bring international students to campus (Participant H, personal communication, April 15, 2012).

Another higher education executive discussed his opinion that study abroad should be directly and comprehensively linked to the design of the curriculum:

> Approximately 60% of our students are studying abroad currently. And students bring experiences back into the classroom. Major integration of study abroad, which I brought, integrated study abroad into majors so that students consider study abroad as part of their academic curriculums. Better collaboration between office and departments; I think that is effecting the design of the curriculum because before everything was centralized in one office. Now we're having

70

conversations about study abroad and how it fits into the goals of the institution

and the institutional goals of internationalization (Participant C, personal

communication, February 13, 2012).

The ability to link internationalization with the curriculum was echoed by yet another

higher education executive who talked about a radical new research institute that was being

developed and that would focus on science and technology. Participant I, a Provost at a

Research/Doctoral University exclaimed:

As far as strategies; we have a research institute. This was started two years ago.

Focus of the research institute is to bring together science and policy; to inform

policy using science. It's a new dimension for our institution. We've always been

strong on the science side and this is a big move for the university because it

allows us to be focused on policy. This is a long-term project and will take a

number of years for it to stand out. This is unique because of the STEM (science,

technology, engineering, and math) focus and the global priorities that we are

seeing. Right now food security is the biggest issue. We have some leadership on

that front and we are looking to add to that topic from a policy perspective here at

the university (Participant I, personal communication, April 18, 2012).

Living-learning communities, in which students are able to fully immerse themselves in

other cultures or languages, were also identified as a strategy adopted by highly internationalized

higher education institutions in the US. The development and facilitation of a Global Village was

discussed at length by Participant B, a Dean at a Liberal Arts College:

I should mention our on-campus internationalization experience, which I would

say is most evident in our global village which is international students and

71

returning study abroad students living and learning together. Collaboration

between departments and offices at the institution have made this a reality. We

based it on studies that focused on the importance of student engagement in a

community setting. Forming bonds and creating an interactive cohort was

essential to our strategy with the Global Village. You immediately feel and sense

this upon stepping onto the campus. Overall, we are looking to impact and create

global citizens of our students over the four years they are with us (Participant B,

personal communication, February 13, 2012).

Unique, distinctive educational opportunities, such as living-learning communities,

blended curricular, co-curricular and social offerings often in a residential or communal setting

have been researched and argued to be an effective way of enhancing cultural competencies

(Astin, 1984; Martin-Kniep, 2008).

Identifying internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education

institutions in the US was an invaluable outcome of the research study. Exploring the strategies

and policies that allowed for a higher education institution to be identified as highly

internationalized was critical to fully understanding how higher education executives put rhetoric

into action and policies into practice. Bruce (2009) highlighted policy recommendations and the

need for buy-in and engagement at the executive level in order to ensure fluid and sustainable

strategies for internationalization. Participants agreed. Tactics and strategies that stood alone, or

that were not fully integrated into the curricular and operational aspects of a higher education

institution, were perceived to be less effective than those that had been fully integrated (Wright,

2009; Yao, 2009). The data collected underscored four main strategies: student mobility, faculty

leadership, curriculum design, and living-learning communities.

Research Question Two

The second research question asked "*Which internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions are perceived and experienced to be the most effective by higher education executives?*" Three areas were specifically found to be perceived as the most effective internationalization strategies: Student mobility, strategic planning, and assessment.

Student mobility in the form of study abroad and international students was mentioned by all fourteen higher education executives interviewed as an effective strategy. One participant stated:

> Our internationalization efforts run the gamut. We also allow students to take financial aid with them to participate in international programs. Ten percent of our student population here is international students. Fifty percent of our students study abroad. These efforts and numbers are tied to our strategic goals (Participant A, personal communication, February 6, 2012).

Strategic planning was heralded by ten of the fourteen higher education executives as an effective strategy. The majority of higher education executives discussed the importance of having a roadmap or blueprint to guide their internationalization efforts. Participant D, a Dean at a Liberal Arts College, discussed the importance of intentionality in planning and putting measurable objectives and goals in place: "I think the overarching and most important strategy we adopted in this whole process for over twenty years is that we have approached internationalization in an integrated way across the entire campus" (Participant D, personal communication, February 4, 2012).

Much of the research (De Wit, 1995; Altbach, 2004, et al.) focused primarily on one specific factor of effective internationalization: student mobility. It came as little surprise that all participants referenced study abroad as being perceived and experienced to be highly effective. Another higher education executive, a Dean at a Liberal Arts College who had expanded on the importance of living-learning communities, spoke about the importance of a comprehensive internationalization strategy, and had stated: "We have had a comprehensive international strategy for about twenty years now. And we have been reaping the benefits of international thinking" (Participant B, personal communication, February 13, 2012).

Linked directly to strategic planning was assessment. The higher education executives believed it was importance to accurately measure outcomes and gather data on internationalization efforts at highly internationalized higher education institutions. The review of literature had also emphasized assessment as a critical toggling mechanism for effective internationalization (Burns & Smuckler, 1995; Childress, 2009). The same Dean, Participant B, expanded on the benefits of an effective strategic plan and had linked it to an assessment model: "We have also developed an inter-culture assessment committee which was developed to gauge inter-cultural learning. We have also focused our efforts in a regional consortium which looks at faculty innovation and global engagement" (Participant B, personal communication, February 13, 2012).

According to the "Mapping Internationalization on US Campuses: 2012 Edition" (American Council on Education, 2012) report, "formal assessments of the impact of progress of internationalization efforts occurred at 37% of institutions in 2011" (p. 14). This percentage was up from 30% in 2006, according to the 2008 edition of the report (American Council on Education, 2008). This substantial rise in assessment and student learning outcomes development

over the past few years indicated that higher education executives were placing more value on measuring internationalization efforts at their higher education institutions.

Yet another higher education executive who was interviewed distinguished between the US models of internationalization with those that had occurred in Europe. Participant F specifically focused on the importance of four main pillars that he perceived to be the keys to unlocking the challenges of internationalization at highly internationalized higher education institutions in the US:

> We know from our European colleagues that numbers are not enough. To continue with our trajectory we can look at four phases: one, you send people back and forth; two you develop a unit; three you create partnerships, four you infuse intercultural perspectives across the university (Participant F, personal communication, March 5, 2012).

The findings related to research question two had everything to do with the perceptions and experiences of the higher education executives interviewed. Student mobility was determined to be one of the main internationalization efforts at highly internationalized higher education institutions. Student mobility was also determined to be one of the most effective strategies according to the higher education executives' perceptions and experiences. Strategic planning and assessment, both of which had often been linked, were perceived to be highly effective and were recommended by the higher education executives.

Research Question Three

The third research question asked "*What do higher education executives perceive and experience to be the benefits of incorporating effective internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions?*" The higher education executives interviewed

identified two main benefits of incorporating effective internationalization strategies. The first was enhancing cultural competencies of students, faculty, and staff. The second was creating a competitive advantage for the higher education institution in the academic market. Thirteen of the fourteen participants perceived an enhanced cultural competency as the greatest benefit of internationalizing a higher education institution. Participant F, an Associate Provost at a Liberal Arts College, detailed three benefits that he had perceived or experienced as having been effective:

> One benefit, of course, is that we remain generally true to our mission statement. The second benefit is that we feel reasonably good that we've done all that is reasonably appropriate to prepare our graduates for the twenty-first century. Third, we have an enormous number of alumni who come to us and explain that they had amazing study abroad experiences and this goes back for decades (Participant F, personal communication, March 5, 2012).

Another higher education executive discussed the importance of cultural competency in the job market and the effects globalization had on finding and securing employment. Participant G, a Dean at a Research/Doctoral University, drew a connection between the benefits for both students entering the twenty-first century job market and faculty who were challenged and required to research and publish on a continuous basis:

> We now have 15% of our undergrads graduating with a study abroad experience. Students are interested in this area. It is helping them to prepare for the future. There isn't a white collar job out there that doesn't require international experience and exposure, whether that be through Skype or going physically abroad or working in diverse teams. We're trying to get students to interact with

one another. We have a very diverse campus here: 20% of our student body is

international. It helps the faculty as well. The faculty are global in their research;

they are not confined by borders; they have colleagues and competitors all over

the world. (Participant G, personal communication, March 20, 2012)

Many of the participants discussed the impact and importance of the global market on

cultural competency and the role of a higher education institution to cultivate scholars prepared

to lead in the twenty-first century:

On campus, first of all, our students' experiences with different cultures are really

critical. If they are looking to go to grad school or to career the employer wants to

know if you can adapt to a global context. It is critical that employees are

comfortable both traveling and interacting with clients and customers overseas

(Participant J, personal communication, March 18, 2012).

Creating a competitive advantage by becoming highly internationalized was discussed by

eleven of the fourteen higher education executives interviewed. This was a specific benefit that

higher education executives admitted was hard to measure, quantify, and operationalize: "We

have continued to work in internationalization which allows us and keeps us distinctive to other

institutions" (Participant E, personal communication, February 4, 2012).

Participant H, a Chancellor at a Community College, rigorously described the external

pressures placed on him and his team of higher education executives to balance the needs of the

region with those of the global market. Striking a delicate balance between serving the students

of the region, the mission of the Community College, while simultaneously expanding

internationalization efforts with international student recruitment was discussed at length.

"Internationalization must provide for viable educational and economic benefits to the college,

the state and the people of our state. This has helped us to do what it is that we do. We feel we can export our expertise" (Participant H, personal communication, April 15, 2012).

Another higher education executive at a Liberal Arts College, Participant D, simply stated: "Well, again, the benefits are the transformation of the institutional culture and identity both internally and the way we are perceived" (Participant D, personal communication, February 4, 2012).

