The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

College of Education

THE FACULTY EXPERIENCE OF INTERNATIONALIZATION:

MOTIVATIONS FOR, PRACTICES OF, AND MEANS FOR ENGAGEMENT

A Dissertation in

Higher Education

by

Sarah Grace Fuller Klyberg

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

August 2012

The dissertation of Sarah Grace Fuller Klyberg was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Lisa R. Lattuca
Professor of Higher Education
Dissertation Advisor
Co-Chair of Committee

Roger L. Geiger
Distinguished Professor of Education
Graduate Chair, Higher Education Program
Co-Chair of Committee

Gerald K. LeTendre
Professor of Education and International Affairs
Head of the Department of Education Policy Studies

Vincent M. Colapietro
Liberal Arts Research Professor of Philosophy

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School.

Abstract

In recent decades, many U.S. colleges and universities have adopted policies of internationalization through which they have promoted such activities as study abroad, international student recruitment, curriculum development and/or reform, faculty exchanges, institutional linkages, and overseas campus development. Prior research has identified institutional motivations for engagement in internationalization that include preparation of students to live and work in an increasingly interconnected world, competition with other institutions, and revenue generation. Institutional initiatives often rely on the cooperation and engagement of faculty members, but faculty motivation for participation in their institution's internationalization effort is not well understood. The absence of research in this area is problematic because the faculty plays a crucial role in the fulfillment of higher education's tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service through such responsibilities as designing and reforming curricula, teaching and mentoring students, collaborating on research, engaging in campus and community outreach, and perpetuating institutional culture.

The phenomenon of internationalization provides a timely setting in which to explore how faculty members, as individuals, choose to enhance their work lives via engagement in an institutional initiative. It also offers an appropriate venue in which to investigate how faculty and institutional goals for an institutional initiative merge and diverge. To these ends, this study engaged 15 faculty members at two undergraduate-focused institutions in the northeastern United States in phenomenological interviews as well as focus groups that explored personal and institutional motivations for faculty participation in internationalization; the teaching, research, service, and other

professional activities that connect to their institution's internationalization initiative; and the effect of facilitators and/or impediments to their engagement in internationalization on their motivation to continue to participate in these efforts. This inquiry was informed by scholarship from the fields of philosophy and higher education, particularly the theoretical underpinnings of the concept of internationalization, research on practices of internationalization, and research on faculty life and work. Data analysis employed Giorgi's method of descriptive phenomenological reduction, through which structures, or dimensions, of the experience of internationalization and descriptions of how those dimensions connected to each other were identified.

Among the key findings of this study regarding the structures of the faculty experience of internationalization was that participants were more intrinsically than extrinsically motivated to engage in it. Specifically, participant engagement in internationalization generally predated institutional adoption of an internationalization initiative and came from personal experience. Regarding faculty practices of internationalization, a key finding was that participants had difficulty integrating internationalized teaching, research, and service practices throughout their work, despite an interest in doing so. Participants generally attributed this difficulty to a lack of institutional support. They also suggested that their efforts were not integrated into the broader life and work of their institutions because, despite the expressed intentions of their universities, internationalization was not incorporated into the broader institutional vision, identity, and mission.

Findings from this study generated a series of propositions for future research on faculty experiences of internationalization and the effects that they believe their

engagement in it has on their academic work and professional lives, as well as on how individuals' goals and institutional goals for internationalization may or may not correspond and thus be achieved. Recommendations for the design of future studies on this topic are also offered, as are recommendations for institutional practices and policies of internationalization.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgments

When I arrived at Penn State, I joined a remarkable community of scholars with whom I am grateful to have made this journey. Thank you to the members of my dissertation committee for its constant encouragement and insight, as well as the occasional indulgence. I am especially thankful to my co-chairs, Lisa Lattuca and Roger Geiger, for their help and guidance throughout my time in Happy Valley. Thank you also to David Post for the assistantship that facilitated my studies and expanded my perspective on the field of international and comparative education.

