

THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION: PERCEPTIONS
FROM INTERNATIONAL EDUCATORS AND SENIOR INTERNATIONAL
OFFICERS

by

LEIGH ANNE POOLE

(Under the Direction of Merrily S. Dunn)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers within the southeastern United States regarding on-campus internationalization initiatives. Members of NAFSA: Association of International Educators' Region VII and the Association of International Education Administrators working at institutions in the southeastern United States were invited to participate. The study focused on elements of internationalization including organization and governance, institutional culture, institutional systems of support, professional roles and responsibilities, and internationalization and globalization. The researcher used a locally developed instrument to answer the following four research questions:

1. What are the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers in the Southeast regarding the strength of their campus' internationalization initiatives?

2. To what extent do professionals in international education in the Southeast perceive the presence of the elements of internationalization at their current institutions?
3. What are the differences in perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on group type (international educators versus senior international officers)?
4. What are the differences in perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on institutional type (i.e., public, private, two-year, four-year)?

Results indicated an association between participants' roles as international educators and senior international officers and their perceptions regarding the strength of campus internationalization initiatives. Descriptive statistics provided information regarding the extent to which international educators and senior international officers perceived the presence of the elements of internationalization at their current institutions. Results also indicated significant differences among the perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on participants' roles as international educators or senior international officers. Additionally, participants did not use the terms *internationalization* and *globalization* interchangeably. The findings supported the premise that institutions of higher education in the U.S. need to clearly articulate goals and establish common terminology for their campuses prior to implementing internationalization initiatives. The results also illustrated that greater attention and focus should be directed toward exploring what internationalization is and how best to implement it on college and university campuses in the U.S.

INDEX WORDS: Internationalization, U.S. Higher Education, Southeast, Perceptions, International Education, International Educator, Senior International Officer, International Education Professional, Elements of Internationalization, Organization and Governance, Institutional Culture, Institutional Systems of Support, Professional Roles and Responsibilities, Internationalization and Globalization

THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION: PERCEPTIONS
FROM INTERNATIONAL EDUCATORS AND SENIOR INTERNATIONAL
OFFICERS

by

LEIGH ANNE POOLE

B.A., Wofford College, 1997

M.Ed., University of South Carolina, 1999

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2012

© 2012

Leigh Anne Poole

All Rights Reserved

THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION: PERCEPTIONS
FROM INTERNATIONAL EDUCATORS AND SENIOR INTERNATIONAL
OFFICERS

by

LEIGH ANNE POOLE

Major Professor: Merrily S. Dunn

Committee: Laura A. Dean
James C. Hearn

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2012

DEDICATION

This manuscript is dedicated to my family (Mom, Dad, Jeff, Sheri, Kaleigh, and Jared). Without their love and constant support, I would not be where I am today. I also dedicate this work and my degree to my mother, both of my grandmothers, and to my maternal great-grandmother. Each of them understood the importance of education and the subsequent opportunities that would be afforded to their children as a result. These women made incredible sacrifices to ensure that the next generation would have educational prospects beyond what they themselves were given. The tremendous value they placed on education is the primary reason I have been able to achieve this degree. My dissertation honors their sacrifices, dedication, and hard work, and is a culmination of their vision for the future as well as the values they each instilled in me. To these women and to my entire family – thank you for your love, support, dedication, and perseverance in supporting me throughout this process. I love you all.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Earning a Ph.D. was never part of the plan. When I graduated from my master's program at the University of South Carolina I remember thinking, "I don't ever have to do this again – no more school, and I am finally done. Hallelujah!" But sometimes, it's not about the plans we make for ourselves. Sometimes, it's about God's plan for our lives.

Approximately four years into my career at The University of Georgia, I had an epiphany. I was doing what I wanted to do professionally. I loved my job and the many opportunities I had at the University. As part of a professional development opportunity sponsored by UGA's Vice President for Student Affairs, Reverend Dr. William H. Willimon spoke to members of the division. As I sat in the audience and listened, I mysteriously and inexplicably became emotional, but had no idea why. It was unusual for me to have such a demonstrative response to a speaker. As I began to process my reaction, I realized that something was missing in my life.

Dr. Willimon's style of speaking and his message that day reminded me of the wonderful and amazing professors I had at Wofford College as an undergraduate. His prose brought back memories of my roots in the liberal arts tradition and the way Wofford's faculty challenged me. They always expected the very best and they taught us to think critically about ourselves and the world around us. That day I realized how much I missed learning and understood that I needed to become a student again.

That moment was the first step towards first becoming a doctoral student, then a doctoral candidate, and finally a graduate from the College Student Affairs Administration (CSAA) program at The University of Georgia (UGA). My success would not have been possible without the support, dedication, and perseverance of many. First, to God be the glory – great things He hath done. I never thought I would earn a doctorate, so to Him be the glory, honor, and praise (Colossians 3:17; 1 Corinthians 10:31; 1 Peter 4:11). To my family, I honor and thank you for your love, passion, devotion, and ability to challenge me to be my “best self” every single day. Mom and Dad, thank you for loving me and for teaching me how to work hard for what I wanted. You were always there for me and I have never doubted that you always believed in me. These things and your faith in me are among the greatest gifts a parent can give a child; I am humbled by you both and thank you for everything you did to make this achievement possible. To Jeff, Sheri, Kaleigh, and Jared – thank you for listening and for caring – even when I was talking about statistics and describing all the many steps it took to get this far. You made me smile and laugh when I needed it most – I love you all.

To my major professor, Dr. Merrily S. Dunn, who has supported and encouraged me throughout my time in the program. Merrily, you were so often exactly what I needed – a sounding board, a cheerleader, someone who was supportive, flexible, thoughtful, challenging, and thought-provoking. Thank you for giving me the freedom to choose my research topic, for the time to find the appropriate path, and for being by my side every step of the way. To the equally wonderful members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Laura Dean and Dr. Jim Hearn, I can’t thank you enough for your support and dedication. It was a long road and I wouldn’t be where I am today without you. And finally, to Dr.

Patricia Daugherty, thank you for serving as part of my publishable paper committee and for your many years of friendship, wisdom, and continual support. I am fortunate to have you in my life and would not be the professional I am today without having known you.

To the faculty of the College Student Affairs Administration program, Dr. Diane Cooper, Dr. Laura Dean, Dr. Merrily Dunn, and Dr. Richard Mullendore, you each helped lay the foundation that allowed me to discover who I am as a scholar. Because of you, I learned to appreciate various aspects of this process more than I ever thought I would. I thank each of you for your hard work, dedication, and passion. Your experiences and expertise serve as the fire that heats, treats, and tempers us – shaping us, molding us, and ultimately making us stronger, sharper, and less prone to fractures. It is a hard, challenging, yet beautiful process, and I thank you for the role you have played in it. You are appreciated more than you will ever know. I would also like to extend a note of gratitude to my colleagues and peers from the CSAA doctoral program. So many of you challenged, supported, and encouraged me at different points and in so many ways. Thank you. Also, to my peers, colleagues, and the faculty from the Institute of Higher Education – thank you for being so open and welcoming each time I took classes in your department. It was truly a pleasure.

I am indebted to Dr. Stephen Cramer for his assistance with the methodology for this study and his willingness to extend the support of the Academic Computing Center in the College of Education for this project. I am also extraordinarily grateful to Dr. Kangjoo Lee. His dedication helped me during an extremely difficult time and I appreciate his kindness more than he will ever know. I would also like to thank Ms.

Youn Jeng Choi for her assistance, patience, and persistence during the last phase of this process.

To my colleagues at UGA and across the country who work in international education, thank you for your support of both me and this research study. A special note of appreciation to Region VII NAFSA: Association of International Educators and the Association of International Education Administrators for their kind and gracious assistance. I would also like to thank Dr. Doug Podoll for his willingness to help on multiple occasions and during various stages of the research process. Finally, I would be remiss if I failed to recognize Ms. Susan Caldwell. Susan, words cannot express the depth of my gratitude for your constant support, lovely notes, surprise texts, and wonderful words of encouragement. You were there for me in both the good times and the bad, and you have absolutely been one of my biggest cheerleaders. Susan, your support truly helped me fly. Thank you.

Ultimately, earning this degree would not have been possible without the help, wisdom, and friendship of many colleagues, mentors, and friends. They include Mr. Bernard Anderson, Dr. Eric Atkinson, Ms. Tonya Baker, Dr. Willie Banks, Jr., Dr. Karen Boyd, Dr. T.W. Cauthen, Dr. Jan Davis Barham, Ms. LaQuesha Foster, Dr. Brandon Frye, Mr. Rick Gibson, Ms. Kayla Hamilton, Dr. Darla Deardorff, Ms. Heather Housley, Ms. Zoe Johnson, Dr. Gerry Kowalski, Ms. Pam Lasalle, Mr. Ed Mirecki, Dr. Samantha W. Murfree, Ms. Paula McBride, Dr. Bill McDonald, Dr. Kavita Pandit, Dr. Don Poe, Ms. Kathleen Poe, Ms. Adrianne Ochoa, Ms. Michelle Parnell, Dr. Uttiyo Raychaudhuri, Dr. Beau Seagraves, Ms. Elle Shroyer, Dr. Cara Skeat-Ray, Dr. Lisa Sperling, the

Thompson Family, Ms. Jen Wells, Ms. Holly Williams, Ms. Nikki Williams, Dr. Stacie L. Williams, and Dr. Wesley Young. You each played a vital role in my success.

It is important to also extend a personal note of gratitude to all of the staff at International Student Life at UGA, and in particular to Ms. Jacqueline Minus. Thank you all for being there over the years and for making sure that our events, programs, and services were successful and maintained a high standard of quality for the international students at UGA. Additionally, my success would not have been possible without the support and kindness of my current and former supervisors. Thank you for the role each of you played in encouraging me throughout my time in the doctoral program.

In many ways my process for earning a doctorate was like trying to find Nemo. It was full of promising leads, false starts, backtracking, and swimming off the main path after pretty, shiny things that sometimes were irrelevant and other times led to pure gold. Earning this doctorate taught me a number of things, but the one I cherish the most is the formation of my identity as a scholar. It has also reminded me that help often comes from unlikely places and that we each impact others in ways we can't imagine.

Many people liken earning a doctorate to running a marathon. But I prefer to think of it as a game of football. Football is a game of inches – a process of pushing forward and getting shoved back, gaining ground and then losing it. It is a game that is always focused on moving forward, no matter what happens, towards the end zone to earn enough points to win. It is a game of great triumphs and one of debilitating losses. But ultimately, football is also a process that leads to one thing – a team effort for one person, in due course, to cross into the end zone and earn those last few points that win the game. I am so very pleased, honored, and thrilled to finally be the person sprinting

into the end zone. I extend my deepest gratitude and appreciation to everyone who helped me achieve this dream. And in the words of my very wise older brother – Mom, this is your degree. I love you and thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	xiv
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Significance of Study	5
Purpose of the Study	9
Research Questions	9
Operational Definitions.....	10
Chapter Summary	16
2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	18
The Internationalization of Higher Education	18
The Importance of Internationalization for U.S. Higher Education	30
The Relevance of Internationalization for Today's Students	32
The Institute for International Education and Open Doors Data	35
Senior Administration and Internationalization.....	39
Chapter Summary	41
3 METHODOLOGY	44
Design Overview	44

Sample Selection.....	45
Data Collection Procedures.....	56
Data Analysis	63
Limitations of the Study.....	65
Chapter Summary	65
4 RESULTS	67
Overview of Study Procedures	67
Demographic Information.....	69
Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha.....	77
Validity and Factor Analysis	79
Research Question One.....	82
Research Question Two	84
Research Question Three	94
Research Question Four.....	100
Additional Findings	103
Chapter Summary	104
5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	107
Brief Summary of the Research Study.....	107
Significant Findings	109
Additional Study Limitations.....	128
Implications for Practice	131
Recommendations for Future Research	136
Final Conclusions.....	138

REFERENCES	143
------------------	-----

APPENDICES

A	EMAIL INVITATION TO POTENTIAL STUDY PARTICIPANTS FROM NAFSA REGION VII AND AIEA.....	161
B	REMINDER EMAILS TO POTENTIAL STUDY PARTICIPANTS FROM NAFSA REGION VII AND AIEA.....	163
C	ANNOUNCEMENT FOR NAFSA REGION VII SOCIAL MEDIA.....	165
D	INFORMED CONSENT FOR ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE	166
E	PAPER VERSION OF QUESTIONNAIRE	168

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 3.1: National Rankings for Hosting International Students in the Southeastern U.S.	48
Table 3.2: U.S. Students Participating in Study Abroad Including Department of State Initiatives.....	49
Table 4.1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants.....	73
Table 4.2: Reliability Analysis	78
Table 4.3: Perceptions of Strength of Campus Internationalization Initiatives	83
Table 4.4: Perceptions of Organization and Governance (OG)	86
Table 4.5: Perceptions of Institutional Culture (IC)	88
Table 4.6: Perceptions Institutional Systems of Support (ISS).....	90
Table 4.7: Perceptions of Professional Roles and Responsibilities (PRR).....	91
Table 4.8: Perceptions of Internationalization and Globalization (IG).....	92
Table 4.9: Composite Scores	94
Table 4.10: Pearson Correlation Matrix among Scale Scores	96
Table 4.11: Means and Standard Deviations Based on Group Type	97
Table 4.12: Means and Standard Deviations for Institutional Type (Public versus Private)	101
Table 4.13: Means and Standard Deviations for Institutional Type (Two-year versus Four-year)	102

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been an expansion of the international dimension of higher education on a global scale (International Association of Universities, 2011; Love & Estanek, 2004a). Significant advances in technology, increases in intercontinental transportation, and exceptional growth in international economic markets have “rendered many borders and boundaries irrelevant” (Love & Estanek, 2004b, p. 173). These developments have made it easy to overcome previous barriers of time and space around the world (Friedman, 2005; Friedman, 2007; Hartman & Rola, 2000; Love & Estanek, 2004a; Stewart, 2005).

In the past, academic systems and institutions of higher education had opportunities for growth within national boundaries; now it is necessary to compete at an international level (Altbach, 2008). This competition has led to a movement to “internationalize” much of higher education around the world. Altbach refers to this internationalization movement as a global circulation of academics where the brain drain of the past has morphed into an exchange of people and knowledge across borders and societies. This exchange of higher education across national boundaries is the foundation for the internationalization of higher education both within the U.S. and around the world.

The internationalization of higher education is often operationalized through study abroad, language courses and degree programs, institutional partnerships with

colleges and universities in other countries, and the hosting of international students (Wood & Kia, 2000). Benefits from campus internationalization include international awareness, strengthened research and cooperation, an internationalized curriculum, and enhanced prestige (International Association of Universities, 2009). Internationalization also serves as an important strategy for preparing students to compete for careers in a global economy (Altbach & Peterson, 1998; Fischer, 2007; Hser, 2005; International Association of Universities, 2011; Marmolejo, 2010; McMurtrie & Wheeler, 2008).

Despite the previously noted benefits, there is extensive uncertainty and widespread debate regarding how to define the internationalization of higher education (Arum & van de Water, 1992; Knight, 1999; Zolfaghari, Sabran, & Zolfaghari, 2009). Regardless, U.S. colleges and universities are carefully considering and implementing internationalization initiatives to better prepare today's students for careers in a global economy (Altbach & Peterson, 1998; Fischer, 2007; Hser, 2005; McMurtrie & Wheeler, 2008). There is also pressure within higher education to create campuses that are internationalized in both the U.S. (Fischer, 2008; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005) and around the world (Labi, 2009). Many U.S. institutions of higher education and professional associations supporting higher education consider internationalization to be an essential component of institutional priorities (International Association of Universities, 2011; National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges [NASULGC], 2007; Shutina, 2008).

Statement of the Problem

According to a recent report conducted for the Australian Department of Education, U.S. institutions became the leading host of international students and

researchers during the twentieth century (Green & Ferguson, 2011). Additionally, during that time period they also included internationalization as a central part of U.S. higher education mission statements during that time period (Green & Ferguson). However, many U.S. colleges and universities have adopted internationalization without first delineating or understanding what this process means for their own campuses (Olson, 2005).

There may be a “significant gap between what leaders say about the importance of international learning and what is actually happening at their institutions” (Olson, 2005, p.56). In part, this division between perception and reality stems from the lack of “institution-wide, intentional conversations” about a campus’ vision, goals, and approach to internationalization (Olson, p. 51). According to the International Association of Universities (IAU), a growing number of scholars and practitioners have also begun to question current developments in internationalization (International Association of Universities, 2012). Specifically, their mounting concerns surround (1) whether or not the concept and definition of internationalization have kept pace with changes in higher education, (2) whether or not there is a shared understanding of internationalization, and (3) whether or not internationalization has lost sight of its central purposes (International Association of Universities).

These concerns raise an important question – how do international educators and senior international officers who are designing, implementing, and sustaining programs, services, and activities that make up internationalization efforts conceptualize the internationalization of higher education? Specifically, how do the professionals undertaking the day-to-day work of internationalization view this construct on their own

campuses? Despite the fact that the internationalization of higher education has become a fundamental paradigm for post-secondary education in the U.S. (Hser, 2005), very little research has been conducted to understand the perceptions of professionals who work with internationalization initiatives.

Understanding the perceptions of international educators and senior international officers regarding campus internationalization provides insight into how internationalization is actually viewed. It is critical to study both the people who implement internationalization policies on a daily basis (i.e., international educators) and the senior policy makers (i.e., senior international officers) to effectively learn what perceptions are held regarding campus internationalization at all organizational levels. This knowledge will lead to greater clarity among the campus community – both for those making the decisions as well as those implementing the day-to-day processes. Possessing this knowledge informs administrators regarding topics that need to be more clearly defined, discussed, and communicated. Having a shared understanding also allows international educators and senior international officers to redefine their work in order to craft a definition relevant to their own campuses and daily efforts. Additionally, the work of campus internationalization could progress forward with a greater clarity as a result of having a common definition. The clarity provided by this shared understanding would ultimately lead to greater productivity and intentionality. Ultimately, the work of internationalization could be accomplished more effectively and efficiently when individuals on campus share a common understanding regarding the concept.

Significance of Study

Many leaders in the U.S. recognize the importance of the internationalization of U.S. higher education (Council on Foreign Relations, 2012; Green & Ferguson, 2011; Olson, 2005) and attempt to pursue it in multiple, diverse ways (Green & Ferguson). Olson noted that it would be rare in today's climate for a U.S. college or university president to deny the significance of internationalizing higher education. Recent national, global, and economic challenges, however, have resulted in cuts to international offices and campus internationalization initiatives on U.S. college and university campuses (Green & Ferguson). Regardless of this fact, it is unlikely that U.S. higher education (especially research universities) will retreat from the expansion of their international dimensions (Green & Ferguson).

In light of the focus on internationalization and within the context of reduced spending, understanding the perceptions of the professionals conducting the actual work of internationalization is vital. With dwindling resources for internationalization at the federal, state, and institutional levels (Green & Ferguson, 2011), studying the perceptions of international educators and senior international officers provides a clearer picture about whether or not internationalization goals are being understood and achieved. Additionally, learning more about the perceptions of the people performing the work helps U.S. colleges and universities understand the process of internationalization as well as any potential discrepancies between rhetoric and reality (Green & Ferguson, 2012).

Operationalizing Internationalization

Despite the lack of a uniform definition for internationalization (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Jiang, 2008), this concept has been operationalized at institutions of higher

education in the U.S. There are internationalization strategies that involve curriculum development or study abroad initiatives. Other approaches include emphasizing the number of international students, scholars, and visitors that come to campus annually (Hser, 2005). Some U.S. campuses have expanded internationalization efforts across multiple disciplines and campus boundaries; others, however, have taken a more limited approach (Hser).

According to the American Council on Education, a considerable chasm (Green & Olson, 2003; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005) still exists between the “rhetoric of global and international education and the reality of institutional activities and outcomes” (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005, p. 1). For example, a recent project conducted by the Association of American Colleges and Universities had a goal of globalizing majors on sixteen college and university campuses in the United States. According to Rubin (2009), the results of the project indicated that there were gaps between institutional aspirations for internationalization, senior-level administrative commitment, institutional mission statements, and students’ abilities to examine the global dimensions of their majors. Further investigation into the relevant literature reveals that campus internationalization initiatives in the U.S. are uneven, marginalized, lack structure, and need coherent strategic direction (Altbach & Peterson, 1998; Green & Olson, 2003; Koch, 2008). Additionally, as noted by Rahman and Kopp (1992), citizens of the U.S. are woefully under-prepared to function in an interconnected world that is tied inextricably to the global community. Recently, an independent task force comprised of prominent education experts, national security authorities, and corporate leaders found that U.S. students are ill-prepared to compete with their global peers (Council on Foreign

Relations, 2012). The findings from this report also note that this lack of preparedness poses multiple threats to national security including economic growth and competitiveness, physical safety, and threats to intellectual property as well as U.S. global awareness, unity, and cohesion (Council on Foreign Relations).

In order to help today's students be marketable and train them to survive in an interconnected world (McMurtrie & Wheeler, 2008), internationalization is a key strategy and priority for U.S. institutions of higher education (Altbach & Peterson, 1998; Arum & van de Water, 1992; Burn, 1980; Hazelkorn, 2008; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005). The actual implementation of international initiatives, however, often occurs at the departmental level with staff that may or may not be able to effectively enact internationalization strategies (Davies, 1992). The reality of international education and the internationalization of U.S. higher education is that the work is being performed by people with a broad spectrum of professional experience and training (Stromquist, 2007). To find out whether or not staff members are capable of effectively enacting campus internationalization strategies, it is important to first understand their perceptions surrounding campus internationalization initiatives. Gaining insight into the perceptions of the professionals who implement the daily processes of internationalization may help institutions identify problems that exist with campus internationalization efforts. This understanding could help change and adapt existing structures and policies which would lead to more effective internationalization strategies, policies, procedures, and processes.

Organization and governance, institutional culture, institutional systems of support, professional roles and responsibilities, as well as internationalization and globalization are essential elements that describe the process of campus

internationalization (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008; Green & Olson, 2003; Kälvermark & van der Wende, 1997; Knight, 1994; Knight, 2003; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005;

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 1994). Past research indicates that there is a gap in the literature regarding how institutional culture relates to internationalization strategies and activities (Burnett & Huisman, 2009). To truly understand institutional culture, the entire environment of an institution including organization and governance, institutional systems of support, professional roles and responsibilities should all be taken into account (Wapner & Demick, 2000).

Additionally, an important aspect of institutional culture includes the individuals working on a particular campus who comprise that culture. According to Goodwin and Nacht (1991), it is “useful to examine the attitudes typically reflected by the familiar parts of an academic institution” (p. 54). That is, examining the attitudes and perceptions of international educators and senior international officers about their campus internationalization efforts is a useful endeavor. Additionally, the individuals who implement campus internationalization are the most appropriate population for a study seeking to explore the perceptions of professionals in international education regarding campus internationalization initiatives.

A critical first step toward understanding the internationalization of U.S. colleges and universities is a study of the perceptions of professionals in international education regarding their campus internationalization initiatives. Designing a study such as this one considered the perspectives of the individuals who actually implement internationalization on college and university campuses. Specifically, this study was an exploratory first step towards understanding the point of view of professionals who

execute internationalization processes, policies, and procedures on college and university campuses. Exploring these perceptions provided insight into the rifts between institutional aspirations for internationalization and the realities of implementation. This study also served as a mechanism for discovering how international educators and senior international officers perceived the presence of the elements of internationalization including Organization and Governance, Institutional Culture, Institutional Systems of Support, Professional Roles and Responsibilities, as well as Internationalization and Globalization. Ultimately, understanding the perceptions held by staff and administrators who implement internationalization policies strengthens the body of literature surrounding internationalization. Additionally, the findings from this study provided an understanding of campus internationalization from the perspectives of those who implement these policies on a daily basis.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to explore the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers within the southeastern United States regarding on-campus internationalization initiatives.

Research Questions

The central research questions (RQ) for this study included the following:

RQ1: What are the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers in the Southeast regarding the strength of their campus' internationalization initiatives?

RQ2: To what extent do professionals in international education in the Southeast perceive the presence of the elements of internationalization at their current institutions?

RQ3: What are the differences in perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on group type (international educators versus senior international officers)?

RQ4: What are the differences in perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on institutional type (i.e., public, private, two-year, four-year)?

Operational Definitions

Despite avid interest in internationalizing U.S. institutions of higher education, many scholars debate the definition of internationalization (Arum, & van de Water, 1992; Knight, 1999; Zolfaghari, Sabran, & Zolfaghari, 2009). This debate also includes dissent regarding how the term is operationalized on U.S. college and university campuses. Despite the lack of a clear definition for internationalization, however, there continues to be pressure to create ‘global campuses’ that are ‘internationalized’ in both the U.S. (Fischer, 2008; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005) and around the world (Labi, 2009).

Internationalization, Globalization, and Intercultural

It is important to identify a working definition of internationalization to distinguish between this concept and similar terms used throughout the literature. A number of terms are often confused with *internationalization* (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Green & Olson, 2003; Knight, 1999). Terms that are mistakenly interchanged with *internationalization* include *globalization* and *intercultural*. Despite the fact that the definitions of many of these terms are “hotly disputed” (Carnoy, 2000, p. 44) and “inexact” (Stromquist & Monkman, 2000, p. 3), much of the literature surrounding internationalization is definitive about the fact that there is a distinction between the terms (Knight, 1999; Zolfaghari, Sabran, & Zolfaghari, 2009). In essence,

internationalization, *globalization*, and *intercultural* are related terms, but they are not synonymous (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

To define the concept of *internationalization*, consideration must first be given to the meaning of the words *global*, *international*, and *intercultural*. The American Council on Education (2009) defines *global* as the “systems and phenomena that transcend national borders,” while *international* focuses on “nations and their relationships,” and *intercultural* conveys knowledge and skills that help one understand and navigate cultural differences. Based on the American Council on Education’s differentiation between *international*, *global*, and *intercultural*, this study focused primarily on *international* in order to study the internationalization of higher education within the southeastern U.S.

Knight (1999) further distinguishes the differences between *internationalization* and *globalization* by framing globalization as a catalyst and internationalization as the proactive response to globalization. Specifically, Knight defines globalization as the “flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, [and] ideas” across borders (p. 13-14). Additionally, Knight adds that globalization “affects each country in a different way due to a nation’s individual history, traditions, culture and priorities” (p. 13-14). According to Knight, internationalization is “one of the ways a country responds to the impact of globalisation [*sic*] yet, at the same time respects the individuality of the nation” (p. 13-14).

Defining internationalization. Knight (1994) further clarifies the distinction between internationalization and globalization by defining internationalization as follows: “Internationalisation [*sic*] of higher education is the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of

the institution” (as cited in Knight, 1999, p. 16). Other definitions of internationalization are similar, including that of NAFSA: Association of International Educators (2010) where they posit that:

Internationalization is the conscious effort to integrate and infuse international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the ethos and outcomes of postsecondary education. To be fully successful, it must involve active and responsible engagement of the academic community in global networks and partnerships.

Knight’s definition of internationalization, however, is one of the most commonly cited throughout the literature and will, therefore, be utilized as the working definition for this research study (Callan, 2000; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Horn, Hendel, & Fry, 2007; Hser, 2005; International Association of Universities, 2011; Jackson, 2008; Jiang, 2008; Kehm & Teichler, 2007; Kälvermark, & van der Wende, 1997; Knight, 2003; Knight, 2004; Knight & de Wit, 1995; Olson, 2005; Qiang, 2003; Teichler, 2004; Zolfaghari, Sabran, & Zolfaghari, 2009).