Forging a competitive advantage is critical when dealing with both an ailing economy and a selective applicant pool. And although enrollment in degree-granting higher education institutions has continued to spike the fact remains that the number of higher education institutions continues to grow at record speeds (US Department of Education, 2011).

Table 5.

Fall Enrollment in US Degree-granting Higher Education Institutions: 1970-2009

Year	1970	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2009
Total	8,581	12,097	12,247	13,819	14,262	14,312	17,487	20,427
Undergraduate	7,369	10,475	10,597	11,959	12,232	13,716	14,964	17,565

Note. Adapted from "Digest of Education Statistics," US Department of Education's (USDOE), 2011, National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES).

Higher education institutions in the US have nearly doubled during the new century showing a 64.5% growth over the last decade (American Federation of Teachers, 2012).

Table 6.

Number of US Higher Education Institutions: 2001-2011

_____

2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
4,293	3,781	3,857	3,771	3,728	3,748	3,702	3,682	3,724	7,060

_____

Note. Adapted from "Number of Institutions," 2012, Higher Education Data Center, American Federation of Teachers; "Higher Education—Institutions and Enrollment," 2012, *The 2012 Statistical Abstract: The National Data Book*, US Census Bureau (USCB).

The number of public and private institutions jumped from a total of 4,293 during the 2001-02 academic year to the 2010-11 total of 7,060 (American Federation of Teachers, 2012). Higher education institutions have to maintain a competitive advantage in order to remain relevant and thrive in the new century.

Only one of the higher education executives mentioned the economic benefits that internationalization can bring to a higher education institution. Harris (2008), Jiang (2008) and Knight (2011) warned against becoming entrenched in the economic benefits of internationalization and dependent on the funds generated. The majority (twelve out of fourteen) of the higher education executives perceived or experienced internationalization strategies as costly endeavors for a higher education institution. The Chancellor of the Community College,

Participant H, continued to highlight the economic impact of internationalizing a higher

education institution regardless of the mission of serving the local region/population:

> I think that there is an economic benefit and there are many others, we look at
>
> tuition dollars and the "Open Doors" publication by IIE looks at the economic
>
> benefit of international students coming to the school. This is $15 billion industry.
>
> This is the third largest industry with $125 to $130 million brought into the state.
>
> For our institution we collect tuition and fees from 9,000 students enrolled and 9
>
> to 10% are international students. They pay about 42 to 45% of tuition and fees
>
> collected. They help the college expand courses and offerings to our students. We
>
> could not provide what we do without them (Participant H, personal
>
> communication, April 15, 2012).

It was perceived and experienced that the two main benefits of incorporating effective

internationalization strategies were to have enhanced cultural competencies of students, faculty,

and staff and the creation of a competitive advantage for the higher education institution in the

academic market. Knight (2011) warned higher education executives against using

internationalization for competitiveness, rankings, and commercialism and stated that global

branding was part of an implicit assumption, or myth, which needed to be dispelled. Knight

(2011) contested that internationalization for the sake of commercialism and economic benefit

eroded the merit of internationalizing for the purpose of learning and valuing other cultures and

experiences.

Research Question Four

The fourth research question asked "*What do higher education executives perceive and

experience to be the costs of incorporating effective internationalization strategies at highly*

internationalized higher education institutions?" Not surprising was the simple fact that the majority (twelve of the fourteen higher education executives) perceived the costs to internationalization as being monetary. These tangible costs were easily identified by the participants who were basing their answers on their own perceptions and experiences. Participant F, an Associate Provost at a Liberal Arts College, remarked, "An enormous amount of money! We spend an enormous amount of money" (Participant F, personal communication, March 5, 2012).

The cost to internationalization being monetary was echoed by Participant E, a Provost at a Liberal Arts College: "Financially, it costs a lot of money to send 85% of our students on study abroad for three, four, or six months. We have built that into our budget" (Participant E, personal communication, February 4, 2012).

Campbell & Brown (2003) and Miller & Robbins (2004) held that a cost-benefit analysis was an effective way to determine the goals and strategies that were feasible and sustainable at higher education institutions that looked to introduce, expand, or enhance internationalization efforts. Mobility, both in terms of student mobility and the physical movement of faculty across borders, was articulated as an expensive and sometimes prohibitive cost by Participant B:

> What we need is a lot of money to bring faculty and staff to our partners. Gas prices and travel costs are high and we fully understand that. What we are actually doing is an investment and in return we get students in exchange programs. This becomes more of a perceived cost then an actual cost (Participant B, personal communication, February 13, 2012).

A variety of tactics were taken to secure external funding through grants, endowments, and collaborations to keep costs to a minimum. Higher education executives also stated that a

number of polices were put in place to remain financially viable and fiscally responsible. These efforts were expanded on by Participant I, a Provost at a Research/Doctoral University:

> We are establishing a different tuition rate for international undergraduates. This would mean an increase by $1,000 to $2,000 to build up program offerings and to increase inclusion, teaching faculty to engage international students, and not letting them form separate non-interacting communities but having them work with domestic students. This is probably the biggest investment in international students on campus. We have an International Office that is funded by a fee. But we are looking to increase these resources (Participant I, personal communication, April 18, 2012).

Fiscal prudence was also stated by the same participant as a way to responsibly take on internationalization efforts which were perceived to be costly. The Provost continued:

> We haven't made a big gamble yet. No overseas campus or partnership that would have seen significant funding lost. We have been debating opening an office in Beijing. The cost-benefit is being looked at and we are being very cautious. Our Chinese international student population is one of the largest in the nation. We have been very cautious (Participant I, personal communication, April 18, 2012).

Along with monetary costs, higher education executives outlined a number of intangible costs associated with internationalization efforts at their higher education institutions. These costs were far ranging in topic areas and no consensus was determined by the data collection. Altbach (2002) argued that operationalizing and implementing internationalization efforts successfully at most higher education institutions could be a difficult process due in part to the limitations of their institutions, resources, and overall abilities. Other researchers also

82

underscored the difficulties of effectively internationalizing a higher education institution and the costs inherent in the process (Hanson & Meyerson, 1995; Stier, 2004; Stohl, 2007). These challenges and costs were reiterated by a number of the participants. Not only did Participant I, the Provost at the Research/Doctoral University, discuss monetary costs, he also introduced intangible costs when he explained:

> There are some interesting costs that come from a risk management aspect of having students and faculty traveling all over the world. Is it suitable for students and faculty to go to Afghanistan? Columbia? Mexico? Risk management is an important factor of the study abroad process. That is a fairly expensive operation (Participant I, personal communication, April 18, 2012).

With study abroad as a main strategy identified by the majority of the higher education executives (ten of the fourteen) it made sense that student absence would be a concern and would have consequences on campus:

> The secondary cost is that when students are gone on study abroad they are gone. We lose 80% of our juniors so we lose that leadership and sophomores have to step up. We also have a disconnect between third year students with the campus. It is a real cost. But it's one the school continues to support for decades because the college feels the outcomes are worth it (Participant F, personal communication, March 5, 2012).

Yet another intangible cost that was perceived by a higher education executive, Participant C, an Associate Dean at a Liberal Arts College, was time. "I would say this is common everywhere: time. That to internationalize the curriculum takes time to prepare better,

do research, and collaborate with faculty overseas. Time is a problem to fit into any schedule" (Participant C, personal communication, February 13, 2012).

The majority (twelve of the fourteen higher education executives) perceived and experienced the costs to internationalization as monetary. However, intangible costs were many and no consensus was found in the data. Intangible costs ranged from risk management, student absence, and time.

Research Question Five

The fifth research question asked "*How similar and different are higher education executives' perceptions and experiences of internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions?*" The higher education executives interviewed for the research study had similar perceptions and experiences of internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions. In terms of perceptions held regarding their higher education institutions, all fourteen felt that the internationalization efforts enhanced their schools. One higher education executive remarked, "I would say they have definitely enhanced the institution. We have established ourselves as a leader in internationalization and study abroad" (Participant E, personal communication, February 4, 2012).

Participant B, a Dean at a Liberal Arts College, specifically mentioned the importance of being both strategic and intentional: "I think overwhelmingly enhanced. The institution has been strategic and intentional. And positive effects are being seen across our campus" (Participant B, personal communication, February 13, 2012).

Internationalization enhancing an institution was directly linked to the competitive advantage that was sought by many of the higher education executives. Participant H, a Chancellor at a Community College, discussed the competitive advantages his higher education

experienced by successfully internationalizing: "It has also enhanced the reputation of our institution. Enhanced credibility and standing in the community and as a source of expertise" (Participant H, personal communication, April 15, 2012).

The Provost of a Research/Doctoral University, Participant I, chronicled his higher education institution's history, mission, and design and how those factors directly linked to the internationalization efforts and strategies that were effective at his campus:

> Definitely enhanced. We were early in the game mainly due to agricultural, which goes back five decades. We were early in game to recruit international students. This has become woven into our culture. This is part of what we do. Can't go back. Internationalization has been engrained in the culture and we cannot go back, nor do we want to go back (Participant I, personal communication, April 18, 2012).

Researchers and professional organizations have been working for some time to develop a universal ranking system with which to denote those higher education institutions that are champions of internationalization (Altbach, 2012; Krane, 1994; Horn, Hendel & Fry, 2007; Christophe & Lee, 2005). With a variety of rankings that focused on a wide array of mechanisms and criteria, the academic community is still unable to agree on a comprehensive survey or index. However, the higher education executives interviewed all perceived their higher education institutions as deserving of the title "highly internationalized," even if they were hesitant to embrace it: "Absolutely! We have some external measures that tell us so" (Participant B, personal communication, February 13, 2012).