I must also thank my doctoral cohort, particularly Issam Khoury, India McHale Menon, Nate Sorber, and Jim Woodell, for the moral and intellectual support that they offered during our tenure at Rackley. Among my predecessors in the Higher Education program, I would like to thank Jen Domagal-Goldman, Suzie Hickey, Jordan Humphrey, Jason Lane, Meghan Pifer, and Alex Yin for being sounding boards and offering encouragement throughout my studies. I am also grateful to Sally Kelley, Angela Packer, Karen Tzilkowski, Susan Bass, and Trudi Haupt for always being ready to offer kind words and administrative assistance. Finally, Shannon Smythe Fleishman, thank you for your hospitality, positive energy, and willingness to help at a moment's notice.

This study would have taken even longer to begin had it not been for my serendipitous encounter at a NAFSA conference with an undergraduate student from an institution that would ultimately become one of my research sites. Thank you to her for providing me with the information that I needed to get started. Thank you also to the Louise M. Berman Scholarship Board for the financial support that eased my research expenses, and to Louise Berman for being such an inspirational figure.

This study could not have happened at all without the cooperation of my two research sites. I am grateful to my primary contacts at each institution, who provided support throughout my data collection process. I am thankful to all 15 study participants for their trust in me and enthusiasm for my research. These institutions are very fortunate to have such passionate administrators and faculty members as part of their communities, and I hope that they will find the results of this study to be useful to them.

The production of this dissertation has been a family affair. Thank you to my parents, Ben and Christine Fuller, who, unbeknownst to them at the time, set me on this path 27 years ago. They have continued to support my academic and professional pursuits ever since. Thank you to my husband, Kevin Klyberg, who spent what seemed like endless miles on the road between Rhode Island and Pennsylvania as I finished my coursework, and then made it possible for me to be on the road to complete my research. Thank you to my stepchildren, Graham and Rowen, for being such great kids, and to my parents-in-law, Al and Bev, for being there for all of us.

My grandfather, William Harley Bailey, did not live to see this dissertation come to fruition, but I promised him that I would keep writing, and I did. He was and remains a profound source of inspiration to me, for which I am thankful. My son, William Alden Klyberg, waited just long enough to arrive so that I could finish this dissertation before heading to the hospital, and for that and the joy he brings me every day, I am grateful. Thank you for making me Dr. Mom. I think that Pappy would be proud of both of us.

Chapter 1

Introduction

A college or university community consists of diverse individuals who coalesce

around the goal of the advancement of knowledge (Maringe, 2009). Traditionally,

members of U.S. institutions of higher education have pursued this goal in three venues:

teaching, research, and service. Colleges and universities employ different strategies to

engage in these areas in ways that will address institutional needs and ambitions, as well

as those of members of their immediate and surrounding communities, their nations, and

the world. People in academic, administrative, and staff positions throughout a college or

university community contribute to the pursuit and fulfillment of their institution's

tripartite mission, but an institution's faculty plays key roles in the achievement of all

three components because of its responsibilities for teaching and mentoring of students,

collaborating on research, and engaging in campus and community outreach (O'Hara,

2009), as well as for designing and reforming curricula (Diamond, 1998; Lattuca & Stark,

2009) and perpetuating institutional culture (Richardson, 1994; see also Antonio, Astin,

& Cress, 2000).

Given the vital contributions that the faculty—as a group and as individuals—

makes to the advancement of knowledge in myriad forms and at numerous sites, for

higher education institutions to continue to progress in achieving their mission, scholars

and practitioners must better understand the work experiences of faculty members. In

particular, we need to grasp what motivates faculty members as they make decisions

about how they, as individuals, will contribute to their institutions and to the

advancement of knowledge in their fields of study. There has existed within the research

literature on the faculty, however, a tendency to explore the faculty experience from an organizational rather than an individual perspective. For example, in the landmark study *The Academic Life*, Clark (1987) argued that institutional affiliation, along with disciplinary background, was key for understanding the faculty experience. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) also acknowledged the influence of institution type on the faculty experience, but they elaborated on it by bringing to the fore of their theoretical model the interaction between the "characteristics of individuals" and their institutions (p. 15). More recently, in an analysis of prior research on this issue, O'Meara, Terosky, and Neumann (2008) asserted that scholarship on the faculty perpetuates a "narrative of constraint" that emphasizes how institutional policies and procedures—rather than faculty members' personal motivations, ambitions, and agency—shape faculty members' work lives. The traditional approach, O'Meara and her colleagues averred, "[obscures] what and how faculty grow and … strive for their full potential in their intellectual and professional lives" (p. vii).