Based on the definition of internationalization being used for this study and the literature previously outlined, it is clear that internationalization is a broad construct with multiple meanings. Due to the broad nature of the definition being used, it is practical to focus the study around one of the three functional areas (teaching, research, or service) within Knight’s definition. Ultimately, many of the service functions of international education involve international educators who work directly with students. Additionally, as previously noted, internationalization serves as a key strategy in the preparation of students who will be competing for careers in a global economy (Altbach & Peterson, 1998; Fischer, 2007; Hser, 2005; International Association of Universities, 2011;

Marmolejo, 2010; McMurtrie & Wheeler, 2008). For these reasons, this study focused on the service function of Knight's definition.

Defining International Initiatives, Efforts, Strategies, and Internationalization Policies

Knight's (1994) definition fits a broad array of initiatives that are often part of campus internationalization efforts. For the purposes of this study, *internationalization* was used as an umbrella term that included a variety of international initiatives, efforts, strategies, and policies. Consequently, terms such as *international initiatives*, *international efforts*, *internationalization policies*, and *international strategies* should all be considered part of the *internationalization* umbrella for purposes of this study. The rationale for utilizing a multiplicity of terms is because they fit within the definition of *internationalization* being used for this study. Additionally, they reflect the complexity of the internationalization process within higher education.

Elements of Internationalization

Previously in this chapter, brief mention was given to specific elements of internationalization. The literature highlights more than 75 elements of internationalization (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008; Green & Olson, 2003; Kälvermark & van der Wende, 1997; Knight, 1994; Knight, 2003; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005; OECD, 1994; Qiang, 2003). Many of these elements had common paradigms and included a number of duplications. Based on the review of the literature, for the purposes of this study, the elements of internationalization were defined as: Organization and Governance (OG), Institutional Culture (IC), Institutional Systems of Support (ISS), Professional Roles and Responsibilities (PRR), and Internationalization and Governance (IG).

Chapter 2 provides further discussion of the elements of internationalization being utilized for this study.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators

NAFSA: Association of International Educators is “the world’s largest nonprofit professional association dedicated to international education” (NAFSA: Association of International Educators, n.d.). Today, NAFSA has approximately 10,000 members. NAFSA was founded in 1948 as the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers and historically “pioneered the concept of providing professional services for post-secondary exchange students” (NAFSA: Association of International Educators). Over time, the organization expanded their purpose beyond assisting foreign students studying in the U.S. after World War II and began to envelop functional areas including admissions, English language specialists, and community volunteers. As a consequence, the group changed its name in 1964 to the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. In 1990, the membership renamed the organization NAFSA: Association of International Educators (retaining the original NAFSA acronym) to reflect the role NAFSA members play in all aspects of international education and exchange (NAFSA: Association of International Educators).

AIEA: Association of International Education Administrators

Founded in 1982, the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) is comprised of institutional leaders who are engaged in the advancement of the international dimension of higher education. According to their website, the purposes of this organization are to (1) provide an effective voice regarding significant issues within international education, (2) improve and promote international educational programming

and administration within institutions of higher education, (3) establish and maintain a professional network among institutional leaders in international education, and (4) cooperate in appropriate ways with other national and international groups having similar interests (AIEA, n.d.).

Miscellaneous Terms

Additional terms used throughout this study include *international education*, *international educator*, and *international education professional*. According to the American Council on Education, *international education* generally functions as an “umbrella term for institutional programs and activities that have a recognizable international dimension, such as student and faculty exchange, study and work abroad, international development activities, foreign language studies, international studies, area studies, joint degree programs, and comparative studies” (Green & Olson, 2003, p. 1). For the purposes of this study, *international educator* refers to individuals employed by college or university campuses in the U.S. who also work with students and international education as defined by the American Council on Education.

Additionally, *international educator* has been used synonymously with *international education professional* throughout this study. Specifically, these professionals could include individuals who work as foreign student advisors, admissions officers, study abroad advisors, directors of international programs, teachers of English as a second language, or administrators of intensive English programs, as well as administrators of sponsored exchange programs. Specific information concerning the rationale behind selecting this broad array of professionals is explored in Chapter 3.

Another term used in this study is *senior international officer*. This term refers to the on-campus individuals who are responsible for directing and providing leadership for campus-wide internationalization initiatives. Senior international officers are involved at the “highest levels in integrating internationalization into the overall mission and strategic plan and developing partnerships and other connections that go beyond study abroad or exchanges” (Green & Ferguson, 2012, p. 6).

Finally, this study focused on researching the perceptions of international educators and senior international officers within seven states in the southeastern U.S. The rationale behind selecting these particular states is discussed in Chapter 3. For the purposes of operational definitions, the southeastern states incorporated into this study included international educators and senior international officers from Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

Chapter Summary

The internationalization of U.S. colleges and universities is an important component of today’s higher education landscape (International Association of Universities, 2011; Love & Estanek, 2004a; NASULGC, 2007; Shutina, 2008). Despite unclear terminology, diverse goals and divergent implementation efforts, internationalization is manifested on various campuses in a number of ways. Several of these include education abroad, overseas campuses, and hosting of international students. Researching the perceptions of people who perform the day-to-day work of campus internationalization informs practice. It also adds to the body of literature surrounding the internationalization of higher education. Additionally, it assists university and

college campuses with better implementing stated internationalization strategies more effectively through understanding gaps between perceptions and reality.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter provides an overview of relevant literature related to the internationalization of U.S. higher education. Specifically, it creates the context needed to understand the significance of the internationalization of higher education as well as the rationale for this study. The main constructs for this chapter include a review of literature related to (1) the internationalization of higher education including its history in the U.S., (2) the importance of internationalization for U.S. higher education, (3) the relevance of internationalization for today's students, and (4) the relationship of senior administration to internationalization. The purpose of this chapter is to construct a framework for expanding the limited research-based knowledge surrounding the internationalization of U.S. higher education.

The Internationalization of Higher Education

It is often taken for granted that universities are international (International Association of Universities, 2011; Healy, n.d.). In the past, academic systems and institutions of higher education experienced opportunities for growth within their own national boundaries, but now find it necessary to compete at an international level (Altbach, 2008). This competition has led to a movement to internationalize much of higher education. As noted in the previous chapter, Altbach refers to this internationalization movement as a global circulation of academics where the brain drain of the past has morphed into an exchange of people and knowledge across borders and

societies. The exchange of higher education across international boundaries is the foundation for the internationalization of higher education.

Defining the Internationalization of Higher Education

As previously noted in Chapter 1, Jane Knight provides one of the most commonly cited definitions for internationalization (Callan, 2000; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Horn, Hendel, & Fry, 2007; Hser, 2005; Jackson, 2008; Jiang, 2008; Kälvermark, & van der Wende, 1997; Kehm & Teichler, 2007; Knight, 2003; Knight, 2004; Knight & de Wit, 1995; Olson, 2005; Qiang, 2003; Teichler, 2004; Zolfaghari, Sabran, & Zolfaghari, 2009). Her definition was utilized for the purposes of this dissertation. Knight (1994, 1999) defines internationalization as follows: *Internationalisation [sic] of higher education is the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution* (OECD, 1994, p. 16).

An Emerging Construct – Comprehensive Internationalization

As part of the review of the literature, it is important to note recent developments in the concept of the internationalization of higher education in the U.S. A recent NAFSA task force called for an “overview of the major dimensions of internationalization” to provide a common foundation for dialogue among higher education, professional associations, U.S. higher education, campus leaders, faculty, and staff who are engaged in “aspects of comprehensive internationalization” (Hudzik, 2011, p.4). According to Hudzik, *comprehensive internationalization* is an emerging concept that is seen as an organizational paradigm which helps individuals and institutions think “holistically about higher education internationalization and how internationalization is evolving in the early twenty-first century in the United States” (p. 5).

Ultimately, the purpose of comprehensive internationalization is not to “prescribe a particular model or set of objectives, but to recognize a diversity of approaches” for internationalization that allows for divergent paths, methods, and mechanisms for internationalizing a campus (Hudzik, 2011, p. 5). Hudzik’s definition of *comprehensive internationalization* is as follows:

Comprehensive internationalization is a commitment, confirmed through action, to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education. It shapes institutional ethos and values and touches the entire higher education enterprise. It is essential that it be embraced by institutional leadership, governance, faculty, students, and all academic service and support units. It is an institutional imperative, not just a desirable possibility.

Comprehensive internationalization not only impacts all of campus life but the institution’s external frames of reference, partnerships, and relations. The global reconfiguration of economies, systems of trade, research, and communication, and the impact of global forces on local life, dramatically expand the need for comprehensive internationalization and the motivations and purposes driving it.

(p. 6)

Clearly, many parallels may be inferred from Hudzik’s definition of *comprehensive internationalization* and Jane Knight’s definition of *internationalization*. However, for the purposes of this research study, the focus remained on Jane Knight’s concept of internationalization.

Internationalization of Higher Education around the World

Much of the literature surrounding the internationalization of higher education concerns policies and practices originating from countries outside the United States (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Bostrom, 2010; Hellstén, n.d.; International Association of Universities, 2009; Knight, 1997; Moores & Popadiuk, 2011; Popadiuk & Arthur, 2004; Qiang, 2003; Rudzki, 1995; Sawir, Marginson, Deumert, Nyland, Ramia, 2008; Whitsed & Wright, 2011). A 2009 study conducted by the International Association of Universities (IAU) surveyed higher education institutions from 115 countries around the world (n=745). This research (the 3rd IAU Global Survey) noted that the primary rationales for internationalization around the world include (1) student preparedness, (2) curriculum and quality, (3) profile and reputation, (4) research and production, as well as (5) increasing the diversity of students (International Association of Universities, 2009).

The 3rd IAU Global study also demonstrated that institutional priorities for internationalization included (1) outgoing mobility for students, (2) international student exchanges and attracting international students, (3) research collaboration, (4) strengthening the international content of the curriculum, (5) joint or double/dual degrees, (6) outgoing mobility for faculty/staff, (7) development and capacity building projects, and (8) internationalization at home (International Association of Universities, 2009). However, other scholars contend that there may be a “significant gap between what leaders say about the importance of international learning and what is actually happening at their institutions” (Olson, 2005, p.56). As noted by Green and Ferguson (2012), it is “sometimes difficult to separate rhetoric from the reality” (p.3).

Growing concerns. According to the International Association of Universities (IAU), a growing number of scholars and practitioners are questioning current developments in internationalization (International Association of Universities, 2012). As a result of these concerns, IAU created an ad hoc group of experts and senior leaders from around the world in fall 2011 to discuss (1) whether the concept and definition of internationalization have kept up with developments within higher education, (2) if there is a shared understanding of internationalization, and (3) if internationalization has lost sight of its central purposes (International Association of Universities). These questions regarding many of the core constructs of internationalization make the current study quite timely and relevant. Furthermore, this study provided specific insight into how internationalization was perceived within institutions of higher education in the southeastern United States.

The History of the Internationalization of U.S. Higher Education

Prior to World War II, widespread concern for international affairs did not exist in the United States (Kerr, 1980). For much of its history, the United States has considered itself to be geographically isolated from the rest of the world. Historically domestic issues such as civil rights (Kerr) have often overshadowed international issues. The U.S. has also been impatient with events beyond its borders that threaten to “distract” the country from growth and development as a nation (Kerr, p. xviii). World War II, the Vietnam War, the Gulf Wars, and September 11, 2001, however, have had a strong impact on the isolationistic attitudes in the U.S. As noted by Love & Estanek (2004b), “September 11, 2001 was a devastating wake-up call for all of American society to realize that they are in and of the world, not passive observers of global events” (p. 185).

The United States began to realize that understanding other nations was essential to successfully engage with other countries (U.S. Department of State: Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, n.d.) and for national defense (Kerr).

Prior to the twentieth century, the international dimension of higher education was more “incidental than organized” (de Wit, 2002, p. xvi). Historically, the United States based its internationalization strategies around a reactionary method of funneling funding and support for international education initiatives only after horrific tragedies occurred (e.g., World War II; September 11, 2001). One mechanism for surmounting the lack of knowledge about other countries included educating U.S. citizens about languages and nations beyond its borders. Legislation such as the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and the National Security Language Initiative of 2006 were enacted (and funded) to “support existing and new foreign language offerings” (Rahman & Kopp, 1992, p. 2) as well as develop students’ foreign language skills. According to the U.S. government, these foreign language skills would “promote understanding, convey respect for other cultures, and encourage reform. These skills are also fundamental to the economic competitiveness and security interests of the nation” (U.S. Department of State: Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, n.d.).

Over time, the internationalization of higher education in the U.S. became tremendously important for national security and economic competitiveness (U.S. Department of State: Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, n.d.). One example of past presidential focus on these matters includes President Lyndon B. Johnson. President Johnson articulated the importance of the connection between higher education and internationalization when he stated “learning respects no geographic boundaries” (Vestal,

1994, p. 184; Kerr, 1980). His statement that “growth and the spread of learning must be the first work of a nation that seeks to be free” (Vestal, 1994, p. 184) further demonstrated the importance of the internationalization of higher education for U.S. interests. Ultimately, President Johnson challenged members of the U.S. Congress to pass the 1966 International Education Act which provided for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research (Woolley & Peters, n.d.). Once passed, however, it was given no funding to implement the core tenets of the bill.

The pattern of not sufficiently funding international initiatives at the federal level is one that continues to be repeated (Green & Ferguson, 2011; Stewart, 2005). Stewart pointed out that “despite persistent calls from the U.S. State Department, the U.S. Defense Department, and the business community to expand the nation’s capacity in a wider range of major world languages, there has been no significant national initiative to address the issue” (p. 232). As noted by Green and Ferguson (2012), recent cuts in federal funding for faculty and student exchange programs resulted in a \$35 million loss (a 5.5% decrease). Additionally, Department of Education programs including Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs experienced a 40% decrease of \$50 million for 2011 (Green & Ferguson, 2012). Furthermore, institutional collaborations between the U.S. and Brazil, the European Union, Russia, and the North American Mobility Program are all scheduled to be phased out in 2012 (Green & Ferguson, 2011).

According to NAFSA: Association of International Educators (n.d.), a timeline of policies, programs, and initiatives regarding internationalization in the United States is as follows:

- From 1940-1950, the first participants involved in the U.S. Fulbright program went abroad; the U.S. Congress passed the U.S. Education and Educational Exchange Act (Smith-Mundt Act); the Marshall Plan was enacted in the U.S., and several professional associations involving international education were formed, including the International Association for Exchange of Students for Technical Experience and the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers (NAFSA).
- From 1951-1960, the U.S. Commissioner of Education designated Hindi as a critical language as well as Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Portuguese, and Russian; a student visa extension was created to provide practical training options for international students studying in the U.S., and the U.S. Congress passed the National Defense Education Act (NDEA).
- From 1961-1970, the U.S. Peace Corps was established and the first volunteers went to Ghana and Tanzania; the U.S. Congress passed the Fulbright-Hays Act and the International Education Act.
- From 1971-1980, President Nixon visited the People's Republic of China; the first students from the People's Republic of China arrived in the U.S.; the U.S. President's Commission released a report that prompted universities to boost capacities for international studies; and Title VI of the U.S. National Defense Education Act (NDEA) was incorporated into the Higher Education Act (HEA) and expanded.
- From 1981-1990, the U.S. Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Studies (CAFLIS) was created.

- In 2000, President Clinton called for a nationally-based U.S. international education policy and created an international education week across the U.S.
- In 2001 the events of 9/11 sharpened the focus on international expertise and prompted Congress to boost Title VI and Fulbright-Hays funding.
- Starting in 2003 the U.S. government implemented Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) to track international students and scholars at campuses in U.S., while in 2005 the Lincoln Commission called for one million U.S. undergraduates to study abroad annually by 2017.
- In 2006 President Bush launched initiatives to boost the number of Americans learning critical foreign languages and the Abraham Lincoln Student Abroad and Paul Simon Study Abroad Acts were introduced; the U.S. Academy for Educational Development hosted colloquium on diversity in education abroad; and U.S. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings co-hosted a summit of university presidents on international education in both 2006 and 2007.
- In 2007, the U.S. House passed the Paul Simon Study Abroad Act and Congress made plans to release a newer version of SEVIS (SEVIS II) in 2012.

Based on the legislation and history previously noted, it is clear that there has been an increased national emphasis on the internationalization of higher education in the U.S. as well as in other countries around the world (Altbach & Knight, 2007; de Wit & Knight, 1999; Edwards, 2007; Horn, Hendel, & Fry, 2007; Hser, 2005; Kehm & Teichler, 2007; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005).

It is de Wit's (2002) contention that the elements which describe the internationalization of higher education in the U.S. have changed very little in subsequent decades. Notably, de Wit outlined four summative developments in internationalization that have distinguished the United States from other systems of higher education around the world (specifically European). These include: (1) international activities in the United States have been grounded primarily in foreign policy and national security; (2) variations in the objectives of curricular changes have led to an emphasis on global and intercultural awareness in the United States; (3) efforts to globalize curricula and incorporate study-abroad programs for undergraduates have characterized internationalization efforts in the United States; and (4) internationalization of higher education in the United States is not strategic and can be described as fragmented activities, projects, and programs (Lawrence, 2004).

More recent developments that occurred during the first decade of the twenty-first century (e.g., September 11, 2001) demonstrate a nation-wide focus on global issues, including internationalization within U.S. higher education (Hser, 2005; Reimers, 2009). One example of the federal government's interest in internationalization includes support for international study (e.g., Gilman Scholarships and the Fulbright program). Another example of federal governmental interest in internationalization includes the previously mentioned Presidential Summit on the Internationalization of Higher Education in 2006 and 2007 (attendees included university and college presidents from across the country). Additionally, there have been a number of assurances from the Obama administration pledging support for the internationalization of higher education (McMurtrie, 2010). Two examples include an unfunded pledge from the President of the United States to

send more U.S. students to China (100,000 during the next 4 years) (Green & Ferguson, 2011; *The Chronicle*, 2009) and to increase student exchanges with the Muslim world (Mills, 2009).

Manifestations of Campus Internationalization

Internationalization can be manifested on college and university campuses in a variety of ways. Some institutions develop international opportunities through study abroad and exchange programs with partner institutions (Hser, 2005). Others expand international activities through supporting faculty conducting international research or by strengthening international studies within their curricula (Hser). Another mechanism includes conducting a review of a campus' international opportunities and developing a strategic plan for university internationalization (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2006).

Additionally, partnering with both students and student affairs divisions is another method for increasing the international dimension of an institution (Love & Estanek, 2004a). Collaborating with faculty and departments engaged in service learning to construct international service learning opportunities is yet another opportunity. The creation of overseas campuses is also a mechanism for the manifestation of internationalization on campus. Finally, including internationalization as part of the university's institutional mission statement and integrating it into campus-wide strategic plans (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008; Hser) make a significant statement regarding an institution's commitment to internationalization.

The Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (formerly the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, NASULGC) recommends that institutions consider the following list of strategies for campus internationalization:

(1) include internationalization as an integral part of the institutional vision, mission, and strategic plan; (2) seek a strong commitment from academic and administrative leadership for international engagement; (3) integrate international perspectives into curricula and co-curricula programs; (4) promote, encourage, value, and reward internationally engaged faculty and staff; (5) integrate international perspectives into appropriate research, educational, and outreach programs; and (6) foster a diverse campus culture that supports the presence of international students and scholars while engaging them in all aspects of university life (NASULGC, 2007).

The Elements of Internationalization

As noted in Chapter 1, the elements of internationalization in the literature shared common paradigms and included a number of duplications (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008; Green & Olson, 2003; Kälvermark & van der Wende, 1997; Knight, 1994; Knight, 2003; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005; OECD, 1994; Qiang, 2003). The process for identifying the elements of internationalization used in this study originated from an unpublished pilot study that explored the perceptions of campus internationalization at colleges and universities within the state of Georgia (Poole, 2010). In the pilot study (Poole), a review of the relevant literature was conducted and the most prevalent themes were isolated and utilized as foundational constructs for campus internationalization. The core constructs identified in the pilot study (Poole) included five main conceptual topics. They were (1) Organization and Governance, (2) Institutional Culture, (3) Institutional Systems of Support, (4) Professional Roles and Responsibilities, and (5) Internationalization and Globalization. After identifying these key conceptual topics, sub-topics were then developed for the pilot study (Poole). The sub-topics included governance, mission,

goals, organizational structure, ownership, roles and responsibilities, financial support, perceptions of internationalization, definitions of internationalization, and demographic information.

For both the pilot study and the current study, the researcher utilized the five conceptual topics noted previously as the primary elements of internationalization. Additionally, using these five elements of internationalization as a framework, the sub-topics then guided the actual construction of the items within the study questionnaire. Further details regarding the development and creation of the instrument used for this research study are presented in Chapter 3.

The Importance of Internationalization for U.S. Higher Education

Higher education has traditionally served as one of the primary and most valuable points of interaction between the United States and the rest of the world (G. Dungy, personal communication, February 13, 2012; Love & Estanek, 2004a).

Internationalization has become a fundamental construct for higher education in the U. S. (Altbach & Peterson, 1998; Arum & van de Water, 1992; Burn, 1980; Green & Ferguson, 2011; Hazelkorn, 2008; Hser, 2005; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005). The rationale for internationalizing varies from institution to institution (Green, 2012). However, many U.S. colleges and universities operationalize internationalization without first delineating or understanding what this process means for their own campuses (Olson, 2005).

In part, the division between perception and reality stems from the lack of “institution-wide, intentional conversations” about a campus’ vision, goals and approach to internationalization (Olson, 2005, p. 51). Ultimately, as noted by Brewer, Gates, and Goldman (2002), “an institution’s reputation is based on its ability to respond to the

demands of customers and demonstrate that it is meeting those demands” (p. 28). Failure to have systematic, intentional conversations that result in clear internationalization strategies results in an inability to respond to the demands of a global clientele within international higher education.

During the past few decades, the American Council on Education has supported national research on the internationalization of U.S. higher education including the production of a handbook for advancing comprehensive internationalization (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2006) as well as studies mapping the internationalization of U.S. campuses (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008). Additionally, some institutions of higher education in the U.S. have incorporated internationalization into their national accreditation processes (e.g., the University of Tennessee – Knoxville, Florida International University, University of Texas – Tyler, Saint Augustine’s College, Spelman College, and Motlow State Community College) through Quality Enhancement Plans (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, 2011). Internationalization has also garnered a great deal of attention from numerous professional associations in higher education including the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (formerly the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, NASULGC), the Association of American Universities, and NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. Based on these recent international activities as well as the history and rationale previously presented, it is clear that internationalization has historical traditions and is quite germane for U.S. higher education today.

The Relevance of Internationalization for Today's Students

Even prior to September 11, 2001, Ikegulu (1999) posited that “Given the increasing global interdependence, international education (within the context of multiculturalism and pluralistic education) . . . [is] perceived as a necessity not a frill . . .” (p. 8). Kerr (2001) spoke of the modern day university as a “multiversity” with an identity that is split into multiple communities and activities that are loosely coupled by a common name, governing board, and a related purpose. Kerr also notes that higher education has been under greater scrutiny as a result of its increased usage as a method of international competition. Additionally, during the transition into the second decade of the twenty-first century, colleges and universities in the United States face a challenging dilemma – the education of students within the milieu of today’s globally interdependent world (Hser, 2005; NASULGC, 2007). Strengthening the internationalization component within institutions of higher education in the U.S. helps ensure a timely response to the dilemma of educating globally competent students (Hser; Reimers, 2009).

Student Success

Internationalization is critical to student success. According to the American Council on Education, our ever-increasingly diverse world requires U.S. citizens to be able to understand people from other countries as well as communicate across national, cultural, and socio-economic boundaries (American Council on Education, 1995; American Council on Education, 2011). Students today are focused on obtaining employment after graduation (Green & Ferguson, 2011) and must develop the competencies needed to function effectively in a global environment (American Council on Education, 1995; American Council on Education, 2011). Additionally, students who

are unable or unwilling to do so are at greater risk of becoming economically disenfranchised – unable to successfully find or retain challenging employment and the financial compensation that comes with it (American Council on Education, 1995). As noted by Stewart (2005) jobs have become increasingly linked to international trade as a result of the globalization of economies. Additionally, advances in science and technology have flattened the world (Friedman, 2007; Stewart), resulting in work environments that have moved beyond the physical into the virtual (Stewart). As a result of these changes, there has been an increase in student diversity worldwide and the expansion of international cooperation across a “wider range of occupations than ever before” (Stewart, p. 229).

Over the past few decades, the impact of internationalization has irrevocably interconnected local, national, and international boundaries (Chisholm, 2003). Diversity and student needs in higher education are constantly evolving, shifting, and changing (El-Khawas, 1996). Higher education is a global enterprise (American Council on Education, 2011) that must be willing to change, shift, and evolve if it is to continue to be a viable resource for today’s students. Reimers (2009) noted that a report from the National Intelligence Council predicted that the next fifteen years will be filled with significant global changes including the transformation of the international political system constructed after World War II, an unprecedented transfer of wealth from the West to the East, enormous pressure on natural resources resulting from continuing economic growth, and increased potential for global conflict, particularly in the Middle East. Given this report and the growing interdependence of nations (Friedman, 2007) due to trade, technological advances in communication, and migratory flows, Reimers

contends that it is critical to develop the skills necessary to help understand and resolve these urgent challenges.

To help U.S. students survive and be more marketable in today's interconnected world (McMurtrie & Wheeler, 2008), internationalization is a key strategy and priority for U.S. institutions of higher education (Altbach & Peterson, 1998; Arum & van de Water, 1992; Burn, 1980; Hazelkorn, 2008; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005). Reimers (2009) stated that modern students need to develop a foundation in global competency. More specifically, he contends that U.S. students need knowledge and skills that help them traverse disciplinary domains in order to understand global events and provide effective, sophisticated responses (Reimers). In recognition of the need for globally competent students, many U.S. universities and colleges have made strides towards internationalizing their campuses (Hser, 2005).

International Students and Internationalization

One important component of campus internationalization and helping U.S. students become more globally competent includes hosting international students. Educating today's diverse students to be multiculturally competent includes helping them develop the ability to function within the pluralistic society of the U.S. (Hanassab & Tidwell, 2002). Additionally, institutions of higher education are positioned to help students develop skills in the areas of intercultural and multicultural competency and should not pull back from these efforts despite the economic crisis (McMurtrie & Wheeler, 2008).

The Institute for International Education and Open Doors Data

The Institute of International Education (IIE) publishes the Open Doors Report on an annual basis. The Open Doors Report is a “comprehensive information resource on international students and scholars studying or teaching at higher education institutions in the United States and U.S. students studying abroad for academic credit at their home colleges and universities” (Institute of International Education, 2012). This report helps provide an overview of internationalization in terms of how students interface with programs and policies on their home campuses.

According to the 2010 and 2011 Open Doors Report, the number of U.S. students studying overseas for academic credit was 260,327 in 2008-2009 and 270,604 in 2009-2010 (*Open doors 2010 fast facts*, 2010; *Open doors 2011 fast facts*, 2011).

Bhattacharya (2005) noted “higher education operates within a global marketplace, attracting a large number of foreign-born students to the U.S.” (p. 332). Per the Institute of International Education, the United States hosted 690,923 international students at institutions of higher education in the U.S. during 2009-2010 (*Open doors 2010 fast facts*, 2010) and 723,277 international students during 2010-2011 (*Open doors 2011 fast facts*, 2011). Of the 690,923 international students studying in the U.S. during 2009-2010, the number of new international students enrolling for the first time in U.S. institutions was 202,970, which was approximately 29% of the overall total number of international students studying in the U.S. at that time (*Open doors 2010 fast facts*, 2010). Of the 723,277 international students studying in the U.S. during 2010-2011, the number of new international students enrolling for the first time was 214,490, which is

approximately 30% of the overall total number of international students studying in the U.S. (*Open doors 2011 fast facts*, 2011).