Participant F, an Associate Provost at a Liberal Arts College, also agreed that his higher education institution was indeed highly internationalized, stating:

85

I should tell you that you are talking to somebody who has a professional

inferiority complex so I'm generally careful about pronouncements on that part. If

I was to remove all inhibitions I would say yes. We've worked hard to reach that

place (Participant F, personal communication, March 5, 2012).

Participant G, a Dean at a Research/Doctoral University, was reserved in his response:

"Well, I'm typically my own worst critic and a critic of the university as well. Our claim to fame

is international recruitment and we are the leader there" (Participant G, personal communication,

March 20, 2012).

Finally, when asked if they considered themselves to be an "expert" in US

internationalization twelve of the fourteen had felt they were deserving of the title. Participant F

remarked:

I have been put in the place of being a US expert in internationalization by

various firms and agencies. Yeah, I guess I'm not so bad. But you have to

remember I have this professional inferiority complex. Am I not bad? Sure. Do I

want to be better? Yes (Participant F, personal communication, March 5, 2012).

Participant D was also hesitant to herald herself an expert: "Well, all modesty aside, yes I

do. I'm on the boards of a number of internationally recognized organizations and acted as board

president for one such organization" (Participant D, personal communication, February 4, 2012).

Participant G, a Dean at a Research/Doctoral University, who was reserved in embracing

the distinction of a highly internationalized title for his higher education institution, explained

why he too was deserving of such a title:

If I take off my modesty hat: Yes, I do think I am. I do know the issues and the

buttons to push. But it requires not only knowledge but the know-how about how

to be effective in moving the global needle at the institution. My time as dean has been productive and I feel that I've helped and assisted the institution. The jury is still out, though. Can I use my expertise and in-roads to move that global needle further along? Time will tell. Enlisting others to do what you think is right when you have no authority over them is very challenging (Participant G, personal communication, March 20, 2012).

Only two participants stated that they were not considered experts in the field of internationalization. The first higher education executive who felt he was not an expert, Participant I, a Provost at a Research/Doctoral University, responded, "From my own perspective: no. I'm still learning" (Interview I, personal communication, April 18, 2012).

The second, Participant A, the President of a Liberal Arts College, had cautiously explained his reasoning for not perceiving himself to be an expert in internationalization: "I'm not sure I would identify as an expert. I would say I was highly informed" (Participant A, personal communication, February 6, 2012).

Sullivan's (2011) research investigated higher education executives' perspectives on internationalization on a global scale. The study had found that higher education executives were most invested in planning and operational strategies over student education and teaching and faculty development. The research also highlighted the fact that the majority of participants found a lack in economic resources as the greatest perceived barrier to internationalizing their campuses (2011).

The Institute of International Education's (2011) "Eight Common Perceptions from University Leaders" highlighted the need for a more comprehensive approach at the executive

level of an academic institution. One of the common issues that many chief executives struggled with was in adequately defining internationalization (2011). When higher education executives were unable to comprehend the mission being put forth the sustainability factor diminished and eventually efforts were unable to produce results.

This chapter explained the findings related to a rigorous search of the highly internationalized higher education institutions' websites and each of the five research questions designed for this study. Findings were presented descriptively for meaningful interpretation. Chapter five will present analyses, conclusions, and recommendations that relate to these findings.

CHAPTER V:

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes the summary of findings from the analysis of data collected from publicly accessible websites and of five research questions that were designed to collect data on higher education executives' perceptions and experiences of internationalization at highly internationalized higher education institutions. Each finding is followed by specific conclusions. A theory is also presented by the researcher based on an inductive analysis of the data collected. The recommendations suggested are data-driven and based upon the conclusions presented.

Summary of Findings

The study focused on the perceptions and experiences of higher education executives charged with internationalization efforts at highly internationalized higher education institutions throughout the US. Using three independent firms' rankings of higher education institutions based on internationalization efforts, ten higher education institutions were identified. Seven of the ten institutions participated in the research study. The participating higher education institutions' official websites were investigated and fourteen telephone interviews were conducted.

All highly internationalized higher education institutions that partook in the study had a webpage dedicated to internationalization that linked to other institutional webpages and guided online visitors. Only three of the institutions had the internationalization webpage linked to the institutions' official homepage which allowed online visitors to quickly and easily access the internationalization page without having to conduct a search. The majority of the participating institutions had an internationalization webpage that included a mission statement specific to

internationalization. These same highly internationalized higher education institutions included sections of the institutions' strategic plan and the short and long-term goals of internationalization at the institution.

Almost all of the institutions had a webpage that was solely dedicated to internationalization efforts. Two of the higher education institutions' international webpages were shared with a diversity department. The two institutions combined both internationalization and diversity efforts and used a blended design with staffing, facilities, and resource allocation. The majority of the websites indicated that the higher education institution had a resource center for internationalization that was either a free-standing building or space dedicated within a student center or student commons. Only three of the higher education institutions included information about a member of the board of trustees. The trustee acted as a liaison between the executive team and the board and focused on internationalization.

Research Question One: *Which internationalization strategies are identified by higher education executives at highly internationalized higher education institutions*?

A variety of internationalization strategies were identified by higher education executives at highly internationalized higher education institutions. These tactics and policies included faculty experiences, curriculum design, living learning communities, facilities allocation and staffing that was specific to internationalization. However, student mobility was overwhelmingly identified as the top strategy to undertake at a higher education institution. This was a salient finding. Student mobility included study abroad and international student recruitment and retention. Study abroad programs allow domestic students to travel and study at a higher education institution in a foreign country. International student recruitment and retention is a

strategy in which a US higher education institution enrolls foreign students and provides them with services on campus.

Research Question Two: *Which internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions are perceived and experienced to be the most effective by higher education executives*?

Student mobility was identified by higher education executives as the most effective internationalization strategy at a highly internationalized higher education institution. Ten of the fourteen higher education executives interviewed responded that study abroad allowed students to experience other cultures and peoples and was also a core pillar in their internationalization efforts on and off campus. Moreover, higher education executives also mentioned two strategies that they perceived and experienced as vital to the success of internationalization efforts at their higher education institution: strategic planning and assessment.

Research Question Three: *What do higher education executives perceive and experience to be the benefits of incorporating effective internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions*?

Higher education executives perceived and experienced the benefits of incorporating effective internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions as twofold. The first benefit was enhancing cultural competencies of students, faculty and staff. The second benefit was the competitive advantage experienced by the higher education institution in the academic market by being highly internationalized.

Research Question Four: *What do higher education executives perceive and experience to be the costs of incorporating effective internationalization strategies in highly internationalized higher education institutions*?

Higher education executives at highly internationalized higher education institutions in the US perceived and experienced the monetary—dollars and cents—as the greatest cost of incorporating effective internationalization strategies. Although intangible costs were discussed, these factors were wide ranging and no consensus was identified.

Research Question Five: *How similar and different are higher education executives' perceptions and experiences of internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions*?

Higher education executives' perceptions and experiences of internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions were very similar. The majority of higher education executives identified student mobility as not only the top strategy (fourteen out of fourteen), but also the most effective (ten out of fourteen) strategy undertaken by their higher education institution. Two main benefits were identified by the majority of participants: enhanced cultural competency of students, faculty, and staff, and institutional competitive advantage in the higher education market. Moreover, twelve of the fourteen higher education executives' perceived and experienced financial factors as the main cost to incorporating effective internationalization strategies at a US higher education institution. Finally, all higher education executives interviewed believed that internationalization efforts had enhanced their higher education institution and all participants believed that their school was deserving of the title "highly internationalized" higher education institution.

The majority, twelve of the fourteen higher education executives, perceived themselves as "experts" in internationalization of US higher education. The interview findings indicated that the higher education executives that participated in the qualitative study had similar perceptions overall. Differences in perceptions and experiences were most apparent when higher education executives were asked to identify intangible costs associated with internationalization efforts. Responses ranged from risk management and ensuring the safety of students, faculty, and staff abroad and in transit, to time management and the constraints time can have on introducing and anchoring internationalization strategies at higher education institutions.

Regardless of the title the higher education executive possessed (i.e. Chancellor, Provost, Dean, etc.) the responses were similar on a majority of the interview questions. The two Presidents (Participants A & L) and Chancellor (Participant H) were very knowledgeable about the internationalization efforts at their higher education institutions and this was reflected in the level of detail provided in the interviews. Higher education executives with titles such as Dean (Participants B, D, G & J) and Associate/Assistant Vice President (Participants M & N) were also very knowledgeable of the internationalization efforts at their respective higher education institutions and this was also reflected in the level of detail that they provided. In all fourteen interviews the higher education executives provided qualitative data that supported the claims and responses that their institutional counterpart provided.

The gender of the higher education executives did not affect the perceptions and experiences of internationalization strategies at highly internationalized higher education institutions. Three female higher education executives partook in the research study (Participants B, D & N) and there were no clear differences identified within the responses to the interview questions. The three female higher education executives provided similar responses as the eleven

93

male higher education executives (Participants A, C, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L & M) and no apparent distinctions were identified.

Conclusions

The grounded theory, qualitative research study allowed for a theory to emerge from the data collected. Having collected, coded, triangulated and analyzed the data it is argued that internationalization efforts that are intentional and work in concert with mission and design will enhance and benefit US higher education institutions. This means identifying the institutional characteristics, or distinctive signatures, of the higher education institution and highlighting them within internationalization strategies. Using these distinctive attributes as the drivers of an internationalization strategy will provide the higher education institution with a competitive advantage and allow them to stand out in a crowded market.