The phenomenon of internationalization—understood for the purpose of this study to be "the conscious effort to integrate and infuse international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the ethos and outcomes of postsecondary education" (NAFSA Board of Directors, 2010)—provides an appropriate and timely setting in which to explore how faculty members, as individuals, choose to enhance their work lives via engagement in an institutional initiative. Colleges and universities typically operationalize internationalization through faculty exchanges, curriculum reform, promotion of study abroad among students, and recruitment of international students, among other interculturally, internationally, and globally oriented activities.

At least since exchanges between medieval European and Arab institutions of higher learning, the desire to advance knowledge has led institutions and their faculties to interact with peers around the world (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002; Maringe, 2009). In more recent decades, political, economic, and social globalization trends have "[heightened] the need for most people, regardless of their vocational, cultural, or geographical contexts, to learn to interact more effectively with others from different cultural backgrounds" (Stone, 2006, p. 335). To advance knowledge in these ways, U.S. colleges and universities have been adopting formal policies and practices of internationalization (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008). These internationalization initiatives typically include activities such as curriculum development and reform, study abroad, international student recruitment, faculty exchanges, collaborative research projects, linkages with foreign institutions, and establishment of overseas campuses.

Internationalization policies tend to be developed and supervised at an institutional level (Dolby & Rahman, 2008), but faculty members' responsibilities place them in crucial positions for the successful realization of these initiatives. As is the case with scholarship on the faculty experience in general, however, research on faculty involvement in internationalization has primarily been approached, as Neumann (2009) would say, from the "outside-in" rather than the "inside-out." That is, the numerous contributions that faculty members might make to such initiatives are understudied because the phenomenon has been explored from a national or an organizational perspective rather than from an individual perspective (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002; Svensson & Wihlborg, 2010). In existing research on internationalization, if the faculty experience was considered at all, it was typically bundled into larger single and

comparative case studies of internationalization programs (e.g., Biddle, 2002; Stromquist, 2007).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this dissertation study was two-fold. First, the study sought to understand the experiences of faculty members participating in their institution's internationalization efforts and the effects that they believe their engagement has on their academic work and professional lives. Second, the study was designed to examine how individuals' goals and institutional goals may or may not align and thus be realized. As this study is an exploration of individual faculty members' lived experience of a phenomenon (i.e., internationalization) within their institutions, I use phenomenological interview (Seidman, 2006) and analysis (Giorgi, 2009) techniques to describe what constitutes faculty members' experiences of internationalization and how those experiences relate to institutional goals.

This inquiry built on a pilot study conducted for a course during the spring 2010 semester. This exploratory investigation examined the motivations of faculty members who participated in a formal internationalization initiative—specifically, a grant program for internationalization of the curriculum—at their institution and the effects of their participation on their professional lives. I decided to continue working in this line of inquiry because the higher education literature lacks research on faculty experiences with internationalization efforts. This gap is problematic because it reduces our understanding of the practice of internationalization within U.S. higher education specifically and in our insights into U.S. faculty life more broadly.

This study explored three interrelated research questions in an effort to provide insights into the experiences that motivate faculty members to engage and persist in (or drop out of) their institution's internationalization initiative. These questions also explored the effects that this engagement has on their professional lives.

1. **What motivates faculty to engage in internationalization efforts? Are personal or institutional influences more influential in their decision to participate?**

   Just as a college's or university's decision to pursue internationalization can be motivated by numerous internal and external influences, faculty members' motivation to participate in internationalization can originate from different personal and professional desires and needs. In my pilot study, faculty members explained that they were motivated intrinsically by encounters with international students during their studies, by personal travel experiences, by faculty exchange opportunities, and by their beliefs about the purposes of higher education. Their extrinsic motivations included awareness of the globalized political, economic, social, and professional environments into which their students would enter upon graduation; desire to prepare students to live and work in these settings; and accreditation requirements for their academic programs.

2. **Which of faculty members' teaching, research, service, and other professional activities do they connect to their institution's internationalization initiative?**

Faculty members have diverse responsibilities that contribute to higher education's pursuit of its tripartite mission. In my pilot study, faculty members described diverse activities in which they engaged with their institution's internationalization effort. Beyond participation in their university's grant program for internationalization of the curriculum and different types of course development and reform, they engaged in international research projects with students, interdepartmental collaborations on class projects, and interdepartmental sponsorship of guest speakers on campus.