The educational and economic contributions that international students make are valuable (Andrade, 2006) and serve to further the internationalization of higher education in the U.S. It is estimated that international students and their dependents contributed approximately \$20.23 billion to the U.S. economy during the 2010-2011 academic year (NAFSA: Association of International Educators, 2012). Additionally, many recent studies regarding campus internationalization have focused on the experiences of international students living and studying in the U.S. (Andrade; Bhattacharya, 2005; Goncalves, 2009; Kim, 2007; Mtika, 2009; Popadiuk & Arthur, 2004; Tabor, 2008; Vaughn, 2007).

Increasing Competition

According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, education and training is one of the top ten largest exports of the United States (Douglass, Edelstein, & Hoareau, 2011; Shenoy, n.d.). Since the attacks of September 11, 2001, however, it has become more challenging for international students to gain permission to study in the United States (Tabor, 2008; Vaughan, 2007). Countries including Australia, the U.K., Germany, France, and Canada have noted these changes and acted quickly to scoop up international student enrollments created by U.S. immigration policies (Andrade, 2006). Strategies to increase the overseas market share of international students included centralized planning (with centralized higher education websites), cooperation between national governments and their educational systems, and educational programs taught in English within non-English speaking countries (Andrade). Additional strategies included funding geared

towards outreach and marketing to international students who may have previously studied in the U.S., as well as simplified visa and university application processes overseas (Andrade).

As recently as 2007, visa issuances in U.S. consuls in Latin America were half of those issued prior to 9/11 (Vaughan, 2007). Additionally, countries such as China and Korea that traditionally sent a large number of international students to study in the U.S. have worked to increase both the quality and quantity of programs on their own shores (potentially decreasing the number of students from those countries planning to come to the U.S.) (Vaughan). Additionally, as part of the “dramatic modernization of its education system,” the People’s Republic of China increased the international focus of its school system (Stewart, 2005). English is the second language of China and is being taught to all students in third grade and beyond (Stewart, 2005). Additionally, Chinese schools have been encouraged to host visiting international teachers, especially from English speaking countries (Stewart). Beyond China, growing numbers of Asian students are looking to other countries such as Australia as viable options for foreign study (Stewart).

The Consequences of Disregarding Internationalization

The reality of ignoring the demand for a sophisticated, interculturally competent workforce is staggering. Leaders in industry ask if U.S. students have the “knowledge and skills to function effectively and be leaders in [an] increasingly interconnected world” (Stewart, 2005, p. 229). To help today’s students be marketable and train them to survive in today’s interconnected world (McMurtrie & Wheeler, 2008), internationalization is a key strategy and priority for U.S. institutions of higher education

(Altbach & Peterson, 1998; Arum & van de Water, 1992; Burn, 1980; Hazelkorn, 2008; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005). Additionally, a significant role of U.S. higher education is to teach and prepare students for the workplace. Omitting internationalization as one of the core components of institutional teaching, instruction, and service missions (Kehm & Teichler, 2007) puts graduates at a sincere disadvantage. Without international experiences, graduates are much less prepared than their counterparts to function and thrive in the complex global marketplace (Reimers, 2009). Additionally, if the U.S. plans to compete economically with the rest of the world, Crouse and Wood maintain that the U.S. “can no longer produce college graduates who respond to world events with ethnocentric biases, insufficient information, and a general lack of interest in world events” (as cited in Hartman & Rola, 2000, p. 17).

Administrators and institutions of higher education must also understand that the person and environment are irrevocably intertwined and that by changing one, the other must also be affected (Wapner & Demick, 2000). Supporting students’ learning by incorporating internationalization into the curriculum and using appropriate technology provides exposure to different cultures, languages, and worldviews. Additionally, focusing on internationalization as a core construct helps students learn the skills necessary to compete in the global economy both inside and outside the classroom. To continue to compete with increasingly diverse options for higher education (Brewer, Gates, & Goldman, 2002), internationalization is a core strategy that promotes student learning and prepares students to be more competitive (Hser, 2005). Ultimately, constructing an environment that supports and promotes internationalization plays a vital role in producing graduates who are prepared to compete in a global marketplace.

Senior Administration and Internationalization

Regardless of the absence of well-defined internationalization policies on U.S. campuses, universities have traditionally supported international dimensions in research and scholarship efforts (Davies, 1992; Knight, 1999). Despite the lack of a uniform definition for *internationalization* (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Jiang, 2008), it has been operationalized at institutions of higher education in the U.S. Some internationalization strategies involve study abroad initiatives (Green & Ferguson, 2011) or curriculum development. Other approaches include emphasizing the number of international students, scholars, and visitors that come to campus annually (Green & Ferguson, 2011; Hser, 2005). Many U.S. institutions have incorporated internationalization strategies into the core elements of teaching, instruction, and research within their institutions.

Senior International Officers

According to Green and Ferguson (2012), “as institutions become more deeply engaged in strategic internationalization, the role of the senior international officers seems to be developing into a more central position at a more senior level” (p. 5). In terms of senior leadership at college and university campuses in the U.S., some of the most notable developments include the changing role, credentials, and positioning of senior international officers within any given institution (Green & Ferguson, 2011). Senior international officers now come from the ranks of faculty or have other senior level experience (Green & Ferguson, 2011; Green & Ferguson, 2012). They are also involved in integrating internationalization into the mission and strategic plan of the institution at the highest levels (Green & Ferguson, 2011; Green & Ferguson, 2012). Additionally, senior international officers may now report directly to the office of the

president or have a dual reporting structure to both the president and the provost (Green & Ferguson, 2011; Green & Ferguson, 2012).

Rhetoric versus Reality

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the American Council on Education noted that there is a considerable chasm (Green & Olson, 2003; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005) between the “rhetoric of global and international education and the reality of institutional activities and outcomes” (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005, p. 1). The Association of American Colleges and Universities worked on a recent project to globalize majors on sixteen college and university campuses in the United States. According to Rubin (2009), the results of the project indicated gaps in institutional aspirations for internationalization, senior-level administrative commitment, institutional mission statements, and students’ abilities to examine the global dimensions of their majors. Further investigation reveals that campus internationalization initiatives in the U.S. are uneven, marginalized, lack structure, and need coherent strategic direction (Altbach & Peterson, 1998; Green & Olson, 2003; Koch, 2008).

Better understanding of the internationalization process helps senior leadership at U.S. colleges and universities more successfully employ effective internationalization strategies, policies, procedures, and processes. According to Green and Ferguson (2011), internationalization occurs “one campus at a time rather than at the system level” (p. 13). Additionally, Green and Ferguson noted that internationalization is often “shaped by the institution’s mission, tradition, and current situation. State policies may set tuition and prescribe the permissible proportion of out-of-state students, but within those parameters, campuses have the freedom to chart their internationalisation [*sic*] course” (p. 13).

Furthermore, the actual implementation of international initiatives has often occurred at the departmental level with staff who may or may not be able to effectively enact internationalization strategies (Davies, 1992). The reality of international education and the internationalization of U.S. higher education is that the work is being performed by individuals with a broad spectrum of professional experience and training (Stromquist, 2007).

Past research indicates a gap in the relevant literature regarding how institutional culture relates to internationalization strategies and activities (Burnett & Huisman, 2009). According to Goodwin and Nacht (1991), it is “useful to examine the attitudes typically reflected by the familiar parts of an academic institution” (p. 54). Examining the perceptions of both senior international officers as well as international educators reveals important facets of institutional culture regarding campus internationalization. Additionally, to effectively enact a goal or institutional mission, administrators need the support of many constituents (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005). Ultimately, this study was a foundational step towards understanding the point of view of professionals who execute internationalization processes, policies, and procedures on college and university campuses.

Chapter Summary

Colleges and universities outside the United States have incorporated aspects of internationalization into their institutions for decades (Jiang, 2008). Despite governmental initiatives, institutions of higher education in the U.S. have been slow to respond (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008). From World War II through the end of the Cold War, international aspects of higher education in the United States (U.S.) were a

combination of national foreign policy, methods for protecting national security interests, and measures used to correct student parochialism (de Wit, 2002; Lawrence, 2004). Area studies and study abroad were the primary components of internationalization efforts and were typically funded by the U. S. government and private foundations (de Wit; Lawrence).

The world has grown smaller and flatter (Friedman, 2007) while the sheer speed of technological advances has made more agencies, businesses, and services accessible to people than ever before. As noted by NASULGC (2007), “information, capital, products, labor and individuals cross national borders with ever increasing frequency and speed. America’s need to remain competitive in the world requires its educational institutions [to] produce globally competent human capital and cutting-edge research” (p. 1). To continue attracting and educating bright, capable students, the United States must be competitive in the higher education marketplace (Brewer, Gates, & Goldman, 2002). To be competitive, internationalization is an essential strategy for the future (Hser, 2005; Reimers, 2009).

According to Green and Ferguson (2012), many university leaders are “increasingly emphasizing the importance of a coherent international strategy—to align international programs and activities with institutional priorities and to focus resources” (p. 3). Very little research has been conducted to understand the perceptions of professionals who work with internationalization initiatives. The purpose of the study was to explore the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers within the southeastern United States regarding on-campus internationalization initiatives. The results from this research study enable colleges and universities in the

U.S. to consider a more systematic and comprehensive approach to campus internationalization. It also helps maximize internationalization opportunities for institutions of higher education in this region. Additionally, this study adds to and strengthens the body of literature surrounding the internationalization of higher education.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers within the southeastern United States regarding on-campus internationalization initiatives. This chapter will (1) explain the study design; (2) describe the participants; (3) review the data collection procedures; (4) describe the initial creation, design, and subsequent revision of the research instrument; (5) discuss the data analysis techniques; (6) review limitations of the study; and (7) summarize the chapter.

Design Overview

This research study utilized survey methodology in the form of an online questionnaire to gather quantitative data from international educators and senior international officers in the southeastern United States. Quantitative methods that collect data in numerical format (Drew, Hardman, & Hosp, 2008) were the most appropriate methodology to answer the study's research questions. The instrument that was used for this study was a locally developed questionnaire and will be discussed later in this chapter. The research study was based upon an unpublished, exploratory (pilot) study that was conducted by the primary investigator in 2010 using quantitative methodology (Poole, 2010). The pilot study explored the perceptions of campus internationalization at colleges and universities within the state of Georgia (Poole). The findings from that study (Poole) led the researcher to revise the initial instrument to better connect the

current study's research questions to quantitative methodologies. The findings from the pilot study (Poole) led the researcher to expand the population being studied to allow for greater participation as well as more generalizable results. For the current study, the researcher collected data electronically utilizing a web-based software program. Three invitations to participate were sent out electronically to international educators and senior international officers in via listservs owned by two professional international education associations.

Sample Selection

The target population for this study included international educators and senior international officers working at colleges and universities within the southeastern United States. Individuals electing to participate in this study self-selected and self-defined in terms of their roles as international educators or senior international officers on their home campuses. Additionally, the sample was one of convenience. According to Urdan (2005), if a convenience sample does not differ from the population of interest "*in ways that influence the outcome of the study*" then convenience sampling is a "perfectly acceptable method of selecting a sample" (p. 3). The researcher sought to engage participants who were either international educators or senior international officers from the following states: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. The researcher also centered participation around individuals who held memberships in either NAFSA: Association of International Educators' Region VII (which represents the seven southeastern states previously noted) or the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA). The rationale for focusing study

participation around members from these two professional associations is described in further detail in the next section of this chapter.

Rationale for Selecting Participants from NAFSA and AIEA

Many individuals working in international education actively participate in various professional development opportunities and professional organizations such as NAFSA: Association of International Educators. As previously noted in Chapter 1, NAFSA: Association of International Educators has approximately 10,000 members from around the world and is “the world’s largest nonprofit professional association dedicated to international education” (NAFSA: Association of International Educators, n.d.). NAFSA is divided into eleven geographic regions within the United States and provides a variety of training opportunities and professional support for individuals working in international education (NAFSA). As previously noted in Chapter 1, the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) is a national association that reflects senior leadership within international education. However, not all members of the Association of International Education Administrators maintain membership within NAFSA. Although there is some crossover between these two professional organizations, it was important to include both of them to obtain a representative sample of international educators and senior international officers working at higher education institutions in the southeastern U.S.

Rationale for Selecting International Educators from the Southeastern United States

The rationale for centering this study on international educators and senior international officers working at institutions of higher education in the southeastern

United States was multidimensional. These reasons included the level of professionalization that exists within NAFSA's Region VII; the diversity in terms of where these states rank nationally for hosting international students; and the national recognition received by institutions within the Southeast for their work in campus internationalization. These constructs are outlined in further detail below.

Regarding the level of professionalization that exists within NAFSA Region VII, the southeastern U.S. supports a relatively high level of involvement and professional engagement. One example of this involvement includes quantifiable data demonstrating the level of participation in Region VII's annual conferences. Excluding NAFSA regions that held joint conferences, Region VII has ranked either first or second in regional conference attendance five times during the past ten years (NAFSA, n.d.). Additionally, Region VII has ranked among the top three regions in the nation eight times for regional conference attendance during the past decade (NAFSA). Furthermore, the national headquarters for AIEA is maintained within the southeastern U.S. at Duke University (AIEA, n.d.).

States in the southeast also have a broad range of diversity in terms of where they rank nationally for hosting international students (see Table 3.1). This dichotomy was the second rationale for focusing on this region. Among states hosting international students, three southeastern states are ranked in the top twenty (Florida, Georgia, and North Carolina) (Institute for International Education, 2012). Three southeastern states are ranked in the thirties (Alabama, Tennessee, and South Carolina) while one is ranked in the forties (Mississippi) (Institute of International Education). Additionally, in 2010 – 2011 the University of Florida and the Georgia Institute of Technology were ranked in

the top twenty institutions for hosting international students in the U.S. (Institute for International Education).

Table 3.1

National Rankings for Hosting International Students in the Southeastern U.S.

State	National Rank for Hosting International Students	Total International Students Hosted in State	Estimated Revenue from International Students & Families (in Millions)
Alabama	#31	6,340	\$129.0
Florida	#7	29,719	\$836.7
Georgia	#12	15,359	\$429.8
Mississippi	#43	2,537	\$46.4
North Carolina	#17	12,824	\$304.3
South Carolina	#35	4,529	\$107.5
Tennessee	#30	6,399	\$158.4

According to the Institute of International Education (2012), students from southeastern states participated in study abroad opportunities (including Department of State initiatives such as the Fulbright program) as follows (see Table 3.2):

Table 3.2

U.S. Students Participating in Study Abroad Including Department of State Initiatives

State	Number of U.S. Students Participating in Study Abroad		Number of U.S. Fulbright Students		Number of Foreign Fulbright Students	
	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2010-11	2011-12
Alabama	2,135	2,320	7	4	14	18
Florida	7,985	8,195	35	41	158	88
Georgia	7,774	8,408	28	33	150	106
Mississippi	985	940	4	3	18	18
North Carolina	8,948	9,624	34	41	127	82
South Carolina	3,096	3,359	7	14	39	20
Tennessee	4,033	4,427	17	26	35	18

The third and final rationale for focusing this study on southeastern states was their national recognition as measured by receipt of campus internationalization awards. Since 2003, eight institutions within this region have received national recognition related to campus internationalization. Two of these awards include the Senator Paul Simon Award for Comprehensive Internationalization and the Senator Paul Simon Spotlight Award, both given by NAFSA: Association of International Educators. The Simon Award for Comprehensive Internationalization recognizes institutions for their “overall excellence in internationalization efforts as evidenced in practices, structures, philosophies, and policies” (NAFSA: Association of International Educators, n.d.). NAFSA's Senator Paul Simon Spotlight Award is “presented to institutions for a specific innovative program or initiative that contributes to comprehensive internationalization”

(NAFSA). Another example of national recognition was the inclusion of Wofford College as part of the Documenting Effective Educational Practice (DEEP) project for its campus internationalization in terms of undergraduate students studying abroad (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2010). Wofford was also recognized nationally in the *Open Doors 2011: Report on International Educational Exchange* as second among the top 40 baccalaureate institutions in the U.S. for undergraduate students studying abroad for credit (Wofford College, 2011).

Breadth of the Sample and Sample Parameters

As noted in Chapter 1, the definition of internationalization used for this study was: “Internationalisation [*sic*] of higher education is the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution” (Knight, 1999, p. 16). As explained in previous chapters, internationalization is a broad construct that has multiple meanings. Due to the broad nature of internationalization, a study centered on all three areas of Knight’s definition (teaching, research, and service) was beyond the scope of this study. To focus this study, one area of Knight’s definition was used. Specifically, the participants predominantly came from areas of international education related to the service function of Knight’s definition (as described in further detail below).

Many of the service functions of international education involve international educators who work directly with students. As noted in a previous chapter, the importance of internationalization to today’s students is incontrovertible. Additionally, it was less feasible to attempt to target faculty, administrators, and researchers in one study regarding perceptions of campus internationalization. As a result, beyond senior

international officers, the international educators who participated in this study worked directly with college and university students in the southeastern United States.

Participants' professional roles. It was reasonable to anticipate that potential participants would have a variety of professional roles, job responsibilities, and educational backgrounds related to the service aspect of international education. Some participants might work with education abroad or be the senior international officer for their campus. Others might play supporting roles for international students including academic advising as well as working with international admissions, immigration, and student services. Additional participants could include professionals working with English as a Second Language, international student and scholar programs, and cultural programming. Regardless, participants were either international educators or senior international officers working with students in the southeastern U.S.

Rationale for breadth of sample. The reality of international education and the internationalization of U.S. higher education is that the work is being performed by individuals with a broad spectrum of professional experience and training (Stromquist, 2007). It was important that the sample be reflective of the population performing the work in order to gain an accurate understanding of the perceptions held by senior international officers and international educators who work with students. Realistically, professionals in international education work at a variety of institutions and have a broad range of experience levels and educational backgrounds. To be as representative of the population as possible (Urdan, 2005), the sample for this study was intentionally broad.

It is important to also note the likelihood of fewer respondents who would be senior international officers because a smaller number of these jobs exist at institutions of

higher education in the U.S. Therefore, the inclusion of participants from professional associations such as the Association of International Education Administrators was essential. In order to discover what internationalization perceptions were held by southeastern professionals who worked in international education, it was essential to study the policy makers at senior levels as well as the people who implemented the policies on a daily basis. Ultimately, it was crucial that the sample reflect the population performing the work to gain an accurate understanding of the perceptions held. Again, it was reasonable to anticipate that participants of this study would have a variety of professional roles, job responsibilities, and educational experiences. Some of these roles included working with populations such as international students and U.S. students studying abroad. Other roles include individuals responsible for international admissions, English as a Second Language, international student and scholar programs, cultural programming, and senior international officers.

Participants and institutional type. Potential respondents worked at a variety of institutional types. As a result, a demographic question concerning institutional type (two-year, four-year, public, or private) was included in the questionnaire. In the unpublished pilot study, the results indicated that there were statistically significant differences among institutional types (Poole, 2010). That finding was explored further in this research study.

Sample parameters. As previously noted, to be as representative of the population as possible (Urdan, 2005), the sample for the study was intentionally broad. Due to the comprehensive nature of the sample, several parameters were established for study participants. Respondents were required to be at least eighteen years of age and

work at an institution of higher education in the southeastern United States. Participants were either international educators who worked with students or senior international officers. Additionally, for international educators, their work with students and international initiatives on their campus required a minimum of 51% of their professional time.

Sample size. As previously noted, NAFSA Region VII incorporates states from the southeastern region of the United States (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee). As of April 2012, NAFSA Region VII had 1002 members in their 4th quarter membership report for 2011 (C. Orrison, personal communication, January 25, 2012). The states within Region VII had memberships as follows: Alabama, $n=83$; Florida, $n=297$; Georgia, $n=196$; Mississippi, $n=44$; North Carolina, $n=179$; South Carolina, $n=92$; Tennessee, $n=99$. Additionally, one of the individuals listed on the NAFSA Region VII membership list was from Ohio, while nine were from Puerto Rico and two did not select a state affiliation. Of the total 1002 NAFSA members in Region VII, 89 did not meet the study criteria (i.e., they were not employed by institutions of higher education within the region being studied). Additionally, to maintain the integrity of the research, the primary researcher did not participate in the study, which brought the number of ineligible NAFSA participants to 90. As a result the total number of potential study participants from NAFSA yielded $n=912$.

AIEA: Association of International Educators (AIEA) classifies membership in two ways including institutional memberships as well as individual memberships. As of May 2012, AIEA had 296 institutional members (AIEA, n.d.) with 592 individuals who

were part of the association's listserv (E. Gorsuch, personal communication, March 15, 2012). (The researcher used AIEA's organizational listserv to seek participants.) Of those 592 individuals on the association listserv, there were only 86 members who were listed in the online membership directory as working at institutions of higher education in the southeastern U.S. Therefore, the number of eligible AIEA participants for this study was $n=86$. One limitation was that the researcher did not have access to the names and email addresses associated with the AIEA listserv. Additionally, some AIEA members may not have been listed as part of the online membership directory if they did not complete their membership profile. As a result, the total number of potential study participants from AIEA may have been slightly higher than the numbers indicated through available data.

The total number of possible NAFSA Region VII participants and the number of AIEA participants combined resulted in a possible $n=998$. It is important to note, however, that some higher education institutions in the Southeast may not have had memberships in AIEA; therefore, their senior international officers may not have received information about participating in the study. Additionally, there may have been senior international officers who were members of NAFSA but not of AIEA. As a result, those individuals would have received information about the study through the communications that were sent to NAFSA Region VII as outlined later in this chapter. Finally, as described in further detail below, there may have been crossover in terms of membership within both associations.

Crossover and study parameters. Since the researcher utilized the associations' listservs to seek participants and not individual email addresses, accounting for crossover

was an important aspect of the study design. Due to the specialized nature of international education, it was reasonable to anticipate that there may have been individuals who were members of both AIEA and NAFSA. After comparing available information about the two groups' individual memberships, the researcher identified 39 possible duplications. It was not likely, however, that individuals would attempt to participate in the study more than once (S. Cramer, personal communication, May 4, 2012). As a result the combined total of potential AIEA and NAFSA Region VII participants was $n=959$. Additionally, to prevent duplication of responses, potential participants from both organizations were instructed to complete the instrument only once. Furthermore, prior to entering the drawing for the study incentive (described in further detail below) participants were informed that multiple entries would make them ineligible for the incentive.

There is no effective way to determine how many NAFSA or AIEA members were qualified to participate in the study based on the second and third study parameters (i.e., working with students and spending a minimum of 51% of their professional time on international initiatives on their campus). Therefore, it was feasible that the total possible $n=959$ was higher than it would have been if that information were accessible. Participants who were not senior international officers were asked if they worked directly with students and if they spent at least 51% of their professional time on international initiatives on their campus. Additionally, a demographic question was added to the beginning of the questionnaire to determine whether or not participants worked at an institution of higher education within the region being studied.

Data Collection Procedures

The researcher collected data electronically by utilizing the web-based software program *Qualtrics*. The researcher utilized electronic listservs managed by both NAFSA and AIEA to advertise the study to potential participants. The researcher was granted permission to seek participation from members of Region VII within NAFSA:

Association of International Educators (which represented the southeastern states) (H. Housley, personal communication, March 14, 2012). The researcher was also granted permission to send information about the study via the Association of International Education Administrators' member listserv (D. Deardorff, personal communication, March 6, 2012).

Data Collection

The researcher contacted the national NAFSA office as well as the national office for AIEA to inquire about any relevant policies regarding conducting personal research within each of the respective associations. Ultimately, each organization had its own policies but gave approval for the primary researcher to seek participants from both organizations. Specifically, the researcher received approval from both AIEA and NAFSA Region VII to send information about the study and a link to the questionnaire to their organizational listservs.

After receiving approval through the institutional IRB process, the researcher sent an initial email (Appendix A) and two reminder emails (Appendix B) to the AIEA and NAFSA: Region VII listservs seeking participation. Additionally, the researcher received permission to post information (including contact information) about this study in the NAFSA Region VII electronic newsletter that goes out to NAFSA members on a

quarterly basis (H. Housley, personal communication, March 14, 2012). The researcher also utilized the Region VII online social media page (via Facebook) to generate interest in the project (Appendix C). The link to the instrument was not posted via social media, but general information about the study (including contact information) was (Appendix C).

Individuals choosing to participate in the study clicked on a link that was included in the listserv emails (Appendix A and Appendix B), entered the study password, and were directed to the informed consent form (Appendix D) prior to beginning the actual questionnaire (Appendix E). Participants responded to a series of questions that included parameters for the study, demographic information, Likert-scaled items, and several multiple choice items (all of which are described in further detail later in this chapter).

The researcher offered individuals participating in the study an incentive of a chance to win one of three Visa gift cards in the amount of \$100 each. At the end of the questionnaire, participants were asked if they wanted to participate in the incentive drawing. To maintain anonymity and the confidentiality of participants, those who elected to participate in the incentive were directed to a separate link to enter the drawing for the gift cards. Having this separate link maintained the anonymity of participants' responses and the integrity of the confidentiality of the study. To avoid duplicate entries, participants were instructed that they were only permitted to enter the drawing once and that duplicate entries would be disqualified. Pursuant to Georgia state law, individuals who elected not to participate were still eligible for the study incentive.

Questionnaire Design and Revision

Locally developed instruments. When determining whether or not to use a locally developed instrument (LDI) versus a commercially developed instrument (CDI) important considerations include relevance (Suskie, 1996), match, and purpose (Ory, 1994). According to Suskie, relevance is the most important factor when determining whether to design a questionnaire or use a published one. Relevance relates to designing a study that asks only the questions a researcher is interested in studying (Suskie). Schuh and Upcraft's (2001) concept of *match* is closely related to Suskie's construct of *relevance*. Match is the process of exploring whether or not an existing CDI addresses the purpose of the current study. As noted previously, the purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers within the southeastern United States regarding on-campus internationalization initiatives. In light of the fact that research had not been conducted previously on this topic, a LDI that was grounded in the literature was the most appropriate option for the current study.

Original questionnaire design. As previously noted in this chapter, the original questionnaire was designed locally by the researcher in 2010 to study the perceptions of professionals who worked in the field of international education at institutions of higher education in the state of Georgia (Poole, 2010). The original LDI was grounded in the literature (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008; Green & Olson, 2003; Kälvermark & van der Wende, 1997; Knight, 1994; Knight, 2003; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005; OECD, 1994). Based on the work of Green, Luu, and Burris, the LDI was constructed by using multiple stages of development as described below.

Original questionnaire development. The first stage of development for the LDI included a review of the relevant literature surrounding the internationalization of higher education (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008; Green & Olson, 2003; Kälvermark & van der Wende, 1997; Knight, 1994; Knight, 2003; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005; OECD 1994). Based on this review, the most prevalent themes (i.e., the elements of internationalization) were isolated and identified as foundational topics for campus internationalization. Grounded in the literature, these core constructs included five conceptual topics. They were (1) Organization and Governance, (2) Institutional Culture, (3) Institutional Systems of Support, (4) Professional Roles and Responsibilities, and (5) Internationalization and Globalization. After identifying the key conceptual topics (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008), sub-topics were then developed. The sub-topics included governance, mission, goals, organizational structure, ownership, roles and responsibilities, financial support, perceptions of internationalization, definitions of internationalization, and demographic information.

The researcher then began a process of constructing questions for the original LDI utilizing a 6-point Likert-like scale (Clason & Dormoody, 2000) to match possible items with the overarching conceptual themes as well as the sub-topics. This process was repeated four times, with each cycle serving to refine word choice and clarity of the potential questions. The researcher also shared this process with faculty and peers from the researcher's doctoral program for discussion.