Although high costs were almost always associated with effective internationalization efforts, the higher education executives interviewed were able to articulate long and short-term benefits that outweighed initial costs and added value to their institutions. These value-added benefits were both tangible and intangible in nature. They included enhancing the reputation of the institution, creating distinctive living-learning and research opportunities, attracting and recruiting students and faculty both nationally and internationally, developing twenty-first century skills with language and cultural competencies, and providing a viable educational and economic benefit to the institution, state, and nation. These multidimensional factors worked in tandem and developed a competitive advantage for the higher education institution.

Although a variety of agencies, publications, and theories exist to assist higher education executives in their efforts to internationalize their US higher education institutions, many take a

broad and general form. This is a critique that is echoed again and again by practitioners in the field (Altbach, 2004; Bernhard, 2012; Cantwell & Maldonado-Maldonado, 2009; Cummings & Finkelstein, 2012). Often individual perceptions and behaviors are not explored or articulated. Giving broad and innocuous information will only take an institution so far. What has been missing from a large portion of the body of research and guidebooks dedicated to discussing internationalization of US higher education are the experiences and perceptions of those individuals who put rhetoric into practice and act as true agents of change within their institutions. These individuals are able to harness the abstract and develop best practices that will truly guide others.

The grounded theory approach allowed the researcher to argue that the contextual differences in terms of institutional design, geographical location, and mission of the higher education institution should be considered when introducing, creating, or anchoring internationalization strategies. These institutional characteristics, or distinctive signatures, determine the degree to which internationalization efforts can be effective and sustainable. A number of higher education executives interviewed cited their institutions' ability to successfully link internationalization to a framework that was already inherent at their institution. The expansion of an agricultural institution's research center to shift focus from domestic to foreign food sustainability policy is one example of this act of alignment. A US community college's geographical location allowed executives to tap into international student recruitment throughout Asia, while simultaneously remaining local in focus and educational offerings, was yet another example. These highly internationalized higher education institutions were both adaptive and innovative. They were both mission driven and authentic to their institutional designs and highlighted distinctive signatures of their respective higher education institutions. Working

knowledge of the challenges and opportunities present at a higher education institution will greatly advance the work of intentional, resourceful, and imaginative higher education executives looking to create change.

All of the highly internationalized higher education institutions identified in the research study had full-time staff dedicated to advancing the mission of internationalization at their US institutions. Many of the higher education executives interviewed were members of the institutions' executive cabinet and had direct access to the board of trustees, chief executive, deans and directors. After a comprehensive investigation of the participating institutions' websites it became apparent that some higher education institutions had a blended model in which a single department was charged with both internationalization efforts and diversity efforts. Merging departments requires intentionality and careful planning so that the missions of both distinct focus areas will be met successfully. In addition to having a merged departmental design, the staff, facilities, and resources were also all shared. The majority of the highly internationalized higher education institutions had a free-standing center or designated space on campus that was positioned to provide resources, support, and uphold policy specific to internationalization. This was the sole charge of these departments.

The development of a global village in which international students lived and learned with US students was touted as an effective and beneficial internationalization strategy. Developing opportunities for students to form bonds and create an interactive cohort with a wide array of global citizens can be both a curricular and co-curricular objective. The highly internationalized higher education institutions that created unique, distinctive, residential, living-learning communities did so by allocating and designating residence halls, apartment complexes, and physical spaces on campus. Curriculums were also developed to immerse students into

96

foreign language programs and topic areas like science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM). Enhancing cultural competencies prepared students to confront the twenty-first century. Preparing students to work and live in a global context was mentioned in the mission statements and interviews.

One higher education executive extensively discussed the importance of curriculum design and learning outcomes being attached to internationalization efforts. Training programs in nursing, emergency medical services, and business, pointed to the importance of developing strong and durable curriculums in which students and faculty benefited. It was argued that infusing internationalization into curricular designs would prepare students to work in a borderless world. A global perspective in the fields of nursing, medical services, and business enhanced the quality of the programs for the simple fact that students could take these skills and apply them to a wide array of settings and populations.

Activating the faculty to appreciate and adopt internationalization within their classrooms and committees can be a daunting and often an uneventful task. The higher education executives interviewed discussed the importance of bottom-up buy-in from members of the faculty within a top-down system. This meant empowering faculty to have autonomy within the classroom while simultaneously setting clear and manageable expectations at the executive level. Linking internationalization to the tenure process allowed executives to develop a clear understanding of professional expectations. Internationalization was laced throughout the three core areas of the tenure process: teaching, research, and service.

Having faculty take the lead on international student recruitment, participate in Fulbright exchanges, develop research institutes and policy hubs, and create course content that speaks to

97

internationalization were just a few of the tactics taken by the highly internationalized institutions. As Cummings & Finkelstein (2010) and Schoorman (2000) aptly pointed out, connecting and cultivating faculty buy-in was paramount to getting internationalization strategies anchored within the curriculums of higher education institutions. Student mobility was referenced by all executives interviewed; faculty mobility was equally important to the effort of empowering educators. Allowing faculty to seek out new geographic regions for study abroad programs, international student recruitment, and teaching opportunities allows for passion and creativity to be channeled into effective internationalization strategies (Dewey & Duff, 2009).

One executive mentioned the importance of involving the faculty early and referenced their buy-in dating back to original programs that had started in the 1960's. These efforts were still going strong at the highly internationalized institution's campus and faculty has remained the driving force behind programs and policies. At the heart of these efforts was the fact that internationalization, in a number of forms, was tied to the faculty promotion and tenure process. This allowed for a comprehensive strategy that was not dependent on faculty champions. Instead the faculty, as a cohesive system, believed in and, were rewarded by, a fair and clear process.

Throughout the review of literature, investigation of websites, and individual interviews, student mobility in the form of study abroad and international student recruitment and retention was heralded as the main internationalization effort to undertake at a US higher education institution. The most effective strategies identified were those that integrated study abroad into majors and minors. A clear expectation was made that students would study abroad at some point during their academic careers at the institution. Financial and institutional aid at highly internationalized higher education institutions was almost always provided to students studying abroad. Study abroad as a process was centralized in the international department but specific

98

components branched out into various areas and were tied to programs and offerings. The networked approach allowed study abroad to fit into the goals of the institution and the institutional goals of internationalization (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2009; Lee, 2008; Stejar, 2011).

International student recruitment and retention is the other half of student mobility. With more than 2.5 million students studying outside their home countries currently, and with that number projected to rise to 7 million in 2020, higher education institutions have to be able to create a powerful and sustainable pipeline to recruit and retain international students (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2009). Highly internationalized higher education institutions were able to tap into foreign markets. This provided sustainable funding for a number of their internationalization efforts. Charging higher tuition rates for international students allowed the institutions to expand courses and offerings to all students. Creating student fees specific to international students was also discussed as an effective strategy by executives to raise needed revenue to provide services. Participant H, a Chancellor at a community college stated in an interview: "Internationalization must provide for viable educational and economic benefits to the college, the state and the people of our state. This has helped us to do what it is that we do. We feel we can export our expertise" (Participant H, personal communication, April 15, 2012).

The economic impact was not the only benefit of international students identified. Having a thriving international population on campus allowed US students the opportunity to experience other cultures, religions, and beliefs. New ideas were presented in the classroom and co-curricular interactions became richer and more layered as additional perspectives and experiences were included. Students benefited from having deep and meaningful experiences that enhanced their cultural awareness and intercultural competencies.

99

The formation of an inter-culture assessment committee that brought together members of the faculty, staff, and executive team allowed for data-driven decision making, gap-analysis, and sustainability of practices and policies at one of the highly internationalized higher education institutions. Uniting various stakeholders around common efforts or goal was a powerful way to encourage collaboration between departments. A regional consortium was also spearheaded by the same institution and allowed higher education institutions in a geographic area to partner in innovative ways. The regional consortium allowed executives to interact and share best practices, faculty to develop teaching, research, and service collaborations, and students to engage in curricular and co-curricular activities. These efforts, as specifically pointed out by Burns & Smuckler (1995), built bridges between separate institutions and were a dynamic and innovative way to begin cultivating and cross-pollinating new initiatives, practices, services, and policies.

A few of the highly internationalized institutions also created partnerships between their departments and their board of trustee members. Trustees were designated as liaisons between the international departments and the full board. This strategy was powerful. Not only did it create a system of accountability between the department, higher education executive, and the board, it also allowed for engagement and investment from those charged with overseeing the higher education institution (Scott, 1991). Fostering meaningful partnerships at all levels of the institution will allow for a comprehensive and multidimensional internationalization strategy (Childress, 2009).

Overall, it can be successfully concluded that internationalization efforts enhance a higher education institution when they are intentionally and strategically integrated into the institutional characteristics, or distinctive signatures, that make that institution unique. Adopting key strategies and tactics to internationalize a higher education institution will greatly benefit the

students, faculty, curriculum, community, and institution as a whole and will provide a competitive advantage. Pursuing world class standards, expanding knowledge and international expertise, and leading the way in finding and sharing sustainable and viable solutions are the cornerstones of internationalization efforts at higher education institutions across the US. Moreover, practical, tangible, and anecdotal accounts allow for greater understanding and lesson ambiguity and confusion.

Recommendations

As we enter the second decade of the twenty-first century, higher education executives are tasked with providing students with the skills, resources, and abilities to be successful in a workforce that is increasingly globalized and interconnected. Based on the extensive review of literature, investigation of the public website information for the highly internationalized higher education institutions selected, and the responses to the qualitative interview questions, a number of concrete and data-driven recommendations were formulated. Although individual conditions vary across the country and with each higher education institution, the recommendations identify universal steps that can be taken to introduce or improve internationalization efforts and outlines practical resources.