3. **What do faculty members identify as the facilitators and/or impediments to their engagement in these internationalization efforts? How do these facilitators and/or impediments influence their decisions about engagement and affect their motivation to engage in internationalization efforts on their campus?**

Colleges and universities that pursue internationalization may facilitate faculty involvement through the establishment of faculty development programs and travel grants. They may also encourage faculty participation in the initiative through promotion and tenure policies and other forms of recognition, such as awards. Alternatively, they may establish an internationalization program without considering how existing institutional policies and practices may affect its success. Findings from my pilot study suggest that institutional incentives may encourage faculty participation, but that faculty members' intrinsic motivations diminished the need for institutional facilitators for

engagement. The largest impediments to participation for the participants in
my pilot study, however, were inadequate time and money. The faculty
members whom I interviewed were committed to internationalization, but
some of them were hesitant to continue because of the strain that it was
placing on their personal and professional lives—a strain that was exacerbated
by a lack of tangible and substantive institutional support.

Although this pilot study provided useful insights into faculty motivations for
engagement in, practices of, and facilitators and impediments for internationalization, its
scope was quite limited. The timeframe in which I could complete the study was very
short (less than one semester, as it was part of a course), and this brief timeframe forced
other limitations on the study. I was able to complete interviews at only a single
institution, and I had to keep the number of participants small (five individuals). Beyond
these logistical constraints, the focus of the pilot study was on faculty motivations for
engagement in internationalization, and my reading of the literature was that the field
could benefit from a study of internationalization and faculty work that explored in more
detail issues of practice and facilitators and impediments.

<div align="center">**Significance of the Study**</div>

The findings of this study advance our understanding of the faculty experience in
three ways. First, the findings contribute to the literature on the motivations and decision
making of faculty members at four-year institutions in the United States. Although there
is a long history of scholarship on faculty work, there exist considerable gaps in our
understandings of the faculty experience from an individual perspective. In addition,
there is a perception that the "quality of worklife" for faculty members on U.S. campuses

has diminished in recent years. In response, Johnsrud (2002) has recommended that college and university leaders who desire to create an environment that will enhance faculty members' academic work and encourage them to remain on their campuses "must be able to identify those issues that matter to those in their employ" (p. 380). While survey research such as the 2007 Changing Academic Profession faculty survey (CAP; Cummings & Finkelstein, 2009) has begun to address this question, qualitative inquiries such as this dissertation study can provide more specific insights into what motivates faculty members to make particular decisions and set certain priorities in their work. Moreover, although survey research may identify working conditions that are important for faculty success, it cannot explore how particular initiatives link or do not link to faculty interests and thus how individual and institutional goals may or may not align to produce desired results—for either party.

Second, within the specific context of internationalization, the findings also increase our understanding of how faculty members as individuals view their institution's program and their place within it. Marginson and Rhoades (2002) identified as a conceptual limitation of comparative and international education research the tendency to focus on the nation state, national markets, and national systems of education. They argued that the field "fails to adequately address the local dimension, including the global activity of local … agents" (p. 286), such as faculty members. Similarly, Sanderson (2008) emphasized the "local-global continuum" (p. 279) of internationalization, critiquing other scholars for focusing on the phenomenon at a macro level. By using a qualitative approach to investigate the faculty experience of internationalization, this

study enhances our understanding of the local dimension of the phenomenon and the role of one group of local agents—the faculty—in it.

Third, internationalization advocates can use these findings as they consider ways in which to engage faculty members more effectively in their efforts. Existing survey research has been limited in how well it can identify the types of experiences that encourage faculty involvement, although survey findings have suggested that faculty members are more inclined to persist in peer-led initiatives—that is, efforts in which professors act as local agents—than in administration-initiated programs (Finkelstein, Walker, & Chen, 2009). Survey researchers have also recognized that their work "does not provide an adequate vehicle to probe the many qualitative aspects of internationalization," including depth and breadth of collaboration with foreign partners, integration of international students, and infusion of international and intercultural viewpoints and subject matter into the curriculum and co-curriculum (Green et al., 2008, pp. 4-5). The qualitative approach of this study allowed me to delve more deeply into the questions raised by previous quantitative studies.