Once the questions were finalized, they were put into a paper-based version of the questionnaire. The layout and design of the original LDI were planned carefully to incorporate general questions first so that responses to these questions would not be

influenced by more specific questions (Bradburn, Sudman, & Wansink, 2004). The paper version of the instrument was shared with peers in the researcher's doctoral program for review and feedback. Additionally, the instrument was sent to international education colleagues who held doctoral degrees for additional assessment and analysis. After feedback was received, the questionnaire was revised and shared one final time with peers for review prior to its submission as part of the publishable paper prospectus (Poole, 2010).

Original instrument items and scale of measurement. The original instrument had a total of 41 items with 32 questions based on a 6-point Likert-like scale, as well as 9 demographic questions. The scale ranged as follows: a 1 indicated "strongly disagree," a 2 denoted "disagree," a 3 indicated "neutral," a 4 denoted "agree," a 5 indicated "strongly agree," and a 6 denoted "unsure / not applicable." The questions examined the perceptions that were held by international educators regarding their home campuses' internationalization efforts. Additionally, the original LDI included a consent form and took approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Questionnaire revision. The current research project expanded from the original pilot study focusing on Georgia (Poole, 2010) to the southeastern United States. The research questions posed for the current study examined the perceptions that were held by international educators and senior international officers regarding their home campuses' internationalization efforts in the southeastern U.S. The overall design of the revised instrument was similar to the original questionnaire. Additionally, the revisions to the original instrument were made in a logical, systematic, and structured manner (Rattray & Jones, 2007). Changes to the LDI included: (1) moving demographic questions from the

end of the instrument to the beginning (Bradburn, Sudman, & Wansink, 2004); (2) conducting an item analysis upon the recommendation of two research consultants for the purpose of synthesizing questions that were similar (S. Cramer, personal communication, April 18, 2012; J. Barham, personal communication, April 20, 2012); (3) updating the original 6-point Likert-like scale to a 5-point Likert-like scale that removed the “neutral” option but maintained the “unsure” response (S. Cramer, personal communication, April 18, 2012; J. Barham, personal communication, April 20, 2012); (4) updating the demographic questions regarding citizenship due to participant confusion in the pilot study (Poole, 2010); (5) adding new parameters to the beginning of the questionnaire; (6) changing the institutional type categories to “public,” “private,” “two-year,” and “four-year” to reflect and further explore the findings from the pilot study (that there were statistically significant differences based on institutional type) (Poole); and (7) conducting Cronbach’s Alpha as a coefficient of reliability to determine the internal consistency of the instrument after data were collected (Cronbach, 1951; Santos, 1999; SPSS FAQ, n.d.).

As noted by Rattray and Jones (2007), consulting with experts in the field or potential respondents and reviewing associated literature helps assure content validity for a questionnaire’s item generation, wording, and order. As mentioned earlier in this study, many of the items for the questionnaire were generated from relevant literature on internationalization. Additionally, the redesigned instrument was reviewed by professionals who work or have worked with assessment, higher education research, and/or international education. These professionals also held terminal (doctoral) degrees. After receiving feedback and making revisions as appropriate, the revised LDI was tested

by individuals who were not eligible for the study to determine the length of time needed to complete the questionnaire. After data were collected the revised instrument underwent a reliability test (Cronbach's Alpha). A link to the final version of the instrument (Appendix E) was sent to potential participants electronically as described earlier in this chapter.

Layout and design of the revised instrument. As with the original instrument, the layout and design of the revised questionnaire were carefully planned to incorporate general questions at the beginning. Placing general questions first helps prevent responses from being influenced by more specific questions (Bradburn, Sudman, & Wansink, 2004). Additionally, the instrument was designed for participants who were either international educators or senior international officers who worked with students (e.g., education abroad, international admissions, immigration services) at an institution of higher education in the southeastern U.S. Additionally, these professionals worked with one or more international initiatives (e.g., study abroad, international admissions, international student / scholar services, English as a Second Language, faculty that lead study abroad programs, chief international officers) that required at least 51% of their professional time on campus.

The redesigned LDI (Appendix E) had a total of 42 items including 13 demographic questions, 26 questions based on a 5-point Likert-like scale, one question on internationalization initiatives offered on their campuses (check all that apply), one question regarding the definition of internationalization, and one sliding-scale question regarding perceptions of the strength of the elements of internationalization. The new scale ranged as follows: a 1 indicated "strongly disagree," a 2 denoted "disagree," a 3

indicated “agree,” a 4 denoted “strongly agree,” and a 5 indicated “unsure / not applicable.” The questions examined the perceptions that were held by international educators and senior international officers regarding their home campuses’ internationalization efforts. Additionally, the redesigned questionnaire included a consent form and took no more than 20 minutes to complete.

Questionnaire dissemination. Information about the study as well as the link for the online questionnaire were disseminated the NAFSA Region VII listserv (Appendix A and Appendix B). General information about the study (without the link) was also sent to the Region VII Facebook page (Appendix C). Interested individuals were instructed to contact the researcher for more information. Finally, study information and the link to the instrument were sent to the national listserv for the Association of International Education Administrators (Appendix A and Appendix B). Individuals choosing to participate clicked on a link and were directed to the informed consent form (Appendix D) prior to beginning the actual questionnaire.

Data Analysis

The following procedures for statistical analysis were utilized to answer the study’s research questions. The research questions (RQs) included:

RQ1: What are the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers in the southeast regarding the strength of their campus’ internationalization initiatives?

Hypothesis testing and Fisher’s exact test were used to answer RQ1. Data were analyzed using Fisher’s exact test to examine the relationship, if any, between two nominal variables. Calculating an exact p value with Fisher’s exact test helped describe

the relationship between the nominal variables and provided insight into the perceptions held regarding the strength of campus internationalization initiatives.

RQ2: To what extent do professionals in international education in the southeast perceive the presence of the elements of internationalization at their current institutions?

Descriptive statistics were utilized to answer RQ2. Data were analyzed using measures of central tendency. Items within the instrument's subscales were used to calculate means as well as composite scores for each section of the questionnaire (i.e., for each element of internationalization). This analysis helped demonstrate the extent to which professionals in international education perceived the presence of the elements of internationalization at their current institutions.

RQ3: What are the differences in perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on group type (international educators versus senior international officers)?

Initially, an analysis of the variance (ANOVA) was proposed to answer RQ3. However, data analysis revealed the need for the researcher to conduct a multivariate analysis of the variance (MANOVA) to answer RQ3. The rationale for this change is presented in Chapter 4. Analyzing differences based on group type while accounting for correlated dependent variables yielded a more meaningful understanding of differences in perceptions than the ANOVA alone. The subscales (i.e., the composite scores) were the dependent variables and the group type (i.e., international educator versus senior international officers) was the independent variable.

RQ4: What are the differences in perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on institutional type (i.e., public, private, two-year, four-year)?

Initially, an analysis of the variance (ANOVA) was proposed to answer RQ4. However, data analysis revealed the need for the researcher to conduct a multivariate analysis of the variance (MANOVA) to answer RQ4. The rationale for this change is presented in Chapter 4. Analyzing differences based on institutional type was a more powerful statistical tool than the ANOVA alone. The subscales were the dependent variables and the institutional type was the independent variable.

Limitations of the Study

One of the limitations of this study was that the population being studied was broad in scope. Additionally, another limitation was that the study focused on one aspect (the service aspect) of Knight's (1999) definition of internationalization.

Internationalization of a campus is much broader than the scope of this study; however, to gain perspective on even one aspect of Knight's definition helped illuminate perceptions that existed regarding campus internationalization. Another limitation of this study was that the sample population represented international educators and senior international officers who held membership(s) in specific professional associations. Professionals in the field who fit the study criteria but who did not hold memberships in either AIEA or NAFSA may have been excluded. Additionally, there were concerns regarding crossover and duplication of participants since some professionals may have held memberships in both groups.

Chapter Summary

Quantitative methods were used to gather data from a locally developed instrument (LDI). The LDI was based on a pilot study (Poole, 2010) regarding perceptions of internationalization in the state of Georgia. The original instrument

(Poole) was revised to fit the purposes of the current study. Additionally, the revised LDI went through a multiphase process that included peer review and testing Cronbach's Alpha as a coefficient of reliability to determine the LDI's internal consistency. The researcher collected and analyzed data to study the perceptions of internationalization held by international education professionals and senior international officers who were members of either NAFSA or AIEA. Analysis of the data was conducted by using SPSS version 19. Results are reported in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers within the southeastern United States regarding on-campus internationalization initiatives. This chapter includes the following: (1) a brief overview of study procedures, (2) demographic information for study participants, (3) a discussion regarding the instrument's reliability and validity, and (4) the results of the statistical analyses used to address each research question. Additional findings will also be reported at the conclusion of the chapter.

Overview of Study Procedures

As discussed in previous chapters, an online questionnaire was developed using the Qualtrics software program. Prior to formally opening the questionnaire to potential participants, ten individuals were asked to test the instrument. After receiving feedback, appropriate changes were made and the online questionnaire went live.

An initial email seeking participants was sent to two professional association listservs. These listservs included both NAFSA: Association of International Educators, Region VII and the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA). A short announcement (Appendix C) was also posted via the NAFSA Region VII Facebook page. This announcement (Appendix C) provided general information about the study as well as contact information for the primary researcher.

Initially, the primary researcher planned to seek participants by advertising the study in the NAFSA Region VII newsletter. This announcement was never posted. The rationale behind that decision was two-fold: (1) approval from the Institutional Research Board (IRB) at The University of Georgia was received earlier than anticipated, and (2) the publication date for the subsequent edition of the NAFSA regional e-newsletter was two months after IRB approval had been received. Since the newsletter announcement would have occurred after data collection was completed, the primary researcher elected not to post a study announcement in the NAFSA e-newsletter. Instead, permission was sought to send two reminder emails instead of the one reminder email initially requested. Permission was granted and two reminder emails went out to both professional association listservs. The study was open approximately four weeks.

After data were collected via the online questionnaire, they were cleaned and exported into Excel and SPSS version 19.0 for data analysis. All values were coded as appropriate within SPSS other than questions that were formatted as open-ended responses. Data were analyzed in response to the study's four research questions (RQ) which included:

RQ1: What are the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers in the Southeast regarding the strength of their campus' internationalization initiatives?

RQ2: To what extent do professionals in international education in the Southeast perceive the presence of the elements of internationalization at their current institutions?

RQ3: What are the differences in perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on group type (international educators versus senior international officers)?

RQ4: What are the differences in perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on institutional type (i.e., public, private, two-year, four-year)?

Demographic Information

Out of a possible $n=959$, the initial response rate of 25.4% was derived from a total of 244 individuals who attempted to participate in the study. Of the 244 attempted responses, 10 cases were deleted as a result of participants' failure to enter the study password correctly, which lowered the number of responses to 234. Another 41 cases were deleted because participants did not meet the study parameters (20 did not work in the southeastern U.S.; 1 was not an international education administrator nor a senior international officer; 19 did not spend more than half their time on international programs, services, projects, or initiatives; and 1 individual had previously completed the questionnaire). These actions brought the number of participants from 234 to 193. An additional 15 cases were removed for failure to respond to any of the instrument items (other than entering the study password). That process brought the number of participants to 178. Another 3 cases were removed because the participants indicated they were at least 18 years old, but did not answer any other items on the questionnaire. These reductions brought the final participant number to 175 and the final response rate to 18.2%.

The 175 respondents varied by institutional type, state, numbers of students enrolled, experience in international education, position, organizational structure, professional responsibilities, professional memberships, educational attainment, amount of time spent living outside the United States, citizenship, and gender. Table 4.1 provides detailed information regarding the demographic characteristics for study participants. In

summary, most respondents (88%, $n=154$) worked at four-year institutions while two-year institutions accounted for just 4% ($n=7$) of participants' institutional type by year. A majority of respondents (79%, $n=139$) worked at non-profit institutions while 5.7% ($n=10$) worked at for-profit institutions. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents worked at public institutions, with those institutions representing 64% ($n=112$) of participants' institutional type and 26.9% ($n=47$) representing private institutions. Additionally, study respondents worked at a variety of higher education institutions throughout the southeastern United States including 29.7% from Georgia ($n=52$), 20% from North Carolina ($n=35$), 17.7% from Florida ($n=31$), 11.4% from South Carolina ($n=20$), 9.7% from Tennessee ($n=17$), 6.3% from Alabama ($n=11$), and 2.9% from Mississippi ($n=5$). Most of the study participants worked at institutions with more than 25,000 students (27.4%, $n=48$) with the next highest enrollment falling between 5,000 – 9,999 students (20%, $n=35$). Student enrollment between 10,000 – 16,999 accounted for 14.9% ($n=26$) while those working at institutions with fewer than 2,500 students accounted for 14.3% ($n=25$). Enrollments of 17,000 – 24,999 students (13.1%, $n=23$) and 2,500 – 4,999 students (8.6%, $n=15$) represented institutions with the fewest number of study participants.

Most participants, 74.9%, identified as being international education professionals ($n=131$) while 22.3% identified as being senior international officers ($n=39$). Additionally, 28% of the respondents indicated they were the director of their offices ($n=49$). Organizationally, 60.6% of study participants indicated their offices were housed under academic affairs ($n=106$); 18.3% specified that their offices were neither in academic affairs nor student affairs ($n=32$); 13.7% indicated that their offices were placed

under student affairs ($n=24$); and 5.1% indicated that their offices were organizationally located under both academic affairs and student affairs ($n=9$).

Regarding professional responsibilities, participants were permitted to select more than one option to identify the role(s) they had on their campuses. Respondents were almost evenly split with 56% of study participants who worked in international student services ($n=98$) while 54.3% of participants worked with education abroad ($n=95$). Additionally, 36% of participants worked with international scholar services ($n=63$) whereas 24.6% worked with international admissions ($n=43$). Furthermore, 24.6% of study respondents indicated they provided leadership for internationalization on their campus as the senior international officer ($n=43$). Finally, 22.3% of study participants indicated they had other responsibilities not listed on the questionnaire ($n=39$) while 15.4% worked with English as a Second Language (ESL) ($n=27$).

Regarding memberships within various professional associations, 92% indicated they held membership in NAFSA: Association of International Educators ($n=161$) while 34.9% indicated they held memberships in other professional associations not listed on the questionnaire ($n=61$). Approximately 17.7% were members of AIEA (Association of International Education Administrators) ($n=31$) and another 4 % were members of AACRAO (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers) ($n=7$). NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education members represented 3.4% of participants ($n=6$) with ACPA: College Student Educators International accounting for 1.7% of respondents ($n=3$). Another 1.7% held memberships with NAGAP (National Association of Graduate Admissions Professionals) ($n=3$) while 1.7% indicated they had no professional association memberships ($n=3$). Finally, 1.1%

of study respondents indicated they held memberships with NACAC (National Association for College Admission Counseling) ($n=2$).

Participants had varying levels of work and educational experience. Respondents who had worked between 1 – 5 years accounted for 22.9% ($n=40$). The next two largest groups had worked between 16 – 20 years (16.6%, $n=29$) or between 6 – 10 years in international education (16%, $n=28$). Participants working between 11 – 15 years accounted for 13.7% ($n=24$). The smallest number of participants represented individuals who had worked at least two decades or more in international education. Results indicated that 4% ($n=7$) of respondents worked between 26 – 30 years. Approximately 4% ($n=7$) worked between 31 – 25 years, and 3.4% ($n=6$) worked between 20 – 25 years, while 1.1% ($n=2$) worked between 36 – 37 years. Regarding respondents' educational attainment, 57.1% had earned a master's degree ($n=100$); 27.4% had earned a doctoral degree ($n=48$); 8% had earned a bachelor's degree ($n=14$); 4% had earned a professional degree (e.g., J.D., M.D., etc.) ($n=7$); and 0.6% reported having some college coursework ($n=1$).

Most participants indicated they had lived outside the U.S. for one month or more (80%, $n=140$). A large majority, 85.7%, were U.S. citizens ($n=150$). Approximately 4.6% ($n=8$) were naturalized citizens of the U.S., while 4% were U.S. Permanent Residents ($n=7$). Of the respondents, 1.7% were not citizens of the U.S. ($n=3$) and 1.1% were dual citizens ($n=2$). Additionally, participants were 65.7% female ($n=115$) and 31.4% male ($n=55$). Table 4.1 provides a summary of demographic characteristics.

Table 4.1
Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Variable	<i>N</i>	Percent
Institutional Type (Two-Year or Four-Year)		
Two-Year	7	4.0%
Four-Year	154	88.0%
Missing	14	8.0%
Institutional Type (Non-Profit or For-Profit)		
Non-Profit	139	79.4%
For-Profit	10	5.7%
Missing	26	14.9%
Institutional Type (Public or Private)		
Public	112	64.0%
Private	47	26.9%
Missing	16	9.1%
State		
Alabama	11	6.3%
Florida	31	17.7%
Georgia	52	29.7%
Mississippi	5	2.9%
North Carolina	35	20.0%
South Carolina	20	11.4%
Tennessee	17	9.7%
Missing	4	2.3%
Student Enrollment		
Fewer than 2,500	25	14.3%
2,500 – 4,999	15	8.6%
5,000 – 9,999	35	20.0%

[Table 4.1 continues]

Table 4.1 continued

Variable	<i>N</i>	Percent
Student Enrollment continued		
10,000 – 16,999	26	14.9%
17,000 – 24,999	23	13.1%
25,000 or More	48	27.4%
Missing	3	1.7%
Current Position		
International Education Professional	131	74.9%
Senior International Officer	39	22.3%
Missing	5	2.9%
Director		
Director (Yes)	49	28.0%
Director (No)	79	45.1%
Missing	47	26.9%
Office Organizational Placement		
Academic Affairs	106	60.6%
Student Affairs	24	13.7%
Both Academic Affairs and Student Affairs	9	5.1%
Neither	32	18.3%
Missing	4	2.3%
Professional Job Responsibilities^a		
Education Abroad	95	54.3%
English as a Second Language	27	15.4%
International Admissions	43	24.6%
International Scholar Services	63	36.0%
International Student Services	98	56.0%

[Table 4.1 continues]

Table 4.1 continued

Variable	<i>n</i>	Percent
Professional Job Responsibilities^a continued		
Leadership of Internationalization Initiatives	43	24.6%
Other	39	22.3%
Professional Organization Memberships^a		
AACRAO (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers)	7	4.0%
ACPA (ACPA: College Student Educators International)	3	1.7%
AIEA (AIEA: Association of International Education Administrators)	31	17.7%
NACAC (National Association for College Admission Counseling)	2	1.1%
NAFSA (NAFSA: Association of International Educators)	161	92.0%
NAGAP (National Association of Graduate Admissions Professionals)	3	1.7%
NASPA (NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education)	6	3.4%
Other	61	34.9%
None	3	1.7%
Years Worked in International Education		
1 – 5 Years	40	22.9%
6 – 10 Years	28	16.0%
11 – 15 Years	24	13.7%
16 – 20 Years	29	16.6%
20 – 25 Years	6	3.4%
26 – 30 Years	7	4.0%

[Table 4.1 continues]

Table 4.1 continued

Variable	<i>n</i>	Percent
Years Worked in International Education continued		
31 – 35 Years	7	4.0%
36 – 37 Years	2	1.1%
Missing	32	18.3%
Educational Experience		
Some High School	0	--
High School Diploma or GED	0	--
Some College	1	0.6%
Bachelor's Degree	14	8.0%
Master's Degree	100	57.1%
Doctoral Degree	48	27.4%
Professional Degree (J.D., M.D., etc.)	7	4.0%
Missing	5	2.9%
Lived Outside of U.S. for One Month or More		
Yes	140	80.0%
No	30	17.1%
Missing	5	2.9%
Citizenship		
U.S. Citizen	150	85.7%
Naturalized Citizen of the U.S.	8	4.6%
U.S. Permanent Resident	7	4.0%
Citizen of country other than the U.S.	3	1.7%
Dual Citizen	2	1.1%
Other	0	--
Missing	5	2.9%

[Table 4.1 continues]

Table 4.1 continued

Variable	<i>n</i>	Percent
Gender		
Female	115	65.7%
Male	55	31.4%
Transgender	0	0%
Missing	5	2.9%

^aPercentages do not add to 100%.

Reliability and Cronbach's Alpha

Reliability refers to an instrument's ability to measure consistently (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). Specifically, "internal consistency describes the extent to which all the items in a test measure the same concept or construct" (Tavakol & Dennick, p. 53). Cronbach's alpha is a conservative measure of reliability and is the most widely used objective measure of internal consistency (Tavakol & Dennick). The survey design utilized a Likert-type scale; therefore, Cronbach's alpha was used to assess the internal consistency of the locally developed instrument. Achieving a Cronbach's alpha of .8 was considered reasonable (Gliem & Gliem, 2003). The internal consistency reliability estimate for the overall instrument was found to be highly reliable (26 items; $\alpha = .92$). Additionally, the alpha coefficient of .92 indicated sufficient homogeneity. An analysis was performed to determine if any questionnaire items should be removed. The results of the analysis were that exclusion of questionnaire items would not statistically impact the overall alpha in a positive or negative way. Table 4.2 provides a summary of the Cronbach's Alpha analysis.

Table 4.2
Reliability Analysis

Scale	N			Cronbach's Alpha
	Valid	Excluded ^a	Total	
Overall Questionnaire	157	18	175	.92
Organization and Governance Subscale	167	8	175	.87
Institutional Culture Subscale	164	11	175	.83
Institutional Systems of Support Subscale	165	10	175	.84
Professional Roles and Responsibilities Subscale	163	12	175	.85
Internationalization and Globalization Subscale	162	13	175	.59

^aListwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure

As noted in Chapter 3, there were five conceptual topics that dictated the five sections of the questionnaire. Based on the results from Cronbach's alpha, the alpha coefficients for each of the five sections were as follows: $\alpha = .87$ for Organization and Governance (7 items); $\alpha = .83$ for Institutional Culture (6 items); $\alpha = .84$ for Institutional Systems of Support (4 items); $\alpha = .85$ for Professional Roles and Responsibilities (4 items); and $\alpha = .59$ for Internationalization and Globalization (5 items). These results demonstrated that the alpha coefficient for four of the five questionnaire sections indicated sufficient homogeneity including a reasonable level of internal consistency of .8 or higher (Gliem & Gliem, 2003).

Analyses were run to determine if items should be removed from any of the four sections that had sufficient consistency. A determination was made that excluding items from any of these four sections would not statistically impact that section's alpha

coefficient. A discussion of the low Cronbach's alpha for Internationalization and Globalization will be presented in Chapter 5.

Validity and Factor Analysis

Validity is the extent to which an instrument measures what it claims to measure. A factor analysis helps "examine how underlying constructs influence the responses on a number of measured variables" (p. 1, DeCoster, 1998). A factor analysis also analyzes whether or not the questions on an instrument relate to the construct that was intended to be measured (Field, 2005). Although the main purpose of this study was not to conduct a psychometric analysis of the locally developed instrument (LDI), a factor analysis helped explore the instrument's validity. It also helped examine possible underlying reasons for the low Cronbach's alpha results for the Internationalization and Globalization section of the questionnaire. Brief summary findings from the factor analysis are described below.

A principal axis factoring was performed on 26 items. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was .80, which was above the recommended value of .6 (Neill, 2008). Larger KMO values ($>.5$) indicate that correlations between pairs of variables (i.e., potential factors) can be explained by the other variables. With a KMO value close to one, the data was suitable for running a factor analysis.

Additionally, Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2 (325) = 1482.54, p < .01$). Bartlett's tested whether or not the items were correlated. Based on the results from Bartlett's test (where the null hypothesis was that the correlation between the items was equal to zero), there was significance at the $\alpha = .05$ level. Therefore, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis and accepted the alternative that the items were correlated.

The results from these two tests indicated that the researcher could proceed with conducting the factor analysis.

Initially, the factorability of 26 items in the questionnaire was examined. Item loadings on each factor were estimated by Varimax rotation. Decisions about the number of factors retained for rotation were formed by using eigenvalues larger than 1.0 and the results from the Scree plot. The researcher identified six factors during the course of the analysis. The six-factor model demonstrated that the instrument's factors explained 64.20% of the item variance. The first factor (Organization and Governance) explained 17.82% of the variance while the second factor (Institutional Culture) explained 12.83% of the variance. The third factor (Institutional Systems of Support) explained 10.16% of the variance. The fourth factor (Professional Roles and Responsibilities) accounted for 9.10% of the variance while the fifth factor (Internationalization and Globalization) explained 7.76% of the variance. Finally, the sixth factor (Organization and Governance again) explained 6.54% of the variance. Ultimately, the results from the factor analysis revealed that the instrument consisted of 26 items and six factors.

Based on the six-factor model, the researcher found that the items in the Organization and Governance (OG) subscale measured three factors. The OG section had seven items. With seven items measuring three factors, this section of the questionnaire may need to be refined in the future. Specifically, the OG section should measure constructs related to both organization and governance. If there were a third factor beyond the original two, the OG section may need to be revised or renamed to more accurately reflect this third construct.

The researcher found that the subscales for Institutional Culture, Institutional Systems of Support, Professional Roles and Responsibilities, and Internationalization and Globalization (IG) measured their own constructs effectively. That is, the items in these sections measured each of their corresponding factors. However, as discussed previously in this chapter, the IG section had low reliability.

The factor analysis demonstrated statistically that the items in the IG section measured two constructs or factors. These findings suggest a reason behind the low Cronbach's alpha results for IG. Specifically, if the individual items in the IG section of the questionnaire didn't measure what they were intended to measure, this result could be an indication as to why the IG reliability score was low. The IG section included a total of four individual items with the factor analysis revealing that the four items measured two separate constructs. Not having a sufficient number of items in the IG section of the instrument could help explain the low Cronbach's alpha results and serve as an indicator as to why the IG section didn't have high reliability. Regardless, the results from the factor analysis supported the overall validity of the instrument although two sections of the questionnaire measured multiple constructs. Based on the results from the factor analysis, the researcher found that the items in the subscales measured the constructs intended for each section of the instrument.

As previously noted, a full report of the results of the factor analysis is beyond the scope of the current study. However, it was important to offer a brief, summative overview of the results from the factor analysis to provide a framework for exploring the instrument's validity and possible reasons behind the low Cronbach's alpha results for the

Internationalization and Globalization section of the questionnaire. Additional discussion regarding these summary findings will be presented in Chapter 5.

Research Question One (RQ1)

RQ1: What are the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers in the Southeast regarding the strength of their campus' internationalization initiatives?

The variables under consideration for RQ1 were nominal (participants' roles as either international educators or senior international officers and the letter grade they assigned in terms of their perceptions regarding the strength of their campus' internationalization initiatives). Therefore, hypothesis testing was appropriate to help answer this research question. The null (H_0) and alternative (H_A) hypotheses were as follows:

H_0 : No relationship existed between participants' roles (international educator or senior international officer) and the grade they assigned regarding the strength of campus internationalization initiatives.

H_A : A relationship existed between participants' roles (international educator or senior international officer) and the grade they assigned regarding the strength of campus internationalization initiatives.

In the questionnaire, participants were asked to use a letter-grade scale to delineate their perceptions of the strength of internationalization initiatives on their campuses (see Table 4.3). International educators were more likely than senior international officers to rate their perceptions of the strength of campus internationalization initiatives as either a C (35.1%) or B (26.6%). Senior international

officers were more likely to rate their perceptions of the strength of their campus internationalization initiatives as a B (13%).