Recommendation One: Higher education executives should create a comprehensive strategic plan to guide their planning and resource allocation in order to incorporate effective internationalization strategies that are complementary to the vision and mission of their higher education institutions. Internationalization efforts should be ubiquitous and occur throughout every fiber of the higher education institution. Crafting a strategic plan that acts as a nexus between the institution's mission and internationalization efforts would be advantageous. Senge (2000) discusses the importance of alignment throughout an institution. This means creating a

clear framework where partnerships, connections, and avenues for tangible and intangible resources work in tandem to ensure that strategies and policies are effective and benefit the institution. Designating a trustee to act as a liaison between the international department and the board of trustees will increase accountability, engagement, and investment in internationalization at the institution and assist in the alignment process.

Recommendation Two: Higher education executives should focus on a comprehensive assessment methodology that operates in conjunction with incorporated internationalization strategies at a higher education institution. The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) provides professional learning and development outcomes as well as outlines specific characteristics for excellence in programmatic and service based functions (2012). CAS (2012) would be a recommended starting point for higher education executives looking to lace assessment and standards throughout their work. Additionally an inter-cultural assessment committee consisting of key stakeholders from multiple departments is also recommended. This committee should assess, track and monitor internationalization efforts and generate an annual report that is made public and accessible.

The Higher Education Research Institutes' (HERI) (2012) Diverse Learning Environments Survey (DLE) is a recommended tool that can be used to measure student perceptions and behaviors towards cultural awareness and acceptance. The DLE will also allow higher education executives to complete a gap-analysis to better determine the strengths and weaknesses of internationalization efforts targeted at enhancing student's cultural competencies on their campuses. Developing outcomes and identifying ways to measure success and productivity were referenced by the higher education executives interviewed for the research study.

Recommendation Three: Higher education executives should focus on student mobility as a key pillar of their higher education institutions' internationalization process. The findings highlight the importance of study abroad programs and international student recruitment and retention. Due to the high costs associated with physically moving students across borders higher education executives need to be strategic and intentional. Study abroad should be a curriculum requirement for specific majors and minors. Financial and institutional aid should be provided to allow students to study abroad. Higher education institutions should charge higher tuition and fees for international students in order to provide additional services and generate funds to the higher education institution. Higher education executives should also focus on emerging markets like those of Brazil, Russia, India and China (BRIC) in order to tap into burgeoning geographic areas of demand for both study abroad and international student recruitment and retention opportunities (Altbach, 2009; O'Neill, 2001).

Recommendation Four: Higher education executives should allocate resources towards securing a free-standing building to house the international center. This department should be charged with a single responsibility of internationalization and all blended or merged departments that have multiple missions and objectives should be avoided. A virtual presence in the form of webpages that are linked to the institution's official homepage and have the ability to translate text into multiple languages will benefit online visitors. Staff, resources, and facilities should be designated to optimize the impact of internationalization and the international department at the higher education institution.

Recommendation Five: Higher education executives should provide faculty members with support, resources, and funding to teach and research abroad by way of faculty exchanges and residencies. Fulbright teaching opportunities along with research institutes both on and off

103

campus should be fully employed. Faculty participation and buy-in was referenced as a perceived benefit to internationalization efforts at highly internationalized higher education institutions. Connecting internationalization to the faculty promotion and tenure process in terms of teaching, research, and service would increase accountability and set fair and consistent expectations.

Recommendation Six: Higher education executives should link curriculum design to living-learning communities in which students are immersed in both curricular and co-curricular efforts that allow them to become competent in another culture or language. Executives should designate specific residence halls, apartment complexes, and building on campus as international living-learning hubs. Global villages, interactive living-learning communities, research and international centers that provide resources and support staff were all identified by the research participants as effective strategies.

Recommendation Seven: Higher education executives should join professional organizations that provide support and services to higher education institutions in the realm of internationalization. These professional organizations include American Council on Education (ACE), Institute of International Education (IIE), Association of International Educators (NAFSA), among others. The majority of higher education executives at highly internationalized higher education institutions that were interviewed referenced professional organizations they are members of or that have assisted their internationalization efforts.

Recommendation Eight: Finally, and perhaps most importantly, higher education executives should consider the contextual differences of their institutions in terms of design, geographical location, mission, student demographics, and funding sources. This means rejecting

a one-size-fits-all solution as that will not be feasible in all settings. Higher education executives should develop and design internationalization strategies that will be complementary to their higher education institution's design and characteristics, or distinctive signatures, and will allow for an institutional competitive advantage to emerge. Leveraging institutions against one another can bring about change. Identifying comparable institutions is one recommended way of starting the momentum towards developing a successful plan to capture a competitive advantage.

Recommendations for Future Research

The generalizability of the data and findings of this study is compromised due to the small sample size. Future research would benefit from incorporating a mixed-method approach in which quantitative data is collected and triangulated. Given the scope and scale of this qualitative research study, and the fact that the sample was intentionally limited, it is recommended that a larger sample be interviewed and data gathered.

An in-depth survey of higher education institutions identified as "not highly internationalized" or simply "not internationalized" could also allow for a comparative study in which the ten higher education institutions identified for this investigation would be juxtaposed with ten other higher education institutions with similar designs, geographic locations, and funding sources. This exploration would allow for additional perceptions regarding internationalization to be explored.

Investigating the impact of merged departments on the overall operations and effectiveness of an internationalization strategy would be recommended for further study. Identifying the pros and cons of having shared resources under a departmental or unit design

would allow higher education executives to determine a best practice and guide decision making at multiple levels.

Researching the impact of the BRIC nations on the US higher education sector is another area of study that would be recommended. Fully understanding the economic impact that recruiting and retaining international students and forging study abroad connections in these growth markets is imperative. Little is known beyond economic forecasting in this area of study making it a rich space for future researchers to cultivate.

Finally, the internationalization of community colleges, which are traditionally localized in scope and offerings by design, should be explored. This would be an analysis in a relatively under researched area of internationalization of higher education in the US.

References

Altbach, P. G. (2002). Knowledge and education as international commodities. *International Higher Education*, 28, 2-5.

Altbach, P. G. (2004). Globalization and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. In National Education Association (Ed.), *The NEA 2005 almanac of higher education,* 63-74. Washington, DC: *National Education Association*.

Altbach, P. G. (2009). One-third of the globe: The future of higher education in china and india. *Prospects*, 39, 11-31. doi: 10.1007/s11125-009-9106-1

Altbach, P. G. (2012). The globalization of college and university rankings. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 44, 26-31. doi: 10.1080/00091383.2012.636001

Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 290-305.

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution*. Retrieved from United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Retrieved from: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001832/183219e.pdf

American Association of Colleges and Universities. (2007) College learning for the new global century: A report from the National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise, AAC&U. Washington, DC.

American Council on Education. (2012). Retrieved from: http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Home

American Council on Education. (2008). "Mapping Internationalization on US Campuses: 2008 Edition." Retrieved from: http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ProgramsServices/cii/pubs/ace/Mapping _2008.htm

American Council on Education. (2012). "Mapping Internationalization on US Campuses: 2012

Edition." Retrieved from:

http://www.acenet.edu/links/pdfs/cige/MappingInternationalizationonUSCampuses2012-

full.pdf

American Federation of Teachers. (2012). "Number of Institutions." Higher Education Data

Center. Retrieved from: http://highereddata.aft.org/instit/national/num_inst.cfm

Association of International Educators (NAFSA). (2012). Formerly National Association of

Foreign Advisers (NAFSA). Retrieved from http://www.nafsa.org/

Astin, A. W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education.

Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles.

Barber, D., A. (2012). "5 higher ed tech trends of 2012 – Campus technology." *Gilfus Education

Group*. http://www.gilfuseducationgroup.com/5-higher-ed-tech-trends-for-2012-campus-

technology

Bartz, A. E. (1976). *Basic Statistical Concepts in Education and the Behavioral Sciences*.

Minneapolis: Burgess.

Bernhard, A. (2012). Transformative higher education. *Quality Assurance in an International

Higher Education Area*, 2, 19-38. doi: 10.1007/978-3-531-94298-8_2

Brandenburg, U., & De Wit, H. (2010). The end of internationalisation. *International Higher

Education*, 62, 15-16.

Britez, R., & Peters, M. A. (2010). Internationalization and the cosmopolitical university. *Policy

Futures in Education,* 8, 201-216.

Bruce, G. R. (2009). *Institutional design and the internationalization of us postsecondary

education institutions*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations &

Theses (PQDT).

Burns, B. B., & Smuckler, R. H. (1995). A research agenda for the internationalization of higher

education in the United States. *Recommendations and Report*, 47.

Campbell, H. F., & Brown, R. P. C. (2003). *Benefits-Cost Analysis*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University.

Cantwell, B., & Maldonado-Maldonado, A. (2009). Four stories: Confronting contemporary ideas about globalisation and internationalisation in higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 7, 289-306.

Carnegie Foundation. (2012). Carnegie Basic Classifications of Institutions of Higher Education. Retrieved from http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/

Carver, J. (2006). *Boards That Make a Difference: A New Design for Leadership in Nonprofit and Public Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). (2012). Retrieved from http://www.cas.edu/

Childress, L. K. (2009). Internationalization plans for higher education institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13, 289-309. doi: 10.1177/1028315308329804

Christophe, S.E., *&* Lee, H. (*2005*). What matters about internationalization: A market-based assessment. *Journal of Business Research, 58, 636-643.*

Clinton, H. R. (2011). American global leadership at the center for american progress. *US Department of State*. Remarks by Secretary of State made October 12, 2011 in Washington DC. Retrieved from http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2011/10/175340.htm

Clinton, H. R. (2012). National security & foreign policy priorities in the fy 2013 international affairs budget. *US Department of State*. Remarks by Secretary of State made February 28, 2012, Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in Washington DC. Retrieved from http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2012/02/184847.htm

Cook, B., & Young, K. (2012). The american college president. *American Council on Education.*

Cummings, W. K., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2012). The internationalization of the us academy: A

disciplinary perspective. *Scholars in the Changing American Academy*, 4, 79-91. doi: 10.1007/978-94-007-2730-4_6

Dewey, P., & Duff, S. (2009). Reason before passion: Faculty views on internationalization in higher education. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, 58, 491-504.

De Wit, H. (1995). *Strategies for the internationalisation of higher education: A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States of America*, 176.

De Wit, H. (2002). Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis. *Greenwood Studies in Higher Education,* 270.

De Wit, H. (2008). *The Dynamics of International Student Circulation in a Global Context*. Retrieved from

http://www.arcadia.edu/abroad/blogs/default.aspx?id=27544&blogid=3064

De Wit, H. (2009). *Measuring success in the internationalisation of higher education: an introduction* (Occasional Paper 22). Retrieved from http://www.che.de/downloads/measuring_internationalisation___EAIE_Occasional_Pape rs_22v6.pdf

De Wit, H., & Knight, J. (1999). *Quality and internationalisation in higher education*. Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development. ISBN: 9789264170490

Dunn, P., & Marinetti, A. (2007). Beyond localization: Effective learning strategies for cross-cultural e-learning. *Globalized E-Learning Cultural Challenge*, 12, doi: 10.4018/978-1-301-2.ch015.

EducationUSA. (2012). Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs: US Department of State. http://educationusa.state.gov/

Edwards, J. (2007). Challenges and opportunities for the internationalization of higher education
in the coming decade: Planned and opportunistic initiatives in American institutions.
Journal of Studies in International Education, 11, 373-381.

Excelencia in Education. (2010). "What works for latino students in higher education: 2010
compendium." http://www.edexcelencia.org/promo/2009-what-works-latino-students-
higher-education-0

Fraenkel, J. R. & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*.
New York: McGraw-Hill.

Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century.* New York:
Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Goodwin, C. D., & Nacht, M. (1991). *Missing the boat: The failure to internationalize american
higher education*. Port Chester, New York: Cambridge University.

Hammond, E. H. (2009). Internationalization in higher education and global access in a digital
age (Libraries). *Library Management*, 30.1/5, 88-98.

Hanson, K. H., & Meyerson, J. W. (1995). International challenges to American colleges and
universities: Looking ahead. *American Council on Education Series on Higher
Education*, 149.

Harris, S. (2008). Internationalising the university. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 40, 346-
357.

Healey, N. M. (2008). Is higher education really 'internationalising'? *Higher Education*, 55, 333-
355.

Higher Education Research Institute (HERI). (2012). Diverse Learning Environments: Assessing
and creating conditions for student success (DLE). Retrieved from
http://heri.ucla.edu/dle/?c=goals

Horn, A. S, Hendel, D. D., & Fry, G. W. (2007). Ranking the international dimension of top

    research universities in the United States. *Journal of Studies in International Education*,

    11, 330-358. doi: 10.1177/1028315306294630.

Houston, P. & Eadie, D. (2002). *The Board-Savvy Superintendent*. Maryland: Rowman &

    Littlefield.

Institute of International Education. (2011). Globalization and higher education: Eight common

    perceptions from university leaders. Retrieved from

    http://www.iienetwork.org/page/84658/

Institute of International Education. (2011). Student mobility and the internationalization of

    higher education. Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/en/Who-We-Are/News-and-

    Events/Press-Center/Press-Releases/2011/2011-02-22-Atlas-Book-Student-Mobility-

    Internationalization-Higher-Education.aspx

Jiang. X. (2008). Towards the internationalisation of higher education from a critical perspective.

    Journal of Further and Higher Education, 32, 347-358.

Kanter, M. J. (2011). American higher education: "First in the world." *Change: The Magazine of*

    Higher Learning. Retrieved from:

    http://www.changemag.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/2011/May-June%202011/first-in-

    the-world-full.html

Keeling, R., P. & Hersh, R., H. (2011). *We're losing our minds: Rethinking American higher*

    education. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kehm, B. M., & Teichler, U. (2007). Research on internationalisation in higher education.

    Journal of Studies in International Education, 11, 260-273.

Kelly, S. S. (2011). *Economic impact of international students attending an institution of higher*

    education in the united states (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Louisiana State

University Electronic Thesis & Dissertation Collection.

Knight, J. (1994). Internationalization: Elements and checkpoints. *Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE) Research*, 7, 1-16.

Knight, J. (2003). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 33, 2-3. doi:

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8, 5-31. doi: 10.1177/1028315303260832

Knight, J. (1997). A shared vision? Stakeholders' perspectives on internationalization of higher education in Canada. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 1, 27-44. doi:

Knight, J. (2011). Education hubs: A fad, a brand, an innovation? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 15, 221-240. Doi: 10.1177/1028315311398046

Knight, J. (2011). Five myths about internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 62, 14-15.

Knight, J., & Morshidi, S. (2012). The complexities and challenges of regional education hubs: focus on Malaysia. *Higher Education*, 62, 593-606. doi: 10.1007/s10734-011-9467-2

Krane, M. C. S. (1994). *Development of an internationalization index for us liberal arts colleges.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT).

Lee, W., Blando, J., Mizelle, N. & Orozco, G. (2007). *Introduction to Multicultural Counseling for Helping Professionals*. New York, Routledge.

Lee, W. O. (2008). The repositioning of high education from its expanded visions: Lifelong learning, entrepreneurship, internationalization and integration. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 7, 73-83.

Martin-Kniep, G. O. (2008). *Communities that Learn, Lead, and Last: Building and Sustaining Educational Expertise*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-96.

McMurtrie, B. (2007). The global campus: American colleges connect with the broader world. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53, A37.

Merkurev, S. P. (1991). Implications of internationalization for the university: Student exchanges and education abroad programs foreign language study cooperation in the area of curriculum development of interuniversity information networks establishing joint scientific research projects joint publishing projects the role of international. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 35.1, 43.

Mikhailova, L. K. (2003). *The history of ciee: Council of international education exchange and its role in international education development, 1947—2002*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Thesis (PQDT).

Miller, G. J. & Robbins, D. (2004). Benefit-Cost Analysis. Second Edition. Mark Holzer & Seok-Hwan Lee (Ed.), *Public Productivity Handbook*. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 405-428.

Miyokawa, N. (2009). *International student access to us higher education since world war ii: How nafsa (association of international educators) has influenced federal policy*. (Doctoral dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT).

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. (2004). *A call to leadership: The presidential role in internationalizing the university*. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED483871

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform, US Department of Education (USDOE).Washington, DC.

Noel-Levitz, Inc. (2008). Noel-Levitz white paper-Reaching beyond borders: Key issues in recruiting and retaining international students. Retrieved from https://www.noellevitz.com/documents/shared/Papers_and_Research/2008/ReachingBey

ondBorders.pdf

O'Neill , J. (2001). Building better global economic brics. *Goldman Sachs Economic Research Group*. Retrieved from http://www.goldmansachs.com/our-thinking/topics/brics/brics-reports-pdfs/build-better-brics.pdf

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2010) Education at a glance 2010, OECD Indicators. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org

Policy Futures in Education. (2003). Internationalization of higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. Retrieved from

http://www.ses.unam.mx/docencia/2007II/Lecturas/Mod2_Qiang.pdf

Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). (2007). PISA 2006 science competencies for tomorrow's world. Volume I & II. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

http://www.oecd.org/document/2/0,3343,en_32252351_32236191_39718850_1_1_1_1,0 0.html

Pryor, J., Hurtado, S., Saenz, V., Santos, J. & Korn, W. (2007). "The American Freshman: Forty-year trends 1966 – 2006." *Higher Education Research Institute* (HERI). Retrieved from http://heri.ucla.edu/40yrtrends.php

Roth, K. (2010). Internationalization: The nexus of virtual worlds and reality. *On The Horizon*. 18.2, 132-137.

Schoorman, D. (2000). *How is internationalization implemented? A framework for organizational practice*. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED444426

Schoorman, D. (2000). *Internationalization: The challenge of implementing organizational*

rhetoric. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED444427.pdf

Scott, P. (2000). Globalisation and higher education: Challenges for the 21st century. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 4, 3-10.

Scott, R. A. (1991). *The trustees' role in the globalization of university programs*. Paper presented at the Retreat of University Trustees, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical University (Greensboro, NC, November 19, 1991).

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization*. New York: Currency Doubleday.

Senge, P. M. (2000). *Schools that learn: A fifth discipline fieldbook for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education*. New York: Crown Business.

Stier, J. (2004, March). Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in higher education: Idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 2, 83-97.

Stejar, C. (2011). Higher education: Public good or public service? Analysis from the perspective of internationalization of education. *Management & Marketing*, 139-150.

Stohl, M. (2007). We have met the enemy and he is us: The role of the faculty in the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 359-372.

Strauss, W. & Howe, N. (2007). *Millennials Go To College*. New York: Paramount Market.

Sullivan, J. (2011). *Global leadership in higher education administration: Perspectives on internationalization by university presidents, vice-presidents and deans* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT).

Svensson, L., & Wihlborg, M. (2010). Internationalising the content of higher education: The need for a curriculum perspective. *Higher Education: The International Journal of*

Higher Education and Educational Planning, 60, 595-613.

Terri, K. (2009). Transnational academic mobility, internationalization and interculturality in higher education. *Intercultural Education*, 20, 395-405.

Thune, T. & Welle-Strand, A. (2005). ICT for and in internationalization processes: A business school case study. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, 50, 593-611.

Tinkham, S. (2011). *The value of getting out: The impact of school leaders' international experiences.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation & Theses (PQDT).