Table 4.3

Perceptions of Strength of Campus Internationalization Initiatives

Grade	International Education Professional		Senior International Officer		Total	
	<i>n</i>	(%)	<i>N</i>	(%)	<i>N</i>	(%)
A	9	(5.8%)	2	(1.3%)	11	(7.1%)
B	41	(26.6%)	20	(13%)	61	(39.6%)
C	54	(35.1%)	7	(4.5%)	61	(39.6%)
D	13	(8.4%)	4	(2.6%)	17	(11%)
F	2	(1.3%)	2	(1.3%)	4	(2.6%)
Total	119	(77.3%)	35	(22.7%)	154	(100%)

With nominal variables, a Chi-square would normally have been utilized to answer RQ1. However, according to the assumptions needed for the Chi-square test observed frequencies cannot be too small (Mamahlodi, 2006). When expected numbers are small (less than five), Chi-square results are inaccurate (McDonald, 2009; “UCLA,” n.d.). Additionally, observed frequencies should have no more than 20% of the cells with counts less than five (AcaStat Software, 2012). As indicated by the quantity of cells that had expected frequencies less than five (Table 4.3), the results from the independent Chi-

Square test, χ^2 (4, N=154) = 9.74, $p = .05$, did not meet the assumptions necessary for this nonparametric measure.

To answer RQ1, the researcher conducted Fisher's exact test to measure participants' perceptions of the strength of campus internationalization initiatives. Fisher's exact test functioned in the same way as a Chi-square test for independence ("SISA", n.d.) would have and was more accurate than Chi-square for small sample sizes (McDonald, 2009). With $\alpha = .05$, the results created an exact calculation of the probability (McDonald, 2009) which was $p = 0.03$. With a p value < 0.05 , Fisher's exact test indicated that a relationship existed between the two nominal variables (role and letter grade assigned) and that they were not independent of one another.

Research Question Two (RQ2)

RQ2: To what extent do professionals in international education in the Southeast perceive the presence of the elements of internationalization at their current institutions?

Descriptive statistics were utilized to answer RQ2. Participants were asked to respond to a locally developed instrument with 42 questions on a 5-point Likert-like scale. The instrument's scale was as follows: 1 indicated "strongly disagree," 2 denoted "disagree," 3 indicated "agree," 4 denoted "strongly agree," and 5 indicated "unsure / not applicable." The items examined the perceptions that were held by international educators and senior international officers regarding their home campuses' internationalization efforts.

The researcher used SPSS 19.0 to calculate the means and standard deviations of participants' responses regarding their perceptions of the presence of the elements of internationalization at their current institutions. Tables 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, and 4.8 illustrate

the results including the frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations of participants' perceptions. The tables are organized as follows: Table 4.4 reports items from Organization and Governance (OG); Table 4.5 reports items from Institutional Culture (IC); Table 4.6 reports Institutional Systems of Support (ISS); Table 4.7 reports Professional Roles and Responsibilities (PRR); and Table 4.8 reports Internationalization and Globalization (IG). Missing values and responses indicating "unsure / not applicable" were not used to calculate the means or standard deviations and were not included in the tables.

Organization and Governance (Table 4.4)

Research question two (RQ2) focused on identifying the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers in the Southeast regarding the presence of the elements of internationalization at their current institutions. Table 4.4 highlights the ranked mean scores, standard deviations, and frequencies for each questionnaire item within the *Organization and Governance* section of the instrument. Means were ranked from highest to lowest. The results demonstrated that participants perceived that their office or department's organizational structure supported campus internationalization ($M=3.32$, $SD=0.74$). Additionally, respondents perceived that internationalization was a priority for their institutions ($M=3.12$, $SD=0.79$) and that their institutional strategic plan included internationalization initiatives ($M=3.10$, $SD=0.83$).

To a lesser degree, participants felt their campus' organizational structure supported internationalization initiatives ($M=2.86$, $SD=0.80$) and that their institutional mission statements specifically mentioned internationalization ($M=2.82$, $SD=0.96$). Based on the mean and standard deviation, the results also indicated that participants

perceived that their institutions had specific goals for internationalization that were clearly defined ($M=2.61$, $SD=0.88$). Additionally, based on the mean and standard deviation, participants perceived that their institution's priorities for campus internationalization matched their own ($M=2.55$, $SD=0.88$). However, when reviewing the means and standard deviations in conjunction with the frequency counts (Table 4.4), a fuller picture was revealed. The frequency counts illustrated an almost even split between the disagree and agree categories for these last two items. In other words, half of the participants who responded perceived that their institutions had specific goals that were clearly defined (46.8%), but the other half did not (46.3%). Additionally, half of the participants who responded perceived that their institution's priorities for campus internationalization matched their own (46.9%), while the other half did not (46.3%).

Table 4.4

Perceptions of Organization and Governance (OG)

Item (Section)	<i>n</i>	Frequencies				<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
		Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	
My office and/or department's organizational structure supports campus internationalization. (OG)	166	5 (2.9%)	12 (6.9%)	74 (42.3%)	75 (42.9%)	3.32 (0.74)
Internationalizing the campus is a priority for my institution. (OG)	167	4 (2.3%)	31 (17.7%)	73 (41.7%)	59 (33.7%)	3.12 (0.79)

[Table 4.4 continues]

Table 4.4 continued

Item (Section)	<i>n</i>	Frequencies				<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
		Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	
My institution's strategic plan includes internationalization initiatives. (OG)	163	8 (4.6%)	25 (14.3%)	73 (41.7%)	57 (32.6%)	3.10 (0.83)
My campus' organizational structure supports internationalization initiatives. (OG)	165	8 (4.6%)	42 (24.0%)	80 (45.7%)	35 (20.0%)	2.86 (0.80)
My institution's mission statement specifically mentions internationalization. (OG)	155	14 (8.0%)	46 (26.3%)	49 (28.0%)	46 (26.3%)	2.82 (0.96)
My institution has specific goals for internationalization that are clearly defined. (OG)	163	13 (7.4%)	68 (38.9%)	52 (29.7%)	30 (17.1%)	2.61 (0.88)
My institution's priorities for campus internationalization match my own. (OG)	163	18 (10.3%)	63 (36.0%)	57 (32.6%)	25 (14.3%)	2.55 (0.88)

Note. Scale for responses: 1-Strongly Disagree; 2-Disagree; 3-Agree; 4-Strongly Agree. Missing values are not part of this table (*n*=175). *Unsure/Not Applicable* responses were not used to calculate the mean and are not included.

Institutional Culture (Table 4.5)

Table 4.5 highlights the ranked mean scores, standard deviations, and frequencies for items within the *Institutional Culture* section of the questionnaire. The results demonstrated that participants perceived that their offices ($M=3.72$, $SD=0.56$) and departments ($M=3.58$, $SD=0.61$) were committed to supporting campus

internationalization. Participants also perceived that their offices ($M=3.43$, $SD=0.76$) and departments ($M=3.32$, $SD=0.79$) were involved in planning campus internationalization efforts. Institutional culture was perceived as being open to internationalization ($M=3.11$, $SD=0.66$). Additionally, the item with the lowest mean score still indicated that participants perceived that their institutions were committed to supporting campus internationalization ($M=2.97$, $SD=0.71$).

Table 4.5

Perceptions of Institutional Culture (IC)

Item (Section)	<i>n</i>	Frequencies				<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
		Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	
My office is committed to supporting campus internationalization. (IC)	164	2 (1.1%)	3 (1.7%)	34 (19.4%)	125 (71.4%)	3.72 (0.56)
My department is committed to supporting campus internationalization. (IC)	162	2 (1.1%)	4 (2.3%)	54 (30.9%)	102 (58.3%)	3.58 (0.61)
My office is involved in planning campus internationalization efforts. (IC)	162	5 (2.9%)	11 (6.3%)	55 (31.4%)	91 (52.0%)	3.43 (0.76)
My department is involved in planning campus internationalization efforts. (IC)	157	4 (2.3%)	20 (11.4%)	54 (30.9%)	79 (45.1%)	3.32 (0.79)
My institutional culture is open to internationalization. (IC)	160	2 (1.1%)	21 (12.0%)	95 (54.3%)	42 (24.0%)	3.11 (0.66)

[Table 4.5 continues]

Table 4.5 continued

Item (Section)	<i>n</i>	Frequencies				<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
		Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	
My institution is committed to supporting campus internationalization. (IC)	160	2 (1.1%)	36 (20.6%)	86 (49.1%)	36 (20.6%)	2.97 (0.71)

Note. Scale for responses: 1-Strongly Disagree; 2-Disagree; 3-Agree; 4-Strongly Agree. Missing values are not part of this table ($n=175$). *Unsure/Not Applicable* responses were not used to calculate the mean and are not included.

Institutional Systems of Support (Table 4.6)

Table 4.6 highlights the ranked mean scores, standard deviations, and frequencies for items within the *Institutional Systems of Support* section of the instrument. The results indicated that participants perceived that their offices received institutional funding for internationalization initiatives ($M=2.54$, $SD=0.85$); however, they did not perceive that their offices were sufficiently funded ($M=2.23$, $SD=0.80$). Participants did not perceive that their institutions provided sufficient support services for campus internationalization ($M=2.18$, $SD=0.80$). Additionally, respondents did not feel that internationalization initiatives were funded sufficiently on their campuses ($M=2.08$, $SD=0.78$).

Table 4.6

Perceptions of Institutional Systems of Support (ISS)

Item (Section)	<i>n</i>	Frequencies				<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
		Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	
My office receives institutional funding for internationalization initiatives. (ISS)	158	23 (13.1%)	41 (23.4%)	80 (45.7%)	14 (8.0%)	2.54 (0.85)
My office is sufficiently funded. (ISS)	159	30 (17.1%)	70 (40.0%)	52 (29.7%)	7 (4.0%)	2.23 (0.80)
My institution provides sufficient support services for campus internationalization. (ISS)	157	32 (18.3%)	71 (40.6%)	48 (27.4%)	6 (3.4%)	2.18 (0.80)
Internationalization initiatives are sufficiently funded on my campus. (ISS)	161	40 (22.9%)	71 (40.6%)	47 (26.9%)	3 (1.7%)	2.08 (0.78)

Note. Scale for responses: 1-Strongly Disagree; 2-Disagree; 3-Agree; 4-Strongly Agree. Missing values are not part of this table (*n*=175). *Unsure/Not Applicable* responses were not used to calculate the mean and are not included.

Professional Roles and Responsibilities (Table 4.7)

Table 4.7 highlights the ranked mean scores, standard deviations, and frequencies for items within the *Professional Roles and Responsibilities* portion of the questionnaire. The results indicated that participants perceived they were individually included in informal conversations surrounding internationalization initiatives on their campuses ($M=3.01$, $SD=0.74$). Respondents also indicated that they provided direction for more than one international initiative ($M=2.98$, $SD=0.83$). To a lesser extent, participants indicated that they were responsible for providing leadership for campus

internationalization initiatives ($M=2.69$, $SD=0.89$) and were included in formal meetings surrounding internationalization initiatives ($M=2.67$, $SD=0.90$).

Table 4.7

Perceptions of Professional Roles and Responsibilities (PRR)

Item (Section)	<i>n</i>	Frequencies				<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
		Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	
I am included in informal conversations surrounding internationalization initiatives on my campus. (PRR)	161	8 (4.6%)	19 (10.9%)	97 (55.4%)	37 (21.1%)	3.01 (0.74)
I provide direction for more than one international initiative on my campus. (PRR)	161	6 (3.4%)	38 (21.7%)	70 (40.0%)	47 (26.9%)	2.98 (0.83)
I am responsible for providing leadership for campus internationalization initiatives. (PRR)	153	12 (6.9%)	56 (32.0%)	53 (30.3%)	32 (18.3%)	2.69 (0.89)
I am included in formal meetings surrounding internationalization initiatives on my campus. (PRR)	159	18 (10.3%)	45 (25.7%)	68 (38.9%)	28 (16.0%)	2.67 (0.90)

Note. Scale for responses: 1-Strongly Disagree; 2-Disagree; 3-Agree; 4-Strongly Agree. Missing values are not part of this table ($n=175$). *Unsure/Not Applicable* responses were not used to calculate the mean and are not included.

Internationalization and Globalization (Table 4.8)

Table 4.8 illustrates the ranked mean scores, standard deviations, and frequencies for items within the *Internationalization and Globalization* section of the instrument. To some degree, participants perceived that their campuses used the terms *internationalization* and *globalization* interchangeably ($M=2.51$, $SD=0.68$). Participants did not feel their campuses clearly articulated their institution's definition of internationalization ($M=2.15$, $SD=0.74$). Additionally, they did not perceive that the terms *internationalization* and *globalization* meant the same thing ($M=2.10$, $SD=0.58$). Respondents indicated that they did not personally use the terms *internationalization* and *globalization* interchangeably ($M=2.08$, $SD=0.64$). Additionally, respondents did not have the perception that their campus' definition of internationalization was readily apparent to off-campus constituents ($M=2.01$, $SD=0.68$).

Table 4.8

Perceptions of Internationalization and Globalization (IG)

Item (Section)	<i>n</i>	Frequencies				<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
		Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	
My campus uses the terms internationalization and globalization interchangeably. (IG)	141	9 (5.1%)	57 (32.6%)	69 (39.4%)	6 (3.4%)	2.51 (0.68)
My campus clearly articulates the institution's definition of internationalization. (IG)	149	25 (14.3%)	82 (46.9%)	36 (20.6%)	6 (3.4%)	2.15 (0.74)

[Table 4.8 continues]

Table 4.8 continued

Item (Section)	<i>n</i>	Frequencies				<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
		Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)	
The terms internationalization and globalization mean the same thing. (IG)	155	17 (9.7%)	108 (61.7%)	28 (16.0%)	2 (1.1%)	2.10 (0.58)
I use the terms internationalization and globalization interchangeably. (IG)	156	23 (13.1%)	100 (57.1%)	30 (17.1%)	3 (1.7%)	2.08 (0.64)
My campus' definition of internationalization is readily apparent to off-campus constituents. (IG)	139	29 (16.6%)	81 (46.3%)	27 (15.4%)	2 (1.1%)	2.01 (0.68)

Note. Scale for responses: 1-Strongly Disagree; 2-Disagree; 3-Agree; 4-Strongly Agree. Missing values are not part of this table (*n*=175). *Unsure/Not Applicable* responses were not used to calculate the mean and are not included.

Composite Scores

Gliem & Gliem (2003) pointed out that individual items on an instrument tend to be less valid, less accurate, and less reliable than multi-item equivalents. Additionally, measurement error averages out when individual scores are summed to obtain a total score (Gliem & Gliem). As a result, a composite score for each section of the questionnaire was calculated and data analyses for RQ3 and RQ4 used summated scales (or subscales) versus individual items for the statistical analyses. Table 4.9 highlights the composite scores as well as the means and standard deviations for each section of the questionnaire including Organization and Governance (OG), Institutional Culture (IC), Institutional Systems of Support (ISS), Professional Roles and Responsibilities (PRR),

and Internationalization and Globalization (IG). In terms of the number of items within each subscale, OG included seven, IC had six, ISS had four, PRR had four, and IG included five. As noted previously, the composite scores were utilized during the research process to answer RQ3 and RQ4.

Table 4.9

Composite Scores

Section	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min	Max
Organization and Governance (OG)	168	19.80	4.51	9	28
Institutional Culture (IC)	166	19.52	3.67	4	24
Institutional Systems of Support (ISS)	164	8.73	2.84	1	16
Professional Roles and Responsibilities (PRR)	164	10.98	2.92	3	16
Internationalization and Globalization (IG)	163	9.85	2.61	2	17

Research Question Three (RQ3)

RQ3: What are the differences in perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on group type (international educators versus senior international officers)?

In Chapter 3, the researcher proposed answering RQ3 by conducting an analysis of the variance (ANOVA). However, when conducting multiple ANOVAs, there is an increased likelihood of a Type I error (Huberty & Olejnik, 2006). According to UCLA's Academic Technology Services Statistical Consulting Group (n.d.), failure to take into account the inter-correlation of dependent variables may result in separate univariate tests that are generally less powerful. Additionally, conducting multiple individual ANOVAs

may not produce a significant effect on the dependent variable(s), whereas variables that have been combined may.

By considering whether or not the dependent variables (the composite scores for each section of the questionnaire) were correlated, an informed decision could be made regarding the most appropriate statistical procedure to perform. If the correlation analysis indicated interrelatedness, transitioning from ANOVA to a multivariate analysis of the variance (MANOVA) would be a more appropriate statistical procedure to answer RQ3 (Scanlan, 2004). A correlation analysis (Table 4.10) was conducted on the composite scores (Table 4.9) and the results are outlined in the next section of this chapter.

Correlation Analysis of Composite Scores

Table 4.10 indicates that all but one pairing of the composite scores had a positive relationship (the single pairing that was not correlated occurred between Institutional Culture and Internationalization and Globalization). The results demonstrated that Organization and Governance (OG) was moderately correlated with four other subscales including Institutional Culture ($r(163) = .51, p < .01$), Institutional Systems of Support ($r(161) = .40, p < .01$), Professional Roles and Responsibilities ($r(161) = .38, p < .01$), and Internationalization and Globalization ($r(160) = .28, p < .01$). Institutional Culture (IC) was moderately correlated with two subscales which included Institutional Systems of Support ($r(162) = .45, p < .01$) and Professional Roles and Responsibilities ($r(162) = .44, p < .01$). Institutional Systems of Support (ISS) was correlated with Professional Roles and Responsibilities ($r(161) = .46, p < .01$) and with Internationalization and Globalization ($r(160) = .16, p = .047$). Additionally, Professional Roles and

Responsibilities was correlated with Internationalization and Globalization ($r(161) = .27$, $p = .001$).

Table 4.10

Pearson Correlation Matrix among Scale Scores

Subscale	OG	IC	ISS	PRR	IG
Organization and Governance (OG)	--	.51**	.40**	.38**	.28**
Institutional Culture (IC)		--	.45**	.44**	.13
Institutional Systems of Support (ISS)			--	.46**	.16*
Professional Roles and Responsibilities (PRR)				--	.27**
Internationalization and Globalization (IG)					--

Note. Correlations marked with two asterisks (**) were significant at $p < .01$ (2-tailed). Correlations marked with an asterisk (*) were significant at the $p < .05$ (2-tailed).

The Rationale for Using Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA)

Multivariate analysis of the variance (MANOVA) is an extension of univariate ANOVA that helps account for multiple dependent variables (Grice & Iwasaki, 2007; Scanlan, 2004). As previously noted in this chapter, conducting a multivariate analysis of the variance is appropriate when dependent variables are correlated. Table 4.10 highlights a meaningful pattern of correlations that was observed among most of the

dependent variables for RQ3. One of the assumptions of MANOVA is that the correlations among the dependent variables be moderate (typically ranging from 0.20 – 0.60) (Meyers, Gampst, & Guarino, 2006). All but two of the composite scores were moderately correlated with one another (Table 4.10). These results substantiated the appropriateness of utilizing MANOVA instead of ANOVA to answer RQ3. Based on the meaningful correlations (Table 4.10), the researcher determined that conducting MANOVA was a more appropriate statistical procedure to answer RQ3 (Huberty & Olejnik, 2006).

MANOVA Results for RQ3

The hypothesis for RQ3 was that there would be a significant multivariate main effect on the composite scores based on participants' roles (international educator versus senior international officer). A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to test the hypothesis for RQ3. Table 4.11 contains the means and standard deviations for the composite scores for this analysis based on group type.

Table 4.11

Means and Standard Deviations Based on Group Type

Group	Variable	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min	Max
International Educator	OG	122	19.57	4.47	9	28
	IC	122	19.30	3.82	4	24
	ISS	122	8.61	2.74	1	16
	PRR	122	10.47	2.76	3	16
	IG	122	9.65	2.63	2	17

[Table 4.11 continues]

Table 4.11 continued

Group	Variable	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min	Max
Senior	OG	37	20.24	4.83	11	28
International Officer	IC	37	19.97	3.40	12	24
	ISS	37	8.86	3.18	2	16
	PRR	37	12.57	2.99	5	16
	IG	37	10.46	2.23	7	17

As part of the MANOVA results, Box's test of equality of covariance matrices at the $\alpha = .05$ level resulted in an *M* value of 19.65 ($p = .23$). With a p value $> .05$ the researcher accepted the null hypothesis that the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables were equal across groups (Huberty, & Olejnik, 2006; "Laerd," 2012). Had the p value for Box's *M* been statistically significant, an assumption of MANOVA would have been violated.

At the $\alpha = .05$ level, the one-way MANOVA revealed a significant multivariate main effect for role (international educator versus senior international officer) with Wilks' $\lambda = .890$, $F(5, 153) = 3.80$, $p = .003$, partial $\eta^2 = .110$. Based on these results, the hypothesis that participants' roles had a statistically significant effect on the dependent variables was confirmed. While statistically significant at the $\alpha = .05$ level, however, the partial eta squared results ($\eta_p^2 = .110$) indicated that only 11% of the variance was explained by the independent variable. The multivariate effect size was small (11%) and indicated that the grouping variable (role) didn't account for a great deal of the variance in the dependent variables (the composite scores).

The multivariate test demonstrated the significance of at least one mean pairing. However, it was not possible to discern from the MANOVA results which observed mean difference(s) were significant. With a statistically significant MANOVA, one of the follow-up analyses that can be performed includes multiple univariate analyses of variance ("UCLA," n.d.). To determine where the differences existed, a series of univariate analyses of variance were conducted on each dependent variable as follow-up tests. It is important to note, however, that the results from the analyses of the variances did not take into account correlations between the dependent variables (Grice & Iwasaki, 2007). With these follow-up tests, each dependent variable was analyzed and interpreted separately (Grice & Iwasaki).

Prior to conducting the follow-up tests, the researcher used Levene's test of equality of error variances to determine if the error variance of the composite scores was equal across all groups. Based on the results ($p > .05$ with $\alpha = .05$), the researcher accepted the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variables was equal across the two groups (international educator and senior international officer). The homogeneity of variance assumption for the univariate analysis was satisfied. Additionally, the means and standard deviations for the composite scores were recorded in Table 4.11.

Using Bonferroni's correction to guard against Type I error, $\alpha = .05$ was divided by the number of univariate tests (5) which resulted in a conservative significance value of $\alpha = .01$ ("SISA," n.d.). With $\alpha = .01$, the analysis of variance for the composite score for Professional Roles and Responsibilities (PRR) was significant, $F(1,157) = 15.79$, $p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .091$. The results from the partial η^2 indicated that 9.1% of the variance

within PRR could be explained by role (international educators versus senior international officer). However, with a small effect size (9.1%) the grouping variable did not account for a large proportion of the unexplained variance within PRR. With only two groups (international educators and senior international officers), it was not possible to perform post-hoc analyses for PRR. The results for the remaining composite scores Organization and Governance ($F(1,157) = 0.61, p = .44$, partial $\eta^2 = .004$), Institutional Culture ($F(1,157) = 0.94, p = .33$, partial $\eta^2 = .006$), Institutional Systems of Support ($F(1,157) = 0.23, p = .63$, partial $\eta^2 = .001$), and Internationalization and Globalization ($F(1,157) = 2.90, p = .09$, partial $\eta^2 = .018$) were not statistically significant.

Research Question Four (RQ4)

RQ4: What are the differences in perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on institutional type (i.e., public, private, two-year, four-year)?

In Chapter 3, the researcher proposed to answer RQ4 by conducting an analysis of the variance (ANOVA) to determine what differences, if any, existed in the perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on institutional type (i.e., public, private, two-year, four-year). Similar to the rationale previously discussed in this chapter for RQ3, conducting multiple ANOVAs increases the likelihood of a Type I error (Huberty & Olejnik, 2006). The composite scores (Table 4.9) were already shown to be correlated at the moderate level (Table 4.10). Additionally, RQ4 posed a similar research construct to that of RQ3. Transitioning from ANOVA to MANOVA was the most appropriate statistical technique to answer RQ4 for the same reasons previously outlined for RQ3 (meaningful correlations in the moderate range for the dependent variables, the likelihood of a Type I error, and failure to take into account correlated dependent variables).

MANOVA Results for RQ4

A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to test the hypothesis for RQ4. The hypothesis for RQ4 was that there would be a significant multivariate main effect on the composite scores based on institutional type (i.e., public, private, two-year, four-year). Tables 4.12 and 4.13 illustrate the means and standard deviations for the composite scores including Organization and Governance (OG), Institutional Culture (IC), Institutional Systems of Support (ISS), Professional Roles and Responsibilities (PRR), and Internationalization and Globalization (IG) based on institutional type (public versus private and two-year versus four-year).

Table 4.12

Means and Standard Deviations for Institutional Type (Public versus Private)

Institutional Type	Variable	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min	Max
Public	OG	103	19.46	4.53	9	28
	IC	103	19.30	3.96	4	24
	ISS	103	8.56	2.83	1	14
	PRR	103	10.73	2.98	3	16
	IG	103	9.95	2.51	2	17
Private	OG	46	19.96	4.30	11	28
	IC	46	19.91	3.07	13	24
	ISS	46	8.91	3.19	2	16
	PRR	46	11.30	2.94	6	16
	IG	46	9.52	2.47	2	15

Table 4.13

Means and Standard Deviations for Institutional Type (Two-Year versus Four-Year)

Institutional Type	Variable	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min	Max
Two-Year	OG	6	18.00	6.29	9	28
	IC	6	16.83	7.17	4	24
	ISS	6	8.83	4.83	4	16
	PRR	6	11.67	3.88	6	16
	IG	6	10.50	3.45	5	14
Four-Year	OG	145	19.60	4.33	9	28
	IC	145	19.52	3.47	6	24
	ISS	145	8.70	2.75	2	16
	PRR	145	10.93	2.76	4	16
	IG	145	9.87	2.46	2	17

Public versus private. For the MANOVA results for RQ4, Box's test of equality of covariance matrices resulted in an *M* value of 32.51 ($p=.009$). With $\alpha = .05$ and $p < .05$, the multivariate assumption of the homogeneity of the covariance matrices was violated (Huberty, & Olejnik, 2006; "Laerd," 2012). Additionally, the results for the one-way multivariate tests (MANOVA) for institution type (public versus private) were not statistically significant, Wilks' $\lambda = .978$, $F(5, 143) = 0.64$, $p = .67$, partial $\eta^2 = .022$. These results indicated that there were no differences in the perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on institutional type (public versus private).

Two-year versus four-year. As part of the MANOVA results, Box's test of equality of covariance matrices resulted in an *M* value of 48.33 ($p=.02$). At $\alpha = .05$ and p

$< .05$, the multivariate assumption of the homogeneity of the covariance matrices was again violated (Huberty, & Olejnik, 2006; “Laerd,” 2012). The results for the one-way multivariate tests (MANOVA) for institution type (two-year versus four-year) were not statistically significant (Wilks’ $\lambda = .954$, $F(5, 145) = 1.41$, $p = .22$, partial $\eta^2 = .046$). Therefore, there were no differences in the perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on institutional type (two-year versus four-year). In light of the small number of responses from two-year institutions (see Table 4.13), it is important to note that these results could not be generalized to the larger population.

Additional Findings

Defining Internationalization

Chapter 2 provided a detailed discussion regarding the challenge of defining internationalization. In addition to the four RQs delineated for this study, the researcher was also interested in ascertaining how international educators and senior international officers defined internationalization. An item on the questionnaire provided four different options for defining internationalization and the ability to write-in a personalized definition (Appendix E).

Out of the total number of participants ($n=175$), NAFSA: Association of International Educators’ (2010) definition was selected most often (45.1%, $n=79$). The next most prevalent definition was Jane Knight’s (1994) definition (23.4%, $n=41$), which was also the definition selected for the purposes of this study. The next most common selection was that of OECD (1994) (10.9%, $n=19$) followed by Kälvermark and van der Wende (1997) (10.3%, $n=18$). Six participants (3.4%) chose to write their own definitions while 6.9% ($n=12$) did not respond to this question.

The researcher conducted Fisher's exact test to determine if there was a relationship between international educators and senior international officers and how they defined internationalization. With $\alpha = .05$, Fisher's exact test created an exact calculation of the probability resulting in $p = 0.42$. With a p value > 0.05 , Fisher's exact test indicated that a relationship did not exist and that the results were independent of one another. More specifically, the results indicated that there were no discernible differences in how internationalization was defined based on role.

Differences in Perceptions Based on State

A one-way multivariate analysis of variance was conducted to compare the effect of state on the five composite scores (Organization and Governance, Institutional Culture, Institutional Systems of Support, Professional Roles and Responsibilities, Internationalization and Globalization). Results were not statistically significant ($p > .05$) as demonstrated by Wilks' λ at the $\alpha = .05$ level, $\lambda = .760$, $F(30, 598) = 1.41$, $p = .07$, partial $\eta^2 = .053$. The multivariate analysis demonstrated that there were no discernible differences in the composite scores based on state.

Chapter Summary

For the purposes of this study, the researcher created a locally developed instrument (LDI) designed around five conceptual topics including Organization and Governance (OG), Institutional Culture (IC), Institutional Systems of Support (ISS), Professional Roles and Responsibilities (PRR), and Internationalization and Globalization (IG). Results from Cronbach's alpha confirmed the instrument's reliability. Additionally, although psychometric analysis of the LDI was beyond the

scope of this study, a factor analysis demonstrated the instrument's validity while revealing six factors within the questionnaire.

This study and subsequent data collection addressed four principal research questions including: (1) perceptions regarding the strength of campus internationalization initiatives, (2) perceptions regarding the presence of the elements of internationalization, (3) differences in perceptions based on group type, and (4) differences in perceptions based on institutional type. With an overall response rate of 18.2% ($n=175$), the researcher utilized descriptive statistics, hypothesis testing, Fisher's exact test, and multivariate analysis of the variance to address the four research questions. Based on the results from the various analyses, the researcher found significant differences in the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers regarding the strength of their campus' internationalization initiatives. The researcher used descriptive statistics to learn more about the extent to which international educators and senior international officers perceived the presence of the elements of internationalization at their current institutions. Additionally, the researcher discovered statistically significant differences among the dependent variables based on participants' role (in particular Professional Roles and Responsibilities). Finally, no significant differences were found among the perceptions based on institutional type (public versus private, and two-year versus four-year).

Additional findings revealed that more participants selected NAFSA's (2010) definition of internationalization than any other option available on the instrument. Further investigation indicated that there were no differences in terms of how participants defined internationalization based on role (international educator versus senior

international officer). Additionally, a multivariate analysis of the variance showed that there were no significant differences among participants' perceptions based on their state.

Chapter 5 contains a discussion of the findings outlined in this chapter.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes the research study as well as discusses various conclusions and recommendations. Specifically, the researcher provides a brief summary of the study, discusses significant findings, reviews additional study limitations, and provides insight regarding implications for practice. The chapter culminates with recommendations for future research and final conclusions.

Brief Summary of the Research Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers in the southeastern United States regarding on-campus internationalization initiatives. The researcher created a locally developed instrument that addressed four research questions utilizing quantitative methodology. Grounded in the literature (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008; Green & Olson, 2003; Kälvermark & van der Wende, 1997; Knight, 1994; Knight, 2003; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 1994), the instrument focused on understanding perceptions about campus internationalization. Additionally, the instrument included five distinct sections: Organization and Governance (OG), Institutional Culture (IC), Institutional Systems of Support (ISS), Professional Roles and Responsibilities (PRR), and Internationalization and Globalization (IG).

The researcher sought participants from the Southeast who held membership(s) in at least one of two professional organizations (NAFSA: Association of International

Educators and AIEA: Association of International Education Administrators). Both associations include members actively working in the field of international education at various institutions of higher education in the southeastern United States. There were 959 potential participants. The researcher sent an initial email invitation to listservs owned by both associations. The researcher also utilized social media to post general information about the study on one of the association's Facebook pages. A follow-up email reminder was sent to the associations' listservs one week after the initial invitation. Additionally, a third email reminder was sent seven days later to both associations' listservs. The final response rate was 18.2%. ($n=175$). Of the 175 participants who completed the questionnaire, 39 were senior international officers.

The researcher conducted statistical analyses which addressed the study's four research questions. The researcher utilized hypothesis testing and Fisher's exact test to answer the first research question regarding the perceptions of the strength of campus internationalization initiatives. Descriptive statistics including frequencies, means, and standard deviations were calculated for the second research question. These results described the extent to which international educators and senior international officers in the Southeast perceived the presence of the elements of internationalization at their current institutions. The researcher used a multivariate analysis of the variance for the third research question to determine the differences in perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on group type (international educators versus senior international officers). For the last research question, the researcher conducted a multivariate analysis of the variance to discern any differences in perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on institutional type. In terms of additional

findings, frequencies and Fisher's exact test were used to determine if a relationship existed between international educators and senior international officers and how they defined internationalization. A multivariate analysis of the variance was also conducted to determine if there were differences among participants' perceptions based on location within the Southeast (i.e., by state).

Significant Findings

As noted earlier in this chapter, the focus of this study was to learn about the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers regarding their campus internationalization initiatives. Past studies (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008; Siaya & Hayward, 2003) have asked U.S. institutions of higher education to report quantitative information regarding language programs, numbers of international students and faculty, education abroad programs and the quantity of students studying overseas, international research, and other internationalization initiatives. While valuable in terms of discovering what types of services and programs were offered, previous studies have not addressed foundational constructs including how institutions define internationalization, effectiveness of initiatives, nor campus perceptions surrounding the topic.

This study sought to learn more about how administrators and staff members at university and colleges in the southeastern U.S. perceived internationalization on their own campuses. Specifically, how would staff members and administrators who design, implement, and sustain internationalization initiatives conceptualize the topic for their own campuses? This section of Chapter 5 reviews and discusses significant findings

from this study including the instrument's reliability and validity, the four research questions, and additional findings.

Instrument Findings – Reliability and Validity

As noted in Chapter 3, the researcher's locally developed instrument was grounded in the literature (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008; Green & Olson, 2003; Kälvermark & van der Wende, 1997; Knight, 1994; Knight, 2003; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 1994) and based on the work of Green, Luu, and Burris. The original pilot study (Poole, 2010) described in Chapter 3 was conducted in the state of Georgia and did not include measurement of the instrument's reliability or validity. Part of the design for the current research study included conducting a measure of the instrument's reliability through calculating Cronbach's alpha.

Reliability. As a conservative measure of reliability, Cronbach's alpha is the most widely used objective measure of internal consistency (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). Additionally, as noted in Chapter 4 an alpha of .8 is a reasonable measure (Gliem & Gliem, 2003). The closer Cronbach's alpha is to 1.0, the greater the internal consistency of the items in the scale (Gliem & Gliem, 2003). Overall, the researcher found that internal consistency for the locally developed instrument was highly reliable (26 items; $\alpha = .92$), demonstrating the instrument's ability to measure consistently.

When making use of Likert-type scales, Gliem and Gliem (2003) highlighted the importance of reporting Cronbach's alpha results for summated scales versus individual items on a questionnaire. Chapter 4 presented findings that indicated sufficient homogeneity in all but one of the five sections of the instrument utilized for the current

study (Internationalization and Globalization). Discussion regarding the low alpha coefficient for Internationalization and Globalization is interconnected with the instrument's validity and will therefore be discussed in the next section of this chapter. For the subscales within Organization and Governance (OG), Institutional Culture (IC), Institutional Systems of Support (ISS), and Professional Roles and Responsibilities (PRR), the results from the Cronbach's alpha analyses demonstrated that the items in each section were strongly related to each other. They also demonstrated that these subscales (OG, IC, ISS, and PRR) had reasonable internal consistency (Gliem & Gliem, 2003) and were reliable (the ability of an instrument to measure consistently).

Validity. As reported in Chapter 4, the alpha coefficient for the Internationalization and Globalization (IG) section was low ($\alpha = .59$). According to Tavakol and Dennick (2011), a small alpha value could be the result of a number of factors including too few questions regarding a particular topic, poor interrelatedness between items, and/or heterogeneous constructs. Further tests were needed to determine a reason for the low alpha coefficient for the IG section of the questionnaire.

A factor analysis was conducted to investigate the validity of the locally developed instrument and to explore a reason for the low Cronbach's alpha for the IG section of the questionnaire. The factor analysis helped examine underlying constructs and how they influenced responses on the variables (DeCoster, 1998) as well as whether or not the instrument's items related to the construct that was intended to be measured (Field, 2005). Related findings from the factor analysis were presented in Chapter 4. Results indicated that the instrument was valid overall and the items from each of the

questionnaire's subscales accurately measured the constructs within each of their respective sections.

Internationalization and Globalization (IG) and reliability. The results presented in Chapter 4 indicated that the items from the IG subscale measured not one but two constructs. The factor analysis revealed that the first three questions in the IG section represented one factor while the remaining two items tested a second, separate factor. Specifically, the first three questions in the IG section sought to discover how the terms *internationalization* and *globalization* were utilized. Unlike the other sections of the questionnaire, these first three items did not seek to discern participants' perceptions about the two terms. Instead, they sought to discern how participants and their campuses utilized them. The last two questions in the IG section sought to learn about perceptions held by participants regarding their campuses' articulation of the word *internationalization*. In light of these facts, it is possible that the Cronbach alpha's coefficient was lower for the IG subscale due to heterogeneous constructs, a low number of questions, and potentially poor interrelatedness between items.

Instrument subscales and validity. The factor analysis revealed that six factors explained 64.20% of the item variance. It also indicated that several of the subscales measured their corresponding constructs effectively (i.e., Institutional Culture, Institutional Systems of Support, Professional Roles and Responsibilities, and Internationalization and Globalization). The Organization and Governance (OG) subscale, however, included items that measured three factors. With such a broad range of viable topics for this section, the items within this subscale may need to be refined prior to future use of the instrument. Possible revisions could include breaking the items

within the OG subscale into multiple sections and/or refining core constructs. In terms of Internationalization and Globalization (IG), the items within this section also measured their corresponding factor effectively. However, as discussed previously in this chapter, the Cronbach's alpha for the IG section ($\alpha = .59$) demonstrated low reliability.

Statistically, the factor analysis also revealed that the items in the IG section measured two constructs. As a result, the IG section may also need to be refined prior to future usage of the instrument. Possible revisions might involve the creation of questions that center around perceptions of internationalization related to IG versus the current items that focus on usage of terminology. Ultimately, however, the significance of these results is that the locally developed instrument was found to be both reliable and valid in terms of measuring the constructs presented in this study.

Research Question One

The first research question focused on perceptions regarding the strength of campus internationalization initiatives. The researchers used descriptive statistics and Fisher's exact test to explore participants' perceptions. Fisher's exact test demonstrated that a relationship existed between participants' roles (as either international educators or senior international officers) and the letter grade they selected indicating their perceptions of the strength of campus internationalization initiatives. In other words, the participants' roles and the letter grade they selected were correlated. It is important to note, however, that Fisher's exact test did not provide an indication of the direction of the relationship between the nominal variables.

Results presented in Chapter 4 indicated that international educators selected the letter grade "C" (35.1%) more frequently than the other options provided (Table 4.3),

while senior international officers most often chose “B” (13%). These findings revealed that international educators and senior international officers did not view the strength of campus internationalization in the same way. They also revealed that there was a relationship between role and which letter grade was selected for RQ1.

Discussion and significance.

The findings from RQ1 indicated a discrepancy or “gap” between the perspectives of international educators and senior international officers and how they viewed the strength of their internationalization initiatives. These results provide empirical evidence to support Olson’s (2005) assertion that there is a “significant gap between what leaders say about the importance of international learning and what is actually happening at their institutions” (Olson, p.56). International educators rated the strength of their internationalization initiatives as average while senior international officers considered them to be above average. This difference could be attributed to the actual positions held by each group. Senior international officers would be the individuals on campus who were most likely to create, shape, and implement campus internationalization policies. It is possible that the above average rating for the strength of these initiatives stems from senior international officers having played a part in creating them.

In terms of international educators, it is possible that their rating of average stems from a deficiency in communication regarding the various aspects of internationalization initiatives. Specifically, if internationalization is integrated into a campus community through formal and informal means including OG, IC, ISS, PRR, and IG, shouldn’t perceptions regarding the strength of internationalization initiatives align more closely, regardless of role? These findings lend empirical evidence to the supposition that a gap

exists. They also raise additional questions such as identifying what the gaps are, why perceptions regarding strength differ, what is being perceived differently, and whether or not these perceptions are barriers to achieving effective campus internationalization.

In Chapter 2, Green and Ferguson (2012) were highlighted as stating it is “sometimes difficult to separate rhetoric from the reality” (p.3). One of the pivotal constructs for this study (shared previously in Chapter 1) was that university and college campuses would be better able to implement internationalization strategies more effectively by recognizing and understanding gaps between perceptions and reality. The findings from the first research question indicated empirically that gaps are indeed present in terms of perceptions regarding the strength of campus internationalization initiatives. Identifying what the gaps are and investigating how to effectively overcome them will be a key strategy towards increasing the effectiveness of campus internationalization on U.S. college and university campuses in the future.

Research Question Two

The second research question focused on the extent to which professionals in international education perceived the presence of the elements of internationalization at their current institutions. Descriptive statistics were utilized to answer this research question. In this section of the chapter, a discussion regarding significant findings for each section of the questionnaire is outlined. Implications for the findings from this research question are offered later in the chapter.

Organization and governance (OG). Overall, participants perceived organizational structures on their campuses were supportive of internationalization (both at the office/departmental and institutional levels). Additionally, participants felt that

internationalization was a priority at the institutional level and that their institutional strategic plan included internationalization initiatives. To varying degrees, they also perceived that their campus organizational structure supported internationalization initiatives and that formal constructs including mission statements included references to internationalization or internationalization initiatives.

Results also indicated that participants' felt their institutions had specific goals for internationalization that were clearly defined and that their institutional priorities for internationalization matched their own. However, for these last two items, frequency counts demonstrated an almost even split in the responses between the agree and disagree categories. More specifically, half the respondents perceived that their institutions had specific goals that were clearly defined while the other half did not. Additionally, half the participants felt their institutional priorities for internationalization matched their own while the other half did not.

Discussion and significance.

The findings provided empirical evidence that indicated differences in perceptions surrounding the presence of clear goals for internationalization. If the people doing the day-to-day work of internationalization do not perceive that campus goals are specific and clear, how can they be effective? The findings also revealed half the participants didn't feel institutional priorities for campus internationalization matched their own. This finding signifies a clear disparity in perceptions that may very well impede the ability to effectively implement campus internationalization. At a minimum, these findings indicate that there are communication gaps regarding fundamental constructs such as clear goals and institutional priorities for campus internationalization. This fact provides

empirical evidence supporting literature that was presented in Chapter 2 which outlined concerns regarding potential gaps between institutional aspirations versus actual commitment to internationalization (Rubin, 2009). These findings also reinforced concerns that campus internationalization initiatives are uneven, marginalized, lacking in structure, and need coherent strategic direction (Altbach & Peterson, 1998; Green & Olson, 2003; Koch, 2008).

Institutional culture (IC). As a whole, the IC section of the questionnaire indicated favorable perceptions surrounding institutional culture and internationalization. Participants perceived that their offices and departments were involved with and committed to supporting the planning of internationalization initiatives on their campuses. Additionally, participants felt that their institutional culture was open to internationalization and that their institutions were committed to supporting campus internationalization.

Discussion and significance.

Because they are based on perceptions, these findings may not fully reflect institutional culture regarding internationalization on the participants' campuses. However, the results suggest that participants perceive an institutional message of commitment. They also reflect that participants feel that there is support for campus internationalization (even if the previous section of the questionnaire indicated the absence of a shared vision for institutional priorities and clearly outlined goals).

Institutional systems of support (ISS). The results demonstrated that participants perceived that their offices received institutional funding for internationalization initiatives. However, the findings also indicated that participants did

not feel their offices were sufficiently funded or that there were sufficient support services for internationalization on their campuses. The results also indicated that respondents did not perceive initiatives related to internationalization were sufficiently funded.

For each of the questionnaire items in the ISS section, the means and standard deviations reflected the statements previously made. However, when inspecting the frequency counts, all of the items in the ISS section had approximately 30% or more of participants who held opposite perceptions from the majority response. Specifically, most of the participants felt their offices received institutional funding for internationalization initiatives. However, more than 1/3 of the respondents disagreed with this perception. Additionally, most participants perceived that their offices were not sufficiently funded; however, more than 1/3 felt they were. The majority of respondents perceived that their institutions did not provide sufficient support services for campus internationalization, while 1/3 felt they did. Finally, most participants felt that internationalization initiatives were not sufficiently funded on their campuses while a little less than 1/3 felt they were.

Discussion and significance.

Economic realities could have been a catalyst for some of the perceptions that existed related to Institutional Systems of Support. Specifically, some of the findings may have been a direct result of institutional needs to cut programs and reconsider academic priorities. The frequencies for the ISS section demonstrated gaps in perceptions among respondents regarding Institutional Systems of Support. In terms of Institutional Culture, participants' felt that their institutions were supportive and open to

campus internationalization. However, similar to the OG results, the ISS findings provide empirical evidence of gaps between perceptions regarding institutional aspirations, rhetoric, and actual commitment for campus internationalization (Green & Ferguson, 2012; Rubin, 2009).

Professional roles and responsibilities (PRR). For this section of the questionnaire, participants indicated that they were included in informal conversations surrounding internationalization and that they provided direction for more than one international initiative. To some extent, respondents indicated that they were responsible for providing leadership for campus internationalization initiatives and that they were included in formal meetings surrounding internationalization initiatives. In general, the PRR section of the instrument found favorable perceptions regarding participants' inclusion in both formal and informal meetings as well as opportunities to direct and lead campus internationalization.

Discussion and significance.

When comparing PRR with OG, differences in perception are readily apparent. Despite a feeling of inclusion and the perception of providing leadership for internationalization in terms of PRR, participants did not feel their institution's priorities matched their own. Furthermore, findings from OG indicated that there was a perception of a lack of clearly defined goals for internationalization as well. Participants felt they were included in conversations about campus internationalization; however, either they were not included in the meetings with campus decision makers or their input was not given high priority in establishing internationalization strategies on campus. The PRR findings provide further empirical proof that gaps exist between rhetoric and reality

(Green & Ferguson, 2012; Rubin, 2009). They also provide evidence that internationalization efforts continue to be uneven, marginalized, lacking in structure, and without coherent strategic direction (Altbach & Peterson, 1998; Green & Olson, 2003; Koch, 2008).

Internationalization and globalization (IG). The results indicated that although respondents were somewhat split, a slight majority of them agreed that their campuses used the terms *internationalization* and *globalization* interchangeably. Additionally, participants felt their campuses did not clearly articulate their institution's definition of internationalization. Respondents did not perceive that the terms *internationalization* and *globalization* meant the same thing and they did not personally use the two terms interchangeably. Furthermore, participants did not hold the perception that their campus' definition of internationalization was readily apparent to off-campus constituents.

Discussion and significance.

These findings suggest that institutional usage of *internationalization* was confounded by intermixing the term with *globalization*. They also revealed perceptions that campus-wide definitions for internationalization were not clearly expressed nor were they readily apparent. Shared understanding of terminology is essential if campuses are to make progress the establishment of common goals and institutional priorities. Ultimately, the findings from the IG section supported assertions from the literature presented in Chapters 1 and 2 that indicated a lack of clarity regarding the definition of internationalization at the institutional level (Arum & van de Water, 1992; Knight, 1999; Zolfaghari, Sabran, & Zolfaghari, 2009). The findings from this section also provided evidence that U.S. colleges and universities have adopted internationalization without

first delineating or understanding what this process means for their own campuses (Olson, 2005). Additionally, findings such as the ones from this study empirically validate mounting concerns about whether or not there is a shared understanding surrounding internationalization (International Association of Universities, 2012).

Overall discussion and significance for RQ2.

When considered in the aggregate, the findings from RQ2 provided empirical evidence that gaps in perceptions regarding campus internationalization exist. Specifically, some of the discrepancies include foundational constructs such as goals, institutional priorities, and terminology. Each of these is part of the basic foundation of any initiative. Operating in a setting where people conducting the daily work of internationalization differ on fundamental concepts, how is it possible for the initiative to be successful or effective? Additionally, if international educators and senior international offices have differing perceptions regarding goals, priorities, and terminology, what perceptions exist for individuals working with internationalization in other capacities? Furthermore, how can goals be achieved if there is a perception that they are not clearly defined?

The findings for RQ2 have implications for communication regarding internationalization as well. For the participants, either internationalization has been operationalized without the creation of foundational constructs such as clearly defined goals, common institutional priorities, and shared terminology or respondents' campuses are not effectively articulating these concepts. Either way, the results from RQ2 indicate systemic problems in communication regarding internationalization.

Using the shared terminology for internationalization creates a productive foundation for establishing common goals. Goals are a reflection of institutional priorities. Ultimately, having a shared understanding of foundational constructs and using common terminology leads to enhanced communication regarding institutional priorities for internationalization. Focusing on clarifying and effectively communicating these constructs would strengthen campus internationalization and provide opportunities for more effective internationalization initiatives.

Research Question Three

The third research question focused on discerning differences in the perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on group type (international educators versus senior international officers). The researcher found that the dependent variables were correlated and that there was a significant difference based on group type (Wilks' $\lambda = .890$, $F(5, 153) = 3.80$, $p = .003$, partial $\eta^2 = .110$). Role (international educators versus senior international officers) accounted for 11% of the variance among the composite scores. Additionally, follow-up analysis revealed that role accounted for 9.1% of the variance within Professional Roles and Responsibilities.

Discussion and significance.

While statistically significant results were found, the analysis revealed that role did not play a large part in describing where differences in perceptions existed. More specifically, either 89% of the variance was due to chance or there were independent variables other than role that would have accounted for a greater proportion of the variance. Examples of such independent variables may include institutional size, time spent living outside the U.S., educational experience, or number of years in the field.

Additionally, alternative grouping variables such as organizational structure or type and the number of internationalization initiatives offered may have also helped account for a greater proportion of the variance.

Additionally, it is possible that the sample size for the senior international officers ($n=37$) impacted the results for RQ3. Smaller sample sizes influence the statistical significance of findings. Ultimately, however, the implication for this finding is that group type played a minor role in discerning differences in the perceptions of the elements of internationalization. The perception gaps that were identified in RQ2 exist, but participants' roles only account for a limited proportion of the variance. As previously noted, other factors may play a larger role in determining where differences among the perceptions of the elements of internationalization exist.

Research Question Four

The fourth research question centered on discerning differences in perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on institutional type (i.e., public, private, two-year, four-year). In part, this question stemmed from results from the pilot study conducted in Georgia (Poole, 2010). These results indicated there was a significant relationship when the dependent variables were grouped according to year (two-year versus four-year). In the current study, the researcher wanted to test for significant multivariate main effects on the composite scores based on institutional type (i.e., public, private, two-year, four-year). For both groupings (public versus private and two-year versus four-year), assumptions for the multivariate analyses were violated. Additionally, neither multivariate analysis of the variance produced significant results (public versus private results indicated Wilks' $\lambda = .978$, $F(5, 143) = 0.64$, $p = .67$, partial $\eta^2 = .022$

while two-year versus four-year findings showed Wilks' $\lambda = .954$, $F(5, 145) = 1.41$, $p = .22$, partial $\eta^2 = .046$).

Discussion and significance.

While the findings for this research question were not statistically significant, they are important to discuss in light of two caveats: (1) the small sample size for two-year institutions, and (2) the statistically significant results from the pilot study in Georgia (Poole, 2010). First, the small sample size of two-year institutions ($n=7$) in this research study may have impacted the researcher's ability to find differences that actually existed. The small sample size could be a result of fewer two-year institutions supporting professional memberships (and involvement) in associations like NAFSA: Association of International Educators or AIEA: Association of International Education Administrators. Regardless, with so few two-year institutions participating, it was not possible to conduct effective statistical analyses to answer the research question.

Second, the rationale for the inclusion of the fourth research question emanated from a statistically significant result found in the pilot study (Poole, 2010) in Georgia (where the dependent variables were grouped by institutional type – i.e., two-year versus four-year). However, a multivariate analysis of the variance was not conducted as a statistical procedure for the pilot study (multiple univariate analyses were). Therefore, it is conceivable that the significant results from the pilot study could have been the result of a Type I error. However, finding a significant result in Georgia based on institutional type by year could also have been a consequence of having a larger sample size (i.e., more two-year institutions participated in the Georgia study than in the current study and participation was not limited to NAFSA or AIEA members). Regardless, for the current

study, the findings from the multivariate analyses based on institutional type (public versus private and two-year versus four-year) were not significant. While this research question did not yield statistically significant results, it serves as a foundation for future research in light of the findings from the pilot study in Georgia (Poole).

Additional Findings

Beyond the original research questions for this study, the researcher was also interested in learning more about how participants defined internationalization. The hypothesis for this particular analysis was that institutions weren't defining internationalization and weren't clear about what it means for campus communities prior to operationalizing it. The researcher was interested in empirically learning more about how the people performing the work of internationalization on a daily basis would define the concept.

Additionally, the researcher sought to discover if there were significant differences in participants' responses based on geography (i.e., state). There is no empirical evidence suggesting that the southeastern U.S. is (or is not) representative of the remaining regions within the U.S. The purpose of including this particular inquiry was to help establish a baseline for future comparisons both for states within the Southeast and for comparison with other regions in the U.S. The researcher utilized descriptive statistics, Fisher's exact test, and a multivariate analysis of the variance to respond to these supplemental questions.

Defining internationalization. The confusion surrounding the definition of internationalization was discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. Part of the foundation for the current study stemmed from curiosity regarding how institutions and professionals in

international education defined internationalization. By choosing one of four options provided on the locally developed questionnaire, participants were able to select the option that most suited their own definition of internationalization. The researcher found that participants selected NAFSA: Association of International Educators' (2010) most often (45.1%, $n=79$). The next most prevalent definition chosen by the participants was from Jane Knight (1994) which was also the definition selected for the purposes of this study (23.4%, $n=41$). Additionally, the researcher did not find any significant differences in the definitions selected based on role (international educator versus senior international officer).

Discussion and significance.

Although participants selected NAFSA's definition most often, it is important to note that NAFSA's work was based heavily on Knight's (1994) constructs. The lack of significant differences in the definitions selected based on role (international educator versus senior international officer) could be a reflection of the findings from RQ3 that demonstrated that role did not play a large part in the differences in perceptions of the elements of internationalization. It is also possible that the two groups perceive the definition in the same way (i.e., the groups' perceptions don't differ on this particular question). Another potential reason could be the limited number of definitions presented on the instrument. Additionally, this finding could also have resulted from the fact that confusion regarding how to define and even implement internationalization is still prevalent today (International Association of Universities, 2012). If the participants perceived the definition of internationalization in the same way, it underscores the question of why they had different perceptions regarding the elements of

internationalization. Ultimately, this finding provided further evidence that there was a disconnect between the perceptions of internationalization surrounding foundational constructs.

Differences in perceptions based on state. The researcher wanted to further investigate potential differences that could account for variance among the dependent variables. For example, did the states within the southeastern U.S. perceive internationalization differently from one another? A one-way multivariate analysis of variance was conducted to compare the effect of state on the five dependent variables. Results were not statistically significant (Wilks' λ at the $\alpha = .05$ level, $\lambda = .760$, $F(30, 598) = 1.41$, $p = .07$, partial $\eta^2 = .053$); therefore, the researcher concluded that there were no discernible differences based on participants' state of residence.