United Nations (UN). (2011). Department of economic and social affairs: Population division. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/esa/population/

USAID. (2010). U.S. higher education community: Doing business with usaid.

US Census Bureau (USCB). (2012). Foreign (nonimmigrant) student enrollment in college. *The 2012 Statistical Abstract: The National Data Book*. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/cats/education/higher_education_institutions_and_enrollment.html

US Census Bureau (USCB). (2012). Higher education—Institutions and enrollment. *The 2012 Statistical Abstract: The National Data Book*. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/cats/education/higher_education_institutions_and_enrollment.html

US Department of Education (USDOE), National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2011). Digest of education statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/2010menu_tables.asp

WhiteHouse.gov. (2012). Educate to innovate. Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/education/educate-innovate

Woodward, S. (1936). "A proportion of our eastern ivy colleges are meeting little fellows

    another Saturday before plunging into the strife and the turmoil." *New York Herald*

    Tribune.

Wright, T. S. A. (2009). Sustainability, internationalization, and higher education. *New*

    Directions for Teaching and Learning, 118, 105-115.

Yao, C. (2009). *Internationalization of higher education and study abroad programs at US*

    research universities: A social systems study. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from

    ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.

Appendix A

COVER LETTER

Dear _____:

My name is Vincent G. Porfirio and I am a doctoral candidate in the educational leadership program at the Sage Graduate School in Albany, New York. I am conducting research in the area of internationalization strategies at "highly internationalized" higher education institutions across the United States. Your academy has been identified as a "highly internationalized" higher education institution.

My research is being guided by my dissertation chair, Dr. Daniel S. Alemu, Ph.D., who will be acting as the principal investigator.

The purpose of this qualitative study is to explore the perceptions and experiences of higher education executive members with primary responsibility for internationalization and global education implementation at your institution.

I will be trying to determine which internationalization efforts are occurring at "highly internationalized" higher education institutions and the academic executives' perceived costs and perceived benefits of internationalizing an academic community.

Methods of inquiry will include phone interviews with executive leaders who are primarily responsible for internationalization strategies, including presidents and chancellors, provosts and executive academic officers, vice presidents and vice chancellors, deans and directors in the selected and consenting post-secondary institutions. The data collected will be used to explore this unique and under-researched aspect of leadership.

As a result of your experiences with leading and implementing internationalization strategies and tactics at your institution, I would like to invite you to participate in this research study. The interviews will be conducted over the phone, take approximately thirty to forty-five minutes, will be hand recorded, and will be scheduled at a mutually convenient time.

Prior to the interview, I will collect publicly accessible data from your institution's website that pertains to the institution's internationalization initiatives (if applicable), to deepen my understanding of this topic.

This study is confidential and real names of you or your institution will not be used in recording or reporting the data. To ensure complete confidentiality all names, notes, and transcriptions will not use real names and all data will be de-identified when reporting for publication or otherwise as this small group could be identified. To maintain confidentiality, the data will be stored on a password protected computer and all data will be destroyed after the doctoral research study is complete.

Sharing your knowledge of your institution's leadership as it pertains to internationalization will be a most valuable contribution to the field of educational leadership that could serve as a model for future efforts in improving leadership capacity in global and international affairs.

Please review the attached document regarding informed consent. If you have any questions regarding the nature or scope of this study as well as your participation, please feel free to contact me at XXX/XXX.XXXX (cell), XXX/XXX.XXXX (work) or porfiv@sage.edu (email). I am looking forward to interviewing you to gain a better understanding of internationalization leadership. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Vincent G. Porfirio

Appendix B

WRITTEN PERMISSION

Subject :	Re: Doctoral Research Inquiry

Date : Sat, Oct 01, 2011 01:29 PM EDT

From : "Hennessy, Erin" <EHennessy@ACENET.EDU>

To :	"<porfiv@sage.edu>" <porfiv@sage.edu>

Vin,

Thanks for your note.

You are welcome to use selected questions from Mapping for your own research. If you will be using the questions in a publication, please follow these guidelines:

You must cite ACE as the author and should use our standard citation when reprinting ("© [date]. The American Council on Education. Reprinted with permission.").

Please let me know if you need additional information.

Best,

Erin

Appendix C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1.   What internationalization strategies can be found at your institution?

a.   (Prompt) Can you describe specific internationalization initiatives, programs, services, operations, etc. at your institution?

2.   Which internationalization strategies do you think are the most effective at your institution? Why?

a. (Prompt) Effective meaning you think that they operate well in terms of curriculum design and financially and meet the needs of the institution.

3.   What are the perceived or actual benefits of the effective internationalization strategies at your institution?

4.   What are perceived or actual costs of the effective internationalization strategies at your institution?

5.   Which internationalization strategies do you think are the least effective at your institution? Why?

6.   What are the perceived or actual benefits of the ineffective internationalization strategies at your institution?

7.   What are the perceived or actual costs of the ineffective internationalization strategies at your institution?

a.   (Prompt) Has your institution received external funding specifically earmarked for internationalization programs or activities?

(© [November 27, 2011]. The American Council on Education. Reprinted with permission).

8.   Do you think that internationalization efforts have enhanced or hindered your academic institution? Why?

9.   Do you consider your school to be a "highly internationalized" higher education institution in the US? Why/Why not?

a.   (Prompt) Your institution has been recognized by three independent professional agencies that specialize in internationalization of higher education (the American Council on Education, the Association of International Educators, and the Institute of International Education). This has allowed me to identify your institution as a "highly internationalized" higher education institution. What are your thoughts on that identification?

10.   Do you consider yourself to be a US expert in internationalization? Why/Why not?

a.   (Prompt) Your institution has been selected by the American Council on Education to participate in The Internationalization Collaborative, an invitational consortium of "highly internationalized" colleges and universities whose executives are deemed experts in the field of higher education internationalization. As the higher education executive who oversees internationalization efforts at your institution do you identify as an expert in the field of internationalization? What are your thoughts on that identification?

Appendix D

LETTER SENT WITH INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Dear Colleague:

As a doctoral student at the Sage Graduate School in Albany, New York, I am conducting a study that will explore the perceptions and experiences of higher education executive members with primary responsibility for internationalization and global education implementation at top-tier institutions across the United States. I will be trying to determine if there is a relationship between these perceptions and experiences and their capacity to implement internationalization strategies.

As a higher education executive and colleague I am requesting your assistance in the field testing of the attached interview questions which I plan to administer to a sample of current higher education executives.

Should you consent to participate in the field testing of the interview questions, please look over the following questions and provide me with feedback.

Also, kindly let me know of any suggestions that you have that would improve the interview questions.

 In addition please let me know how long it took for you to complete the interview questions.

Should you have any questions and/or concerns, please do not hesitate to let me know.

I thank you for your time.

Best,

Vincent G. Porfirio

Appendix E

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

To _____:

You are being asked to participate in a research project entitled: System Leaders' Internationalization Strategies in "Highly Internationalized" Higher Education Institutions across the United States: A study to determine which internationalization efforts are occurring at "highly internationalized" higher education institutions and the executives' perceived costs and perceived benefits of internationalizing an academic community.

This research is being conducted by The Sage Colleges' doctoral candidate, Vincent G. Porfirio, under the direct guidance of Dr. Daniel S. Alemu, Ph.D., who is acting as the principal investigator for this study.

The purpose of this study will be to explore the perceptions and experiences of higher education executives with primary responsibility for internationalization efforts at "highly internationalized" post-secondary institutions. A qualitative analysis will be conducted that focuses on the leadership issues related to the implementation of the academy's internationalization efforts and the perceived costs and benefits of internationalization. Methods of inquiry will include telephone interviews of twenty executive leaders who are primarily responsible for internationalization strategies, including presidents and chancellors, provosts and executive academic officers, vice presidents and vice chancellors, deans and directors in the selected and consenting post-secondary institutions.

The data collected will be used to explore this unique and under researched aspect of leadership.

This study will include ten higher education institutions that have been identified as "highly internationalized" based on three independent professional organizations. Institutions will include community colleges, comprehensive universities, liberal arts colleges and research universities in the United States.

I will interview two executives with primary responsibility for internationalization implementation at each institution identified. The interviews will be conducted over the telephone at a convenient time for the subject. They will last approximately thirty to forty-five minutes and will be hand recorded. The procedure involves interviews that utilize ten questions. The twenty subjects will be interviewed independently. Upon completion of the telephone interview participants will have an opportunity to verify the accuracy of their responses by reviewing the typed transcripts of the interviews. If a response is not obtained in seven business days it will be assumed that the transcript is accurate and I will proceed with the research study.

The researcher will collect publicly accessible data from the institution that deals with internationalization by visiting the institution's website. This data will be collected prior to the interviews. They will support the researcher in gaining a more in-depth understanding of the academy's goals and objectives for internationalization, as well as the leadership expectations for executives in internationalization in each setting.

This study is confidential. The data will be stored on a password protected computer and all data will be destroyed after the doctoral research study is complete. In referring to subjects and post-secondary institutions in both the data collection and the written work, the subjects and schools will be assigned pseudonyms and all data will be de-identified when reporting for publication or otherwise to ensure confidentiality.

The benefits of participation are the contribution to the body of knowledge in the area of internationalization leadership that is currently a unique and under-researched area.

There are minimal potential risks for participation in this study. However, due to the interview nature, this study is considered a "minimal risk" study. Risks involve the sharing of information with the researcher in a confidential, but not anonymous, setting.

_____

In the event that I am harmed by participation in this study, I understand that compensation and/or medical treatment is not available from The Sage Colleges. However, compensation and/or medical costs might be recovered by legal action.

I understand that I may at any time during the course of this study revoke my consent and withdraw from the study without any penalty.