Discussion and significance.

It is possible that the small sample size for participants from certain states played a role in this result (specifically Alabama with $n=11$ and Mississippi with $n=5$). With a smaller sample size, there is greater chance for error and fewer possibilities for generalizing results to a larger population. It is also feasible that institutions in these states have less funding to support memberships in professional associations like NAFSA: Association of International Educators or AIEA: Association of International Education Administrators. As the results indicated, there may not be differences by state other than those that occur by chance. Additionally, it is also conceivable that since the states are all in the Southeast, any potential differences could be regional instead of occurring at the individual state level. Without a basis for comparison from other regions in the U.S., discerning the implications of these findings is challenging. Future

researchers may wish to consider alternate mechanisms for increasing participation from various states as well as other regions in the U.S. in order to further explore this construct. While this particular finding was not statistically significant, it serves as a foundation for future research.

Additional Study Limitations

During the process of data collection and analysis, the researcher became aware of additional limitations beyond those previously noted in Chapter 3. These limitations included sample size and geographical limitations. Additionally, they also included concerns regarding the questionnaire password, study parameters, and institutional type as described below.

Sample Size and Geographical Limitations

The study's sample size ($n=175$) included 39 senior international officers. The sample size was representative enough to draw conclusions based on the results from the statistical analyses. However, the low response rate from senior international officers was a limitation and may have occurred for a variety of reasons. Survey fatigue could have been one cause for the response rate as well as the timing of this research project (data collection occurred during the summer months when some faculty members were not on contract and/or when staff and administrators might be travelling). Additionally, there could have been a number of individuals within the two associations who did not meet the minimum parameters for the study. For a more robust statistical analysis, alternative methods of attracting participation from senior international officers may need to be considered in the future to increase the sample size and decrease chances for error.

The study was intentionally limited geographically to the southeastern United States. Individuals from other regions of the U.S., however, contacted the researcher and indicated strong interest in participating. As a result of the study parameters (which required participants to work at an institution of higher education in the Southeast), they were not permitted to do so. Future study designs could incorporate multiple regions of the United States. Additionally, the number of study participants from some of the states was quite small (specifically Alabama had $n=11$ and Mississippi included $n=5$). Although not unanticipated by the researcher, this limitation made statistical analysis involving multiple states more challenging. For a stronger future participation rate, consideration towards alternative methods of communication and additional methods to attract more participation should be considered.

Questionnaire Password

During the course of data collection, the researcher found that several participants had a difficult time entering the correct password to be able to participate in the study. The software utilized for data collection hid the characters of any passwords entered so potential participants were unable to see what they had typed. If given an opportunity to restructure this aspect of the questionnaire design, the researcher would have selected a shorter password or eliminated it altogether.

Study Parameters

As a member of both professional associations (NAFSA and AIEA), the researcher was contacted by a number of potential participants who expressed regret that they were not eligible to participate in the study due to its parameters. The study parameters required participants to be at least eighteen years of age and work at an

institution of higher education in the southeastern United States. They also required respondents to be either senior international officers or international educators who worked with students. Additionally, for international educators, their work with students and international initiatives on their campus required a minimum of 51% of their professional time. Ultimately, the study parameters were necessary to narrow the population to groups that could be compared with each other. However, they did not permit participation from international educators and senior international officers who did not hold memberships in NAFSA or AIEA. Additionally, they focused on participants who worked with students and excluded those in the academy who worked with other areas of internationalization such as curriculum design and international research. Future designs for similar studies may want to carefully review various options and rationales for study parameters related to participation.

Institutional Type

Participants worked at a variety of institutional types. Unfortunately, the number of participants working at two-year institutions was quite low ($n=7$). This limitation made statistical analysis involving institutional type (two-year versus four-year) very challenging. An important caveat to mention is that this questionnaire was disseminated during some of the worst economic times the U.S. has seen in decades. It is possible that two-year institutions were not able to support professional memberships in NAFSA: Association of International Educators or in AIEA: Association of International Education Administrators. With already limited resources that continue to shrink, it is also possible that two-year institutions may not be able to allocate resources towards internationalization. To further explore these constructs, future studies should consider

mechanisms for increasing participation from two-year institutions or conduct a study that focuses solely on two-year institutions.

Implications for Practice

Internationalization is a vital construct for higher education in the twenty-first century. This study suggests that institutions of higher education in the southeastern U.S. have implemented internationalization without first delineating or communicating core paradigms (e.g., clearly defined goals, common terminology, and shared institutional priorities). The findings also demonstrated discrepancies in terms of the perceptions surrounding the strength of internationalization initiatives. As noted previously in this chapter, the findings also provided evidence that international educators and senior international officers in the Southeast defined internationalization in similar ways, but differed in their perceptions regarding the elements of internationalization. The findings indicated that perceptions regarding foundational concepts including the perceived strength of campus internationalization, clear goals, common terminology, and institutional priorities were not the same. The significance of these findings indicates a dearth of communication among the people doing the daily work of internationalization. This section further outlines the implications of these findings.

Foundational Constructs

Implications for practice include that southeastern colleges and universities need to refine and communicate foundational constructs in order to achieve effective internationalization. How can internationalization goals be reached and how can institutions educate their students within the milieu of today's globally interdependent world (Hser, 2005; NASULGC, 2007) if they don't have a shared paradigm for

internationalization? In lieu of continuing to operationalize internationalization initiatives, institutions of higher education in the Southeast must first define the construct for their own campuses. They must also agree upon a shared terminology, and then work to create goals and institutional priorities that are achievable, efficient, effective, and communicated well. Accomplishing these objectives will strengthen the internationalization component within institutions of higher education and help educate globally competent students (Hser, 2005; Reimers, 2009).

An Integrated Approach

In terms of practice, campus leaders also need to work with a variety of staff, faculty, administrators, and students to form a collective, integrated approach to internationalization. Doing so allows for growth, a common understanding and terminology, and buy-in from on-campus constituents for a mutual vision for campus internationalization. Moving forward in this way will permit institutions of higher education in the Southeast to strengthen internationalization by being able to articulate clear goals that are well defined. It will also help them establish institutional priorities that are shared at multiple levels of the campus community. Additionally, using this strategy will help southeastern institutions better articulate what internationalization is, understand how best to achieve it, and effectively measure success from one collective platform at the institutional level.

Gray Literature versus Empirical Research

Much of the literature regarding the internationalization of U.S. higher education is “gray” (J. Knight, personal communication, May 24, 2011) or outside the mainstream of published journal and monograph literature (University of Texas Libraries, n.d.). Gray

literature can include conference papers, research reports, policy statements, standards, newsletters, magazines, newspapers, brochures, fact sheets, or annual reports (American Psychological Association, n.d.; University of Texas Libraries). Gray literature is often difficult to find and does not offer empirical evidence found in peer-reviewed journals (American Psychological Association).

Gray literature alone is not enough. To understand the internationalization of U.S. higher education, empirical research must be conducted. The current study was a first step towards creating a research-based foundation for understanding perspectives of internationalization of U.S. higher education. Additionally, the overall implication for this study is that it served as a mechanism for establishing a baseline for empirical research regarding perceptions of internationalization on college and university campuses in the U.S.

Clarifying Internationalization

In light of diminishing resources at the federal, state, and institutional levels (Green & Ferguson, 2011), understanding perceptions of international educators and senior international officers provides a clearer picture about whether or not campus internationalization goals are actually being understood and achieved. If campus internationalization is to be successfully integrated into the fabric of institutional culture, it needs to be clearly defined with common terminology at the institutional level. An important first step towards creating an institutional culture that values and supports internationalization also includes articulating and communicating the goals and institutional priorities for internationalization in a systematic and structured manner.

The involvement of international educators along with the expertise of senior international officers in constructing campus internationalization strategies would provide much needed support and buy-in from all levels within a college or university setting. Ultimately, the work of campus internationalization can progress with greater clarity, productivity, and intentionality as a result of having a common terminology and clearly defined foundational constructs including goals and shared institutional priorities. Campuses in the southeastern United States need to determine their level of commitment to internationalization by clarifying their definition, vision, mission, goals, and strategic plans surrounding campus internationalization (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008; Hser, 2005; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2006). This clarity will afford professionals at all levels the ability to participate in the process of creating campuses where internationalization is synergistic as well as actively promoted and supported.

Perceptions and Campus Narratives Surrounding Internationalization

An important caveat is that it is possible that the results of this study do not reflect the entire narrative behind campus internationalization in the southeastern United States. With that in mind, however, the purpose of this study was not to find out what types of internationalization programs, services, or initiatives existed in the southeastern United States. Instead, the purpose was to explore the perceptions of international educators and senior international administrators regarding their campuses' internationalization efforts.

Perceptions play an essential role in how individuals perceive the world around them, including their daily work as well as their ability and motivation to be effective as professionals. Finding gaps in the perceptions of how international educators and senior international officers view the strength of their campus internationalization initiatives

signify deeper, more systemic issues. Additionally, the discrepancies in perspective found in both the first and second research questions are indicative of the lack of clarity concerning institutional priorities and goals. It is clear that there are differences of opinion regarding a variety of issues surrounding internationalization. As a result, if the professionals conducting the daily work of internationalization are in doubt about institutional goals, the question of how they can be effective remains. Continuing to explore what gaps may exist (Olson, 2005) and researching underlying causes will permit international educators and senior international officers to work through confusion and discord to strengthen and provide synergy for internationalization on college and university campuses in the U.S.

Understanding Internationalization through Multiple Constructs

Ultimately, internationalization is a vital part of higher education in the U.S. and around the world. It is a mechanism for helping today's students become global citizens who are equipped to work in an interconnected global economy and compete effectively after graduation. As outlined in Chapters 1 and 2, internationalization is a broad construct with a variety of meanings, constructs, and caveats (Arum, & van de Water, 1992; Knight, 1999; Zolfaghari, Sabran, & Zolfaghari, 2009). Understanding the perceptions surrounding internationalization is a starting point for uncovering mechanisms to clarify what internationalization means and how best to implement it on college and university campuses in the U.S.

Clarity surrounding internationalization stems from campus strategies that ensure constituents have a shared vision that both enables and promotes working together toward achieving clearly defined goals and collective institutional priorities. Additionally,

understanding how internationalization is perceived helps institutions better define this paradigm. Ultimately, defining internationalization and establishing common terminology for the entire campus is a vital first step in establishing clear goals and institutional priorities that are readily identifiable to both on and off campus constituents.

Recommendations for Future Research

As noted in previous sections of this chapter, this study provided a foundation for empirical research regarding perceptions surrounding the internationalization of higher education. It also serves as a springboard for further exploration of the internationalization of U.S. higher education. Recommendations for future research are described in further detail in this section.

As noted in Chapter 2, this study was limited to the service function of Jane Knight's (1994) definition of internationalization. The internationalization of higher education is not limited solely to the service function within Knight's definition. Additional research could focus on the other aspects of her definition including the teaching and research functions of internationalization. The work of internationalization is carried out by both researchers and faculty on many campuses across the U.S. Focusing future research on the teaching and research aspects of internationalization would facilitate a broader understanding of this paradigm for today's college and university campuses in the U.S.

Future studies could also consider expanding the scope of the participants beyond the two professional associations used in the current study as one way of generating a larger, more diverse sample. Differences that may exist (e.g., in institutional type) may not have been discernible due to a potential lack of diversity in the study's sample.

Future researchers may seek to recruit a broader range of participants that better reflects perspectives from multiple institutional types and multiple professional organizations.

Future researchers may also wish to conduct a detailed psychometric analysis of the locally designed questionnaire including a full factor analysis. Moreover, using the current instrument to gather data from other regions of the United States would be useful. Gathering this information would help expand (and eventually permit the comparison of) the baseline findings from the current study with other regions of the U.S.

In RQ3, only two groups were utilized in the multivariate analysis of the variance which prevented the ability to conduct post-hoc tests on statistically significant results. Future studies could break the study participants into more than two groups in order to discern potential differences that may exist (e.g., international educators, directors, and senior international officers or group the participants according to number of years worked in the field). Additionally, exploring differences in institutional size, gender, citizenship, race, amount of time spent living outside the U.S., or educational experience, are also areas for future research. These alternative grouping variables may help future researchers account for a greater proportion of the variance among the dependent variables.

Finally, as presented in Chapter 1, an increasing number of practitioners and scholars have begun questioning current developments in internationalization (International Association of Universities, 2012). A research agenda that explores the concept and definition of internationalization and shared understandings surrounding internationalization, as well as whether or not internationalization has retained its central purposes, would also be fitting (International Association of Universities).

Final Conclusions

For this study, the researcher surveyed international educators and senior international officers who were members of two professional associations (NAFSA: Association of International Educators and AIEA: Association of International Education Administrators). Study participants provided the researcher with critical information used to better understand perceptions surrounding campus internationalization. The purpose of this study was to explore the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers within the southeastern United States regarding on-campus internationalization initiatives. Specifically, the research questions for the current study included discovering: (1) the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers in the Southeast regarding the strength of their campus' internationalization initiatives; (2) to what extent professionals in international education in the Southeast perceived the presence of the elements of internationalization at their current institutions; (3) differences in perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on group type (international educators versus senior international officers); and (4) differences in perceptions of the elements of internationalization based on institutional type (i.e., public, private, two-year, four-year).

The current study contributed to the body of literature surrounding internationalization by providing an empirical baseline regarding the perceptions of international educators in the southeastern U.S. regarding campus internationalization. In essence, this study provided a foundation for future research by presenting empirical evidence of gaps and differences in perceptions regarding the elements of internationalization. This study was a baseline that can be used in the future as a starting

point for conducting similar studies in other regions of the U.S. to better understand the internationalization paradigm.

Additionally, the current study serves as a foundation for understanding what perceptions are present among international educators and senior international officers regarding the internationalization of college and university campuses. The results from this study prove empirically that gaps exist. Further research can work to identify what those gaps are and how to respond appropriately. The findings also demonstrate that core components of campus internationalization either have not been established or are not being communicated. College and university campuses can use this information to assess their own campus climates to identify specific discrepancies and create structures that will strengthen internationalization paradigms. Additionally, the current study can be used as a basis for comparison once other regions in the U.S. have been studied.

Understanding perceptions related to campus internationalization provided insight into how the construct of internationalization was actually perceived by international educators and senior international officers. Knowing more about the perceptions of the people performing the work could lead to greater clarity when creating and implementing strategies related to campus internationalization. International educators and senior international officers alike may utilize the findings from this study to identify topics and concepts that need to be more clearly defined, discussed, and communicated. Additionally, they may use this study to begin the process of creating a shared vision regarding campus internationalization. This shared vision would allow international educators at all levels to craft a definition and common terminology for internationalization in conjunction with senior international officers. This combined

effort would establish a synergy for internationalization that would be relevant and would help define and organize daily operations surrounding this paradigm.

International initiatives on college campuses in the U.S. are often designed to prepare students for international experiences that will help them become marketable global citizens (Hser, 2005). To help today's students succeed in an interconnected, global workforce (McMurtrie & Wheeler, 2008), internationalization is a vital priority for U.S. institutions of higher education (Altbach & Peterson, 1998; Arum & van de Water, 1992; Burn, 1980; Hazelkorn, 2008; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005). Disregarding internationalization places graduates at a disadvantage (Kehm & Teichler, 2007) where they are less prepared than counterparts from other nations to thrive in the complex global marketplace (Reimers, 2009). Before implementing policies and programs focused on internationalization, however, it is essential to understand the perceptions of the people who work most closely with internationalization initiatives. This understanding enables colleges and universities to construct a systematic and comprehensive approach to campus internationalization. It also maximizes internationalization opportunities for institutions of higher education in the Southeast and beyond.

Internationalization is a complex, multifaceted construct that is prevalent in institutions of higher education around the world. As indicated in the literature review and study results, many institutions of higher education in the U.S. have operationalized internationalization without first cementing foundational constructs such as common terminology, institutional priorities, and clearly defined goals. Without a shared understanding, institutions of higher education will continue to experience challenges

related to the effectiveness of their internationalization initiatives and strategies.

Ultimately, internationalization in the United States must continue to be strengthened on college and university campuses as professionals and administrators at multiple levels strive to create and maintain a shared vision for their campuses.

The current research study was a preliminary step towards quantifying perceptions surrounding the presence of the elements of internationalization. The findings from this study demonstrated that there is a perception that institutions of higher education may have adopted internationalization on their campuses without clearly outlining foundational constructs. Additionally, the results supported the literature surrounding the internationalization of higher education in terms of gaps in perception, if not reality (Olson, 2005). By studying how international educators and senior international officers in the southeastern U.S. perceived their campus internationalization efforts, this research study added to the body of literature on campus internationalization. Additionally, it provided an understanding of the mindsets of professionals who implement campus internationalization on a daily basis. Finding evidence that gaps in perceptions exist and discovering that these gaps are related to fundamental constructs such as terminology, clearly defined goals, and shared institutional priorities raises questions regarding the effectiveness of internationalization initiatives and strategies. Learning that the mindset of international educators and senior international officers also includes different perceptions regarding the strength of internationalization is indicative of deeper, systemic problems including a failure to define foundational constructs and communicate them effectively.

Results from this study have the potential to impact practice on college and university campuses throughout the Southeast as well as other regions of the United States. The study findings may also influence how future scholars conceptualize researching the internationalization of U.S. higher education, including a paradigm shift away from quantifying existing initiatives. A critical recommendation for institutions of higher education is to define internationalization, create a basis for common terminology, clearly articulate internationalization goals and institutional priorities prior to implementing initiatives. Furthermore, greater attention and focus should be directed toward exploring foundational constructs such as defining what internationalization means and how best to implement it on college and university campuses in the United States. Ultimately, the work of internationalizing U.S. higher education is vital and ongoing. Utilizing results from studies such as this one provides practitioners with a foundation for understanding, formulating, and enacting a cohesive strategy that will strengthen campus internationalization at institutions of higher education in the southeastern U.S. and beyond.

REFERENCES

- AcaStat Software. (2012). Chi-square test of independence. Retrieved from <http://www.acastat.com/Statbook/chisq2.htm>
- AIEA: Association of International Education Administrators (n.d.). AIEA: Leaders in International Higher Education. Retrieved from <http://www.aieaworld.org>
- Altbach, P. G. (2008). Globalization and forces for change in higher education. *International Higher Education*, 50. Retrieved from https://htmldbprod.bc.edu/pls/htmldb/f?p=2290:4:0::NO:RP,4:P0_CONTENT_ID:101286
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 290-305. doi:10.1177/1028315307303542
- Altbach, P., & Peterson, P. (1998). Internationalize American higher education? Not exactly. *Change*, 30(4), 36.
- American Council on Education (1995). *Educating Americans for a world in flux: Ten ground rules for internationalizing higher education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Council on Education (2009). *ACE: International Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Intl&Template=/TaggedPage/TaggedPageDisplay.cfm&TPLID=73&ContentID=12348>
- American Council on Education (2011). *Strength through global leadership and engagement: U.S. higher education in the 21st century*. Washington, DC: Author.

- American Psychological Association. (n.d.). Frequently asked questions about PsycEXTRA: What is “gray” literature? Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/pubs/databases/psycextra/faq.aspx>
- Andrade, M. S. (2006). International students in English-speaking universities: Adjustment factors. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 5, 131-154. doi:10.1177/1475240906065589
- Arum, S., & van de Water, J. (1992). The need for a definition of international education in U.S. universities. In C. B. Klasek, B. J. Garavalia, & K. J. Kellerman (Eds.), *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education* (pp. 191-203). Carbondale, IL: Association of International Education Administrators.
- AIEA: Association of International Education Administrators (n.d.). *AIEA: Leaders in international higher education*. Retrieved from <http://aieaworld.org>
- Bhattacharya, K. (2005). *Border crossings and imagined-nations: A case study of socio-cultural negotiations of two female Indian graduate students in the U.S.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://www.galileo.usg.edu/express?link=getd&parms=query%3Did%3Auga_bhattacharya_kakali_200508_phd
- Bostrom, C. A. (2010). Diffusion of internationalization in Turkish higher education. *Journal of Studies in international education* 14(2), 143-160. doi:10.1177/1028315309332028
- Bradburn, N., Sudman, S., & Wansink, B. (2004). *Asking questions: The definitive guide to questionnaire design – for market research, political polls, and social and health questionnaires* (Rev. ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey–Bass.

- Brewer, D. J., Gates, S. M., & Goldman, C. A. (2002). *In pursuit of prestige: Strategy and competition in U.S. Higher Education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Burn, B. B. (1980). *Expanding the international dimension of higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Burnett, S., & Huisman, J. (2009). Canadian universities' strategies for internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 57. Retrieved from https://htmlprod.bc.edu/pls/htmlprod/f?p=2290:4:0::NO:RP,4:P0_CONTENT_ID:101192
- Callan, H. (2000). The international vision in practice: A decade of evolution. *Higher Education in Europe*, XXV(1), 15-23.
- Carnoy, M. (2000). Globalization and educational reform. In N. P. Stromquist, & K. Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures* (pp. 43-61). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Chisholm, L. A. (2003). Partnerships for international service-learning. In *Building partnerships for service-learning* (pp. 259-288). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*. 16, 297-334.
- The Chronicle of Higher Education* (2009, November 18). Obama pledges to send 100,000 students to China in the next 4 years. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/blogPost/Obama-Pledges-to-Send-1000/8903>

- Clason, D. L., & Dormoody, T. J., (2000). Analyzing data measured by individual Likert-type items. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 35(4), 31– 35. Retrieved from <http://pubs.aged.tamu.edu/jae/pdf/vol35/35-04-31.pdf>
- Council on Foreign Relations. (2012). *U.S. education reform and national security* (Independent Task Force Report No. 68). New York, NY: Author.
- Davies, J. L. (1992). Developing a strategy for internationalization in universities: Towards a conceptual framework. In C. B. Klasek, B. J. Garavalia, & K. J. Kellerman (Eds.), *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education* (pp. 1-21). Carbondale, IL: Association of International Education Administrators.
- DeCoster, J. (1998). *Overview of Factor Analysis*. Retrieved from <http://www.stat-help.com/notes.html>
- de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- de Wit, H., & Knight, J. (Eds.). (1999). *Quality and internationalization in higher education*. Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Dewey, P., & Duff, S. (2009). Reason before passion: Faculty views on internationalization in higher education. *Higher Education*, 58, 491-504.
doi:10.1007/s10734-009-9207-z

- Douglass, J., Edelstein, R., & Hoareau, C. (2011, April 30). *U.S. higher education as an export: It is about the money, but also much more*. Retrieved from http://cshe.berkeley.edu/research/rugg/Brief_US_HE_Exports.4.30.2011.pdf
- Drew, C. J., Hardman, M. L., & Hosp, J. L. (2008). *Designing and conducting research in education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- 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. doi:10.1177/1028315307303920
- El-Khawas, E. (1996). Student diversity on today's campuses. In S.R. Komives & D. B. Woodard, Jr., *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (3rd ed., pp. 64-80). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Field, A. P. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2nd ed.). London, England: Sage Publishers.
- Fischer, K. (2007, November 2). 'Flat world' lessons for real-world students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Flat-World-Lessons-for-Re/18442/>
- Fischer, K. (2008, February 21). Colleges may face challenges in realizing greater internationalization. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Colleges-May-Face-Challenge/527/>
- Friedman, T. L. (2005, April 3). It's a flat world, after all. *The New York Times Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/04/03/magazine/03DOMINANCE.html>

- Friedman, T. L. (2007). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Gliem, J. A., & Gliem, R. R. (2003). *Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Likert-type scales*. Paper presented at the Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education, Columbus, OH.
- Goncalves, M. V. A. (2009). *A study of how the student and exchange visa information system influences the influx and study of graduation international students in science and engineering in the U.S.* Boston University. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304845391?accountid=14537>
- Goodwin, C. D., & Nacht, M. (1991). *Missing the boat: The failure to internationalize American higher education*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Green, M. F. (2012, April 15). Universities must be clear and honest about internationalisation. *University World News*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=2012041114440954>
- Green, M., & Ferguson, A. (2011, June). Internationalisation of U.S. higher education in a time of declining resources. Retrieved from <https://www.aei.gov.au/International-network/northamerica/PolicyUpdates-USA/Documents/Internationalisation%20of%20US%20Higher%20Education%20in%20a%20Time%20of%20Declining%20Resources.pdf>
- Green, M. F., & Ferguson, A. (2012). U.S. internationalization faces the recession. *International Higher Education*, 66, 12-14.

- Green, M. F., Luu, D., & Burris, B. (2008). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: 2008 edition*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Green, M. F., & Olson, C. (2003). *Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Grice, J. W., & Iwasaki, M. (2007). A truly multivariate approach to MANOVA. *Applied Multivariate Research* 12 (3), 199-226.
- Hartman, D., & Rola, G. (2000). Going global with service learning. *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum*, 11 (1), 15-24.
- Hanassab, S., & Tidwell, R. (2002). International students in higher education: Identification of needs and implications for policy and practice. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6, 305-322. doi:10.1177/102831502237638
- Hazelkorn, E. (2008). Globalization, internationalization and rankings. *International Higher Education*, 53, 8-10. Retrieved from https://htmlbprod.bc.edu/pls/htmlb/f?p=2290:4:0::NO:RP,4:P0_CONTENT_ID:110274
- Healy, N. M. (n.d.). The internationalization of higher education: Myths and realities [PDF document]. Retrieved from British Council Online Website: http://www.britishcouncil.org/goingglobal-2_-4a_-nigel_healey.pdf
- Hellstén, M. (n.d.). *Students in transition: Needs and experiences of international students in Australia*. Paper presented at the proceedings from 16th Australian International Education Conference: Hobart, Tasmania: Australia. Retrieved from www.aiec.idp.com/pdf/Hellsten_p.pdf

- 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
- Hser, M. P. (2005). Campus internationalization: A study of American universities' internationalization efforts. *International Education* 35(1), 35-48.
- Huberty, C. J., & Olejnik, S. (2006). *Applied MANOVA and discriminant analysis* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Hudzik, J. K. (2011). Comprehensive internationalization: From concept to action. Retrieved from <http://www.nafsa.org/resourcelibrary/Default.aspx?id=24045>
- Ikegulu, T. N. (1999). *Multicultural and globalized education: International students' perspective*. Grambling, LA: Grambling State University, Department of Educational Leadership, College of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED442417)
- International Association of Universities. (2009, September). Initial results: 2009 IAU global survey on internationalization of higher education. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/iau/internationalization/pdf/Key_results_2009.pdf
- International Association of Universities. (2011). *International Association of Universities*. Retrieved from <http://www.iau-aiu.net/>
- International Association of Universities. (2012). *International Association of Universities: Re-thinking internationalization*. Retrieved from <http://www.iau-aiu.net/content/re-thinking-internationalization>
- Institute of International Education. (2012). *Institute of International Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors>

Jackson, J. (2008). Globalization, internationalization, and short-term stays abroad.

International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 32, 349-358.

Jiang, X. (2008). Towards the internationalization of higher education from a critical perspective. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 32(4), 347-358.

doi:10.1080/03098770802395561

Kälvermark, T., & van der Wende, M. C. (1997). *National policies for*

internationalisation of higher education in Europe. Stockholm: National Agency for Higher Education. Retrieved from

http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/17/a4/e6.pdf

Kehm, B. M., & Teichler, U. (2007). Research on internationalisation in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 260-273.

doi:10.1177/1028315307303534

Kerr, C. (1980). Global education concerns of higher education for the 1980s and beyond. In B. Burns, *Expanding the international dimension of higher education* (pp. xvii-xxxix). San Francisco, CA: Jossey – Bass.

Kerr, C. K. (2001). *The uses of the university* (5th ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kim, Y. (2007). Difficulties in quality doctoral academic advising: Experiences of Korean students. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 6(2), 171-193.

doi:10.1177/1475240907078613

Knight, J. (1994). *Internationalization: Elements and checkpoints* (Research Monograph, No. 7). Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.

- Knight, J. (1997). A shared vision? Stakeholders perspective on the internationalization of higher education in Canada. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 1(1), 27-44. doi:10.1177/102831539700100105
- Knight, J. (1999). Internationalisation of higher education. In H. de Wit, & J. Knight (Eds.), *Quality and internationalization in higher education* (pp. 13-28). Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Knight, J. (2003). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 33, 2-3. Retrieved from https://htmldbprod.bc.edu/pls/htmldb/f?p=2290:4:0::NO:RP,4:P0_CONTENT_ID:99928
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.
- Knight, J., & de Wit, H. (1995). Strategies for internationalisation of higher education: Historical and conceptual perspectives. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Strategies for internationalisation of higher education. A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States* (pp. 5-32). Amsterdam: European Association for International Education. .
- Koch. K. (2008). Internationalization on US campuses: Slipping backward? *International Higher Education*, 53, 10-11. Retrieved from https://htmldbprod.bc.edu/pls/htmldb/f?p=2290:4:0::NO:RP,4:P0_CONTENT_ID:110276

Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., & Whitt, E. J. (2010). *Student success in college:*

Creating conditions that matter. San Francisco, CA: Wiley, John & Sons,

Incorporated.

Labi, A. (2009, September 20). Priorities in internationalization shift from research to

preparing students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from

<http://chronicle.com/article/Internationalizations-Focu/48530/>

Laerd Statistics (2012). One-way MANOVA using SPSS. Retrieved from

<https://statistics.laerd.com/spss-tutorials/one-way-manova-using-spss-statistics.php>

Lawrence, J. H. (2004). Internationalization of higher education in the United States of

America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis (review).

The Review of Higher Education, 27(2), 281-282. doi:10.1353/rhe.2003.0065

Love, P. G., & Estanek, S. M. (2004a). *Rethinking student affairs practice*. San

Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Love, P. G., & Estanek, S. M. (2004b). Adopting a global perspective. In *Rethinking*

student affairs practice (pp. 173-186). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mamahlodi, M. (2006, March 5). *What is the chi-square statistic?* Retrieved from

<http://cnx.org/content/m13487/1.2/>

Marmolejo, F. (2010, October 22). Internationalization of higher education: The good,

the bad, and the unexpected. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from

<http://chronicle.com/blogs/worldwise/internationalization-of-higher-education-the-good-the-bad-and-the-unexpected/27512>

- McDonald, J. H. (2009). *Handbook of biological statistics* (2nd ed.). Baltimore, MD: Sparky House Publishing.
- McMurtrie, B. (2010, February 15). U.S. officials assure international educators that Obama shares their goals. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/US-Officials-Assure/64212/>
- McMurtrie, B., & Wheeler, D. (2008, November 21). Leaders urge colleges to think globally despite economic crisis. [Electronic version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(13), p. A25.
- Meyers, L.S., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A. (2006). *Applied multivariate research: Design and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.
- Mills, A. (2009, June 4). Obama pledges increase in student exchange with Muslim world. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Obama-Pledges-Increase-in-S/47691>
- Moore, L., & Popadiuk, N. (2011). Positive aspects of international student transitions: A quantitative inquiry. *Journal of College Student Development* 52(3), 291-306.
- Mtika, J. M. (2009). *Common themes, challenges, issues, and aspirations of international students pursuing doctoral degrees in education at a midwestern university*. University of South Dakota. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304996413?accountid=14537>
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators (n.d.). *NAFSA: Association of International Educators*. Retrieved from <http://www.nafsa.org>
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2012). Economic impact statements. Retrieved from

[http://www.nafsa.org/Explore International Education/Impact/Data And Statistics/
cs/International Education Data Statistics/](http://www.nafsa.org/Explore_International_Education/Impact/Data_And_Statistics/International_Education_Data_Statistics/)

NASULGC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (2007).

A national action agenda for internationalizing higher education. Retrieved from Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU) website:

<http://www.aplu.org/NetCommunity/Document.Doc?id=471>

Neill, J. (2008). *Writing up a factor analysis* [PDF document]. Retrieved from

[http://www.bwgriffin.com/gsu/courses/edur9131/content/Neill2008_WritingUpA
FactorAnalysis.pdf](http://www.bwgriffin.com/gsu/courses/edur9131/content/Neill2008_WritingUpAFactorAnalysis.pdf)

Olson, C. (2005). Comprehensive internationalization: From principles to practice.

Journal of Public Affairs, 8, 51-74.

Olson, C. L., Green, M. F., & Hill, B. A. (2005). *Building a strategic framework for comprehensive internationalization*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Olson, C. L., Green, M. F., & Hill, B. A. (2006). *A handbook for advancing comprehensive internationalization: What institutions can do and what students should learn*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Open doors 2010 fast facts. (2010). Retrieved from [http://www.iie.org/en/research-and-
publications/~media/Files/Corporate/Open-Doors/Fast-
Facts/Fast%20Facts%202010.ashx](http://www.iie.org/en/research-and-publications/~media/Files/Corporate/Open-Doors/Fast-Facts/Fast%20Facts%202010.ashx)

Open doors 2011 fast facts. (2011). Retrieved from [http://www.iie.org/Research-and-
Publications/Open-Doors/Data/Fast-Facts](http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors/Data/Fast-Facts)

- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Centre for Educational Research and Innovation. (1994). *Curriculum development for internationalisation: Guidelines for country case studies*. Paris, France: CERI/IEA.
- Ory, J.C. (1994). Suggestions for deciding between commercially and locally developed assessment instruments. In J.S. Stark and A. Thomas (Eds.), *Assessment and Program Evaluation*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Poole, L. A. (2010). *The internationalization of U.S. higher education: Perceptions of international educators within the state of Georgia*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Educational Counseling and Human Development, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.
- Popadiuk, N., & Arthur, N. (2004). Counseling international students in Canadian schools. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 26(2), 125-145.
- Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education*, 1(2), 248-270.
- Rahman, T., & Kopp, L. (1992). Administration of international education. In C. B. Klasek, B. J. Garavalia, & K. J. Kellerman (Eds.), *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education* (pp. 1-21). Carbondale, IL: Association of International Education Administrators.
- Rattray, J., & Jones, M. C. (2007). Essential elements of questionnaire design and development. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 16, 234-243. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2702.2006.01573.x

Reimers, F. (2009, January 30). 'Global competency' is imperative for global success.

The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved from

<http://chronicle.com/article/Global-Competency-Is/9742/>

Rubin, K. (2009, Sept/Oct). Globalizing general education. *International Educator*,

XVIII(5), 20-29.

Rudzki, R. E. J., (1995). The application of a strategic management model to the

internationalization of higher education institutions. *Higher Education* 29(4), 421-

221. doi:10.1007/BF01383961

Santos, J. R. A. (1999). Cronbach's alpha: A tool for assessing the reliability of scales.

Journal of Extension, 37(2). Retrieved from

<http://www.joe.org/joe/1999april/tt3.php>

Sawir, E., Marginson, S., Deumert, A., Nyland, C., & Ramia, G. (2008). Loneliness and

international students: An Australian study. *Journal of Studies in International*

Education, 12(2), 148-180. doi:10.1177/1028315307299699

Schuh, J.H., & Upcraft, M.L. (2001). *Assessment practice in student affairs: An*

applications manual. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shenoy, A. (n.d.). International students: The global commerce of higher education. In

Gale Encyclopedia of Education online. Retrieved from

<http://www.answers.com/topic/international-students-the-global-commerce-of-higher-education>

Shutina, R. (2008). An investigation of the role that the nation's six major higher-

education associations have played in the internationalization of American higher

education during the last decade (1996-2006). (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio.

Siaya, L. M., & Hayward, F. M. (2003). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: Final report*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

SISA Simple Interactive Statistical Analysis, (n.d.). Retrieved from
<http://www.quantitativeskills.com/sisa/>

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. (2011).
 Executive summaries of quality enhancement plans. Retrieved from
<http://www.sacscoc.org/index.asp>

SPSS FAQ: What does Cronbach's alpha mean? (n.d.). UCLA: Academic Technology
 Services, Statistical Consulting Group. Retrieved from
<http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/spss/faq/alpha.html>

Stewart, V. (2005). A world transformed: How other countries are preparing students for
 the interconnected world of the 21st century. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 87(3), 229-232.

Stromquist, N. P. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical
 shifts in university environments. *Higher Education*, 53, 81-105.
 doi:10.1007/s10734-005-1975-5

Stromquist, N. P., & Monkman, K. (2000). Defining globalization and assessing its
 implications on knowledge and education. In N. P. Stromquist, & K. Monkman
 (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures*
 (pp. 3-25). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Suskie, L.A. (1996). *Questionnaire survey research: What works* (2nd ed.). Tallahassee,
 FL: Association for Institutional Research.

- Tabor, A. J. (2008). *It's not just a database: SEVIS, the federal monitoring of international graduate students post 9/11*. University of Kentucky. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304550661?accountid=14537>
- Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53-55. doi:10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd
- Teichler, U. (2004). The changing debate on internationalisation of higher education. *Higher Education*, 48, 5-26.
- UCLA Academic Technology Services, Statistical Consulting Group. (n.d.). What statistical analysis should I use? Statistical analyses using SPSS. Retrieved from http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/mult_pkg/whatstat/default.htm
- University of Texas Libraries. (n.d.). Locating gray literature: Conferences, technical reports. Retrieved from <http://www.lib.utexas.edu/chem/info/gray.html>
- Urdan, T. C. (2005). *Statistics in plain English* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.
- U.S. Department of State: Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. (n.d.). *National security language initiative*. Retrieved from <http://exchanges.state.gov/nsli.html>
- Vaughan, J. (2007, June 29). *International students and visiting scholars: Trends, barriers, and implications for American universities and U.S. foreign policy*. Washington, DC: Center for Immigration Studies. Retrieved from <http://www.cis.org/node/586>
- Vestal, T. M. (1994). *International education: Its history and promise for today*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

- Wapner, S. & Demick, J. (2000). Person-in-environment psychology: A holistic, developmental, systems oriented perspective. In W.B. Walsh, K.H. Craik & R.H. Price (Eds.), *Person-environment psychology: New directions and perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 25-59). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Whitsed, C., & Wright, P. (2011). Perspectives from within: Adjunct, foreign, English-language teachers in the internationalization of Japanese universities. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 10(1), 28-45.
doi:10.1177/1475240910396332
- Wofford College. (2011, November 16). Wofford ranks among leaders in nation for study abroad. Retrieved from <http://www.wofford.edu/newsroom/wofford-ranks-among-leaders-in-nation-for-study-abroad/>
- Wood, M., & Kia, P. (2000). International student affairs. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2000(111), 55–64. doi:10.1002/he.11106
- Woolley, J. T., & Peters, G. (n.d.). *The American Presidency Project* [online]. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=27262>
- Zolfaghari, A., Sabran, M. S., & Zolfaghari, A. (2009). Internationalization of higher education: Challenges, strategies, policies, and programs. *US-China Education Review*, 6(5), 1-9. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED505713&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED505713

APPENDIX A

EMAIL INVITATION TO POTENTIAL STUDY PARTICIPANTS FROM

NAFSA REGION VII AND AIEA

Dear NAFSA/AIEA Members:

My name is Leigh Poole and as a graduate student at The University of Georgia, I would like to invite you to participate in a doctoral dissertation study entitled *Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education: Perceptions of International Educators and Senior International Officers within the Southeastern United States*.

The purpose of this study is to research the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers within the southeastern United States regarding on-campus internationalization initiatives.

Your participation would involve completing a brief questionnaire and should take no more than 20 minutes.

Please note that this request is being sent to both the NAFSA Region VII and AIEA listservs. While permission to seek participants from both associations has been granted, please note that this study is not being conducted by either AIEA or NAFSA. **Individuals choosing to participate should only complete the questionnaire once.**

Additionally, study participants from the southeastern U.S. will be eligible for an incentive that includes a drawing in which each participant has equal chance of receiving the incentive (one of three \$100 Visa gift cards). Participation in the research is not required in order to enter the drawing. Individuals who elect not to participate in the study but wish to enter the study's random drawing should send their name, email address, complete mailing address, and contact phone number to Leigh Poole via email at study.incentive.only@gmail.com.

To participate, please click the link below **AND** enter the password as prompted. You will be directed to a consent form that outlines your rights as a participant.

STUDY LINK: [Insert Link Here]

Study participants should meet the following criteria: (1) Be at least eighteen years of age; (2) Work at an institution of higher education and/or postsecondary education in the southeastern U.S. (i.e., Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, or Tennessee); (3) Serve as either the senior international officer for their campus **OR** as an international educator who works with students at your institution; and

(4) Spend more than half (i.e., 51% or more) of your time on international programs, services, projects, or initiatives

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration. It is my hope that the results from this study will contribute to both international education and the internationalization of U.S. higher education. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

This study is being conducted to fulfill the requirements for a Ph.D. and is under the direction of Dr. Merrily Dunn, Associate Professor, Department of Counseling and Human Development at The University of Georgia. She can be reached via email at merrily@uga.edu.

Sincerely,

Leigh Poole
Doctoral Candidate in Student Affairs Administration
University of Georgia
lapoole@uga.edu
706-542-5867

APPENDIX B

REMINDER EMAILS TO TO POTENTIAL STUDY PARTICIPANTS FROM
NAFSA REGION VII AND AIEA

Dear NAFSA/AIEA Members:

My name is Leigh Poole. As a graduate student at The University of Georgia, I would like remind you about a request for your participation in a doctoral dissertation study entitled *Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education: Perceptions of International Educators and Senior International Officers within the Southeastern United States*.

Study participants from the southeastern U.S. will be eligible for an incentive that includes a drawing in which each participant has equal chance of receiving the incentive (one of three \$100 Visa gift cards). Participation in the research is not required in order to enter the drawing. Individuals who elect not to participate in the study but wish to enter the study's random drawing should send their name, email address, complete mailing address, and contact phone number to Leigh Poole via email at study.incentive.only@gmail.com.

The purpose of this study is to research the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers within the southeastern United States regarding on-campus internationalization initiatives.

As a reminder, **participation would involve completing a brief questionnaire and should take no more than 20 minutes.**

Please note that this request has been sent to both the NAFSA Region VII and AIEA listservs. While permission to seek participants from both associations has been granted, please note that this study is not being conducted by either AIEA or NAFSA. **Individuals choosing to participate should only complete the questionnaire once.**

To participate, please click the link below **AND** enter the password as prompted. You will be directed to a consent form that outlines your rights as a participant.

STUDY LINK: [Insert Link Here]

Study participants should meet the following criteria: (1) Be at least eighteen years of age; (2) Work at an institution of higher education and/or postsecondary education in the southeastern U.S. (i.e., Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, or Tennessee); (3) Serve as either the senior international officer for their campus **OR** as an international educator who works with students at your institution; and

(4) Spend more than half (i.e., 51% or more) of your time on international programs, services, projects, or initiatives

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration. It is my hope that the results from this study will contribute to both international education and the internationalization of U.S. higher education. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

This study is being conducted to fulfill the requirements for a Ph.D. and is under the direction of Dr. Merrily Dunn, Associate Professor, Department of Counseling and Human Development at The University of Georgia. She can be reached via email at merrily@uga.edu.

Sincerely,

Leigh Poole
Doctoral Candidate in Student Affairs Administration
University of Georgia
lapoole@uga.edu
706-542-5867

APPENDIX C

ANNOUNCEMENT FOR NAFSA REGION VII SOCIAL MEDIA

Be a part of a study that helps understand internationalization from your perspective as an international educator. Contact Leigh Poole to find out more information / how to participate in her dissertation study that explores the perceptions of international educators and senior international officers in the southeast regarding campus internationalization.

Study participants should meet the following criteria: (1) Be at least eighteen years of age; (2) Work at an institution of higher education and/or postsecondary education in the southeastern U.S. (i.e., Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, or Tennessee); (3) Serve as either the senior international officer for their campus OR as an international educator who works with students at your institution; and (4) Spend more than half (i.e., 51% or more) of your time on international programs, services, projects, or initiatives.

This dissertation study entitled Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education: Perceptions of International Educators and Senior International Officers within the Southeastern United States is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Merrily Dunn, Associate Professor, Department of Counseling and Human Development. She can be reached via email at merrily@uga.edu.

APPENDIX D

INFORMED CONSENT FOR ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

Informed Consent Information

By completing this web-based questionnaire and clicking the "yes" button below, you are certifying that you are at least 18 years old, that you understand the procedures described below, that your questions (if any) have been answered to your satisfaction, and that you agree to participate in the study titled Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education: Perceptions of International Educators and Senior International Officers within the Southeastern United States. This study is being conducted by Ms. Leigh Poole, Department of Counseling and Human Development, College Student Affairs Administration Program at The University of Georgia; 706-542-5867 or lapoole@uga.edu under the direction of Dr. Merrily Dunn, Department of Counseling and Human Development, College Student Affairs Administration Program at The University of Georgia; 706-542-3927 or merrily@uga.edu.

The **purpose of the study** is to research the perceptions held by international educators and senior international officers within the southeastern United States regarding on-campus internationalization initiatives. If you choose to participate in this study, your participation will involve responding to questions via an online survey that asks about your perceptions. The survey will take no more than 20 minutes to complete. The results of the survey will be analyzed by the researcher and will be utilized to inform existing literature regarding internationalization of higher education in the United States. Study participants will be eligible for an incentive that includes entering a drawing to win one of three \$100 Visa gift cards. Study participants electing to participate in the incentive will be directed away from the research instrument to a separate link to enter the drawing to maintain the confidentiality of participants' responses. Individuals who elect not to participate in the study but wish to enter the study's random drawing should send their name, email address, complete mailing address, and contact phone number to Leigh Poole via email to enter the random drawing without participating in the study.

Participation in this survey is voluntary and confidential. No risk, discomfort, or stresses are expected by participating in this study. You may refuse to participate or stop participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The data resulting from your participation will be treated confidentially and maintained on a secure electronic database. As of January 2013, the raw data on the server will be removed. The website and its associated server have been secured for privacy. However, internet communications are insecure and there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to internet technology itself. There are no

identity links within the instrument. The results of the research study may be published, but no identifiable information will be used. If you are not comfortable with the level of confidentiality provided by the internet, please feel free to print out a copy of the survey, fill it out by hand, and mail it to Leigh Poole, International Student Life, University of Georgia, 210 Memorial Hall, Athens, Georgia 30602-3108 with no return address on the envelope.

You may choose to skip any item on the questionnaire; you may stop taking the survey at any time; or you may withdraw your participation in this study at any time without giving any reason and without penalty. To do this, you may close the survey window at any time prior to submitting your responses. All contact information and any identifiers associated with the study incentive drawing will be destroyed as of January 2013.

While there are no direct benefits to you for participating in this study, the findings will provide beneficial information regarding the internationalization of higher education in the southeastern U.S.

Please print a copy of this consent form for your records. If you are not able to print this document one can be requested by emailing the researchers at merrily@uga.edu or lapoole@uga.edu.

If you have questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact Leigh Poole at 706-542-5867 or by emailing lapoole@uga.edu. The researcher will answer any questions about the research, now or during the course of the project.

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address: IRB@uga.edu.

I have read and understand the informed consent document and would like to participate in this study.

- ☐ Yes, I would like to participate in this study.
- ☐ No, I do not wish to participate in this study.

APPENDIX E

PAPER VERSION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education: Perceptions of International Educators and Senior International Officers within the Southeastern United States

© Leigh A. Poole All Rights Reserved

The following instrument asks questions regarding your personal perceptions of internationalization on your campus. Your responses are confidential and the questionnaire will take no more than 20 minutes to complete.

If you have questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact the researchers at 706-542-5867 or by emailing lapoole@uga.edu.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

Are you at least eighteen years of age?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Do you work at an institution of higher education and/or post-secondary education in the southeastern U.S. (i.e., Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, or Tennessee)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Are you either the senior international officer for your campus OR an international educator who works with students at your institution? (For the purposes of this study, an international educator includes professionals who work in education abroad, English as a Second Language, international admissions, international student services, and international scholar services on a college or university campus in the southeastern U.S.)

☐ Yes

☐ No

If you are an international educator, do you spend more than half (i.e., 51% or more) of your time on international programs, services, projects, or initiatives?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Have you previously completed this questionnaire written by Leigh Poole during the past four weeks?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Demographic Information

This section asks several demographic questions that will be used during data analysis. Please respond with the answers that best match your institution and professional experiences.

What is your institutional type? (Select the options that most closely match your institution.)

Two-Year or Four-Year

☐ Two-Year

☐ Four-Year

Non-Profit or For-Profit

☐ Non-Profit

☐ For-Profit

Public or Private

☐ Public

☐ Private

The institution where I work is located in:

☐ Alabama

☐ Mississippi

☐ South Carolina

☐ Georgia

☐ North Carolina

☐ Tennessee

☐ Florida

The total student enrollment on my campus is:

☐ < 2,500

☐ 10,000 - 16,999

☐ 2,500 - 4,999

☐ 17,000 - 24,999

☐ 5,000 - 9,999

☐ 25,000+

How would your institution describe your current professional position? (Select the best fit for your current position.)

- ☐ International Education Professional (e.g., study abroad advisor, international student advisor, director of international office, etc.)
- ☐ Senior International Officer for my campus

Are you the director of your office?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

Where is your office placed organizationally within your institutional structure?

- ☐ Academic Affairs
- ☐ Student Affairs
- ☐ Neither
- ☐ Both Academic Affairs and Student Affairs

My professional job responsibilities include: (Check all that apply.)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education Abroad | <input type="checkbox"/> International Scholar Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> English as a Second Language | <input type="checkbox"/> Provide leadership for Internationalization on my campus as the senior international officer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> International Admissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> International Student Services | |

If you checked "Other" in terms of your professional job responsibilities, please explain.

What professional organizations (if any) do you personally belong to? (Check all that apply.)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> AACRAO (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers) | <input type="checkbox"/> NAGAP (National Association of Graduate Admissions Professionals) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ACPA (College Student Educators International) | <input type="checkbox"/> NASPA (Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> AIEA (Association of International Education Administrators) | <input type="checkbox"/> None |
| <input type="checkbox"/> NACAC (National Association for College Admission Counseling) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> NAFSA (Association of International Educators) | |

If you checked "Other" in terms of your professional association membership, please list the organization(s).

In total, how many years have you worked in international education?

Number of Years 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90

Educational Experience:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Some High School | <input type="checkbox"/> Master's Degree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> High School Diploma or GED | <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Degree (J.D., M.D., etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Some College | <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral Degree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor's Degree | |

Have you lived for an extended amount of time (at least one month or more) outside of the United States?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please list how much time you have spent outside the U.S.

Number of Years 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90



Number of Months 0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90



Citizenship Status:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> U.S. Citizen | <input type="radio"/> U.S. Permanent Resident |
| <input type="radio"/> Naturalized Citizen of the U.S. | <input type="radio"/> Citizen of country other than the U.S. |
| <input type="radio"/> Dual Citizen | <input type="radio"/> Other |

If you are a dual citizen, please list the countries in which you hold citizenship.

If you are a citizen of a country other than the U.S., please list your country of citizenship.

If you checked "Other" for your citizenship status, please explain.

I am:

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male
- ☐ Transgender

Organization and Governance

This section of the questionnaire seeks to understand your perceptions of campus internationalization in terms of organization and governance at your institution. Using the scale provided, please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Unsure / Not Applicable
Internationalizing the campus is a priority for my institution.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My institution's mission statement specifically mentions internationalization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My institution's strategic plan includes internationalization initiatives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My institution has specific goals for internationalization that are clearly defined.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My campus' organizational structure supports internationalization initiatives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My office and/or department's organizational structure supports campus internationalization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My institution's priorities for campus internationalization match my own.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

My institution's campus internationalization initiatives include (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Study abroad | <input type="checkbox"/> English Language Programs (i.e., ESL) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hosting International Students | <input type="checkbox"/> Language Majors |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hosting International Scholars | <input type="checkbox"/> Student Affairs Initiatives |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hosting International Faculty | <input type="checkbox"/> International Research Initiatives |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Campuses Abroad (Overseas Campuses) | <input type="checkbox"/> International Partnerships |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Exchange Agreements with Overseas Institutions | <input type="checkbox"/> International Symposia |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Internationalization Curriculum Initiatives | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

If you checked "International Partnerships" in the previous question regarding your institution's internationalization initiatives, please explain.

If you checked "Other" in the previous question regarding your institution's internationalization initiatives, please explain.

Institutional Culture

This section asks questions about your perceptions regarding campus internationalization and institutional culture. Using the scale provided, please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Unsure / Not Applicable
My institutional culture is open to internationalization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My institution is committed to supporting campus internationalization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My department is committed to supporting campus internationalization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My office is committed to supporting campus internationalization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My department is involved in planning campus internationalization efforts.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My office is involved in planning campus internationalization efforts.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Institutional Systems of Support

This section asks questions about your perceptions regarding institutional systems of support for campus internationalization. Using the scale provided, please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Unsure / Not Applicable
Internationalization initiatives are sufficiently funded on my campus.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My institution provides sufficient support services for campus internationalization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My office receives institutional funding for internationalization initiatives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My office is sufficiently funded.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Professional Roles and Responsibilities

This section seeks to understand your professional roles and responsibilities on your campus. Using the scale provided, please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Unsure / Not Applicable
I am included in formal meetings surrounding internationalization initiatives on my campus.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am included in informal conversations surrounding internationalization initiatives on my campus.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I provide direction for more than one international initiative on my campus.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am responsible for providing leadership for campus internationalization initiatives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Internationalization and Globalization

This section seeks to understand your perceptions regarding internationalization and globalization. Using the scale provided, please rate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Unsure / Not Applicable
The terms internationalization and globalization mean the same thing.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My campus uses the terms internationalization and globalization interchangeably.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I use the terms internationalization and globalization interchangeably.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My campus clearly articulates the institution's definition of internationalization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My campus' definition of internationalization is readily apparent to off-campus constituents.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please select one of the following that most closely matches your campus' definition of internationalization:

- ☐ Internationalisation [sic] of higher education is the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institution. (Knight, 1994)
- ☐ Internationalization is the complex of processes whose combined effect, whether planned or not, is to enhance the international dimension of the experience of higher education in universities and similar educational institutions. (OECD, 1994)
- ☐ Any systematic sustained effort aimed at making higher education more responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy and labour [sic] markets. (Kälvermark & van der Wende, 1997)
- ☐ Internationalization is the conscious effort to integrate and infuse international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the ethos and outcomes of postsecondary education. To be fully successful, it must involve active and responsible engagement of the academic community in global networks and partnerships. (NAFSA, 2010)
- ☐ Other

If you checked "Other" for your campus' definition of internationalization, please explain your response and outline what your campus' definition is for internationalization.

In your opinion, what letter grade would you assign to your institution in terms of the strength of its campus internationalization?



Please explain your response/rating.

You have reached the end of the study. **Please be sure to click the SUBMIT button at the bottom of this page in order to record your responses.**

After clicking the **SUBMIT** button, you will be directed away from the research study to a form where you can register for the study incentive (entering a drawing for one of three \$100 Visa gift cards).

As a reminder, if you elect not to submit your responses, but would still like to be included in the study incentive, please contact Leigh Poole via email (study.incentive.only@gmail.com) with your name, email address, complete mailing address, and contact phone number to enter the random drawing without participating in the study.

Additionally, if you have questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact the researchers at 706-542-5867 or by emailing lapoole@uga.edu.

Thank you for your time and support of this research study.