I have been given an opportunity to read and keep a copy of this Agreement and to ask questions concerning the study. Any such questions have been answered to my full and complete satisfaction.

I, _____, having full capacity to consent, do hereby volunteer to participate in this research study.

Signed: _____

<div align="center">Research Participant</div>

This research has received the approval of The Sage Colleges Institutional Review Board, which functions to insure the protection of the rights of human subjects. If you, as a participant, have any complaints about this study, please contact:

Dr. Esther Haskvitz, Dean
Sage Graduate Schools
School of Health Sciences
65 First Street
Troy, New York 12180
518-244-2264
haskve@sage.edu

Appendix F

INTERVIEW SCRIPT

Hello (Name & Title of Participant):

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this research study. I have ten (10) questions that I will be asking regarding "internationalization" at your higher education institution. During this interview I will be manually typing your answers into a Word Document. No recording devices are being used.

Please note that you can opt out of the study at any point with no ramifications.

Please also note that there is no compensation for participating in this research study.

 Do you have any questions for me prior to starting the interview?

1.   What internationalization strategies can be found at your institution?

a.   (Prompt) Can you describe specific internationalization initiatives, programs, services, operations, etc. at your institution?

2.   Which internationalization strategies do you think are the most effective at your institution? Why?

a. (Prompt) Effective meaning you think that they operate well in terms of curriculum design and financially and meet the needs of the institution.

3.   What are the perceived or actual benefits of the effective internationalization strategies at your institution?

4.   What are perceived or actual costs of the effective internationalization strategies at your institution?

5.   Which internationalization strategies do you think are the least effective at your institution? Why?

6.   What are the perceived or actual benefits of the ineffective internationalization strategies at your institution?

7.   What are the perceived or actual costs of the ineffective internationalization strategies at your institution?

a.   (Prompt) Has your institution received external funding specifically earmarked for internationalization programs or activities?

(© [November 27, 2011]. The American Council on Education. Reprinted with permission).

8.   Do you think that internationalization efforts have enhanced or hindered your academic institution? Why?

9.   Do you consider your school to be a "highly internationalized" higher education institution in the US? Why/Why not?

b.   (Prompt) Your institution has been recognized by three independent professional agencies that specialize in internationalization of higher education (the American Council on Education, the Association of International Educators, and the Institute of International Education). This has allowed me to identify your institution as a "highly internationalized" higher education institution. What are your thoughts on that identification?

10.   Do you consider yourself to be a US expert in internationalization? Why/Why not?

b.   (Prompt) Your institution has been selected by the American Council on Education to participate in The Internationalization Collaborative, an invitational consortium of "highly internationalized" colleges and universities whose executives are deemed experts in the field of higher education internationalization. As the higher education executive who oversees

internationalization efforts at your institution do you identify as an expert in the field of internationalization? What are your thoughts on that identification?

This concludes the questions that I have.

Do you have anything else that you would like to add? Do you have any questions for me?

I will be sending you a copy of this interview as a typed transcript in the form of a Word Document attached to an email. Please review this transcript for accuracy. You can contact me directly regarding any questions or concerns you may have with the transcript. If I do not hear from you within seven (7) business days of receiving the transcript I will assume that the transcript is accurate and will proceed with the research study.

Thank you again for your willingness to assist me with my doctoral research.

Goodbye.

Appendix G

COVER LETTER TO CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Dear _____:

My name is Vincent G. Porfirio and I am a doctoral candidate in the educational leadership program at the Sage Graduate School in Albany, New York. I am conducting research in the area of internationalization strategies at "highly internationalized" higher education institutions across the United States. Your academy has been identified as a "highly internationalized" higher education institution. My research is being guided by my dissertation chair, Dr. Daniel S. Alemu, Ph.D., who will be acting as the principal investigator.

I will be trying to determine which internationalization efforts are occurring at "highly internationalized" higher education institutions and the academic executives' perceived costs and perceived benefits of internationalizing an academic community.

The data collected will be used to explore this unique and under-researched aspect of leadership.

As a result of your institution's experiences with leading and implementing internationalization strategies and tactics, I would like to request your executive consent for your institution to participate in this research study. Attached you will find an Informed Consent Form.

I would also like to request that you provide me with the names, titles, and contact information of two (2) higher education executives who are primarily responsible for internationalization strategies at your institution. These individuals may include the president and chancellor, provost, executive academic officers, vice presidents and vice chancellors, deans and directors or perhaps even you.

Please email me the following information for the two executives requested (note that one of the participants may be you):

Executive 1:

Name: _____ Title: _____

Email: _____ Phone: _(_____)_____

Executive 2:

Name: _____ Title: _____

Email: _____ Phone: _(_____)_____

Once identified, the two participants will be contacted and individual informed consent will be collected. The consenting participants will then be interviewed over the phone.

This study is confidential and real names of you, your institution, or the two (2) executives will not be used in recording or reporting the data. To ensure complete confidentiality all names, notes, and transcriptions will not use real names and all data will be de-identified when reporting for publication or otherwise as this small group could be identified. To maintain confidentiality, the data will be stored on a password protected computer and all data will be destroyed after the doctoral research study is complete.

Sharing your knowledge of your institution's leadership as it pertains to internationalization will be a most valuable contribution to the field of educational leadership that could serve as a model for future efforts in improving leadership capacity in global and international affairs.

Please review the attached document regarding informed consent. If you have any questions regarding the nature or scope of this study as well as your participation, please feel free to contact me at XXX/XXX.XXXX (cell), XXX/XXX.XXXX (work) or porfiv@sage.edu (email). I am looking forward to establishing a professional partnership with you to gain a better understanding of internationalization leadership. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Vincent G. Porfirio

Appendix H

CHIEF EXECUTIVE INFORMED CONSENT FORM

To _____:

Your post-secondary institution is being asked to participate in a research project entitled: System Leaders' Internationalization Strategies in "Highly Internationalized" Higher Education Institutions across the United States: A study to determine which internationalization efforts are occurring at "highly internationalized" higher education institutions and the executives' perceived costs and perceived benefits of internationalizing an academic community.

This research is being conducted by The Sage Colleges' doctoral candidate, Vincent G. Porfirio, under the direct guidance of Dr. Daniel S. Alemu, Ph.D., who is acting as the principal investigator for this study.

The purpose of this study will be to explore the perceptions and experiences of higher education executives with primary responsibility for internationalization efforts at "highly internationalized" post-secondary institutions. A qualitative analysis will be conducted that focuses on the leadership issues related to the implementation of the academy's internationalization efforts and the perceived costs and benefits of internationalization. Methods of inquiry will include telephone interviews of twenty executive leaders who are primarily responsible for internationalization strategies, including presidents and chancellors, provosts and executive academic officers, vice presidents and vice chancellors, deans and directors in the selected and consenting post-secondary institutions.

The data collected will be used to explore this unique and under researched aspect of leadership.

This study will include ten higher education institutions that have been identified as "highly internationalized" based on three independent professional organizations. Institutions will include community colleges, comprehensive universities, liberal arts colleges and research universities in the United States.

I will interview two executives with primary responsibility for internationalization implementation at each institution identified. The interviews will be conducted over the telephone at a convenient time for the subject. They will last approximately thirty to forty-five minutes and will be hand recorded. The procedure involves interviews that utilize ten questions. The twenty subjects will be interviewed independently. Upon completion of the telephone interview participants will have an opportunity to verify the accuracy of their responses by reviewing the typed transcripts of the interviews.

The researcher will collect publicly accessible data from the institution that deals with internationalization by visiting the institution's website. This data will be collected prior to the interviews. They will support the researcher in gaining a more in-depth understanding of the academy's goals and objectives for internationalization, as well as the leadership expectations for executives in internationalization in each setting.

This study is confidential. The data will be stored on a password protected computer and all data will be destroyed after the doctoral research study is complete. In referring to subjects and post-secondary institutions in both the data collection and the written work, the subjects and schools will be assigned pseudonyms and all data will be de-identified when reporting for publication or otherwise to ensure confidentiality.

The benefits of participation are the contribution to the body of knowledge in the area of internationalization leadership that is currently a unique and under-researched area.

There are minimal potential risks for participation in this study. However, due to the interview nature, this study is considered a "minimal risk" study. Risks involve the sharing of information with the researcher in a confidential, but not anonymous, setting.

_____

In the event that I am harmed by participation in this study, I understand that compensation and/or medical treatment is not available from The Sage Colleges. However, compensation and/or medical costs might be recovered by legal action.

I understand that I may at any time during the course of this study revoke my consent and withdraw from the study without any penalty.

I have been given an opportunity to read and keep a copy of this Agreement and to ask questions concerning the study. Any such questions have been answered to my full and complete satisfaction.

I, _____, having full capacity to consent, do hereby volunteer my academic institution to participate in this research study.

Signed: _____

      Chief Executive Consenting Institutional Participation

This research has received the approval of The Sage Colleges Institutional Review Board, which functions to insure the protection of the rights of human subjects. If you, as a participant, have any complaints about this study, please contact:

Dr. Esther Haskvitz, Dean
Sage Graduate Schools

School of Health Sciences
65 First Street
Troy, New York 12180
518-244-2264
haskve@sage.edu

Appendix I

PARTICIPANT TRANSCRIPT VERIFICATION LETTER

Dear _____:

Attached to this email is a copy of the interview you participated in as a typed transcript in the form of a Word Document. Please review this transcript for accuracy. You can contact me directly regarding any questions or concerns you may have with the transcript.

If I do not hear from you within seven (7) business days of receiving the transcript I will assume that the transcript is accurate and will proceed with the research study.

Thank you again for your willingness to assist me with my doctoral research.

Should you have any questions and/or concerns, please do not hesitate to let me know.

I thank you for your time.

Best,

Vincent G. Porfirio