In their efforts to advance knowledge, colleges and universities have historically collaborated with their peers overseas on teaching, research, and service activities. In recent years, increasing forces of political, economic, and social globalization have accelerated the need for institutions of higher education to pursue their tripartite mission in ways that will address issues on local, national, and international levels and prepare their graduates for lives of "global citizenship" (Biddle, 2002, p. 7). In turn, U.S. college and university administrators have adopted on their campuses policies of internationalization, but successful implementation of these initiatives depends on

engagement by the faculty. Despite the key roles that faculty members have to play in internationalization efforts, little research has investigated what motivates faculty members to participate in internationalization and how faculty and institutional goals for internationalization meet and diverge. This study provides insights into faculty motivation in general, as well as within the specific context of internationalization.

Organization of this Dissertation

In this chapter, I argued that internationalization efforts will benefit from greater understanding of faculty motivation and goals and their potential alignment with institutional goals. In Chapter 2, I elaborate on existing literature in the two areas of higher education scholarship that informed this inquiry. First, I discuss theories and practices of internationalization, paying particular attention to the implications of internationalization for faculty work. Second, I discuss existing scholarship on faculty life and work, examining closely previous research on faculty motivation and decision making. In Chapter 3, I present the research methods that I employed in this study, including how this research design was informed by the pilot study conducted in spring 2010. I introduce participants and their institutions in Chapter 4. In Chapters 5 and 6, I present findings that address the three research questions that guided this study. In Chapter 7, I focus on participants' recommendations for the future of internationalization at their institutions. Chapter 8 briefly summarizes the study and its findings, and presents a set of propositions to guide further research on this topic, recommendations for future research design, and my proposed implications for similar institutions that seek to internationalize undergraduate education.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The purposes of this dissertation study were (a) to understand the experiences of faculty members participating in their institution's internationalization efforts and the effects that faculty members believe their engagement has on their academic work and professional lives and (b) to examine how faculty members' goals and their institution's goals for internationalization may or may not align and be realized. This study was informed by scholarship from the fields of philosophy and higher education, particularly the theoretical underpinnings of the concept of internationalization, research on practices of internationalization, and research on faculty life and work. Beyond providing a synthesis of the scholarly literature in these areas, I illustrate the need for new scholarship on the faculty experience of internationalization in particular and on faculty work in general, and I indicate why a qualitative methodological approach is appropriate and desirable for this line of inquiry.

Internationalization

In the first part of this chapter, I examine the literature on internationalization. I begin with a presentation of its historical, philosophical, and theoretical foundations, after which I describe current institutional motivations for engaging in internationalization. I then discuss definitions, models, and practices of internationalization, as well as mediating factors of faculty life that could impede or encourage faculty involvement in these initiatives.

Historical, Philosophical, and Theoretical Foundations of Internationalization

Throughout the history of U.S. higher education, faculty, administrators, students, and other stakeholders have debated the purpose of an undergraduate education (Bloom, 1987, p. 16). One theme that has emerged from these deliberations is that college graduates should be good citizens (e.g., Committee of the Corporation and the Academical Faculty, 1828; Dewey, 1938/1997; Harvard Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society, 1945; Hutchins, 1936; see also Antonio et al., 2000). What such a citizen should look like, and what he or she should learn in order to look that way, remain issues (Bastedo, 2005), but in recent decades, U.S. higher education leaders have increasingly connected good citizenship with global or world citizenship.[1] In this dissertation study, I examined one way in which U.S. colleges and universities have responded to the need to produce good citizens—internationalization—and the implications of the practice of internationalization for faculty work.

The association of good citizenship and global citizenship is not new to U.S. education. The phrase "international education" has been used since the 1870s, but it was popularized with the creation of the Institute of International Education in 1919 (IIE; Sylvester, 2007). After the Great War, IIE's founders "believed that there could be no lasting peace without greater understanding between nations—and that international educational exchange formed the strongest basis for fostering such understanding" ("A brief history," n.d., para. 1). Prior to World War II, however, "American higher education was not very international in either focus or clientele" (Groennings, 1990, p. 16). Instead, primary and secondary educators led on the issue in such venues as the

---

[1] I use these terms interchangeably.

National Society for the Study of Education's (NSSE) 1937 yearbook, *International Understanding through the Public-School Curriculum* (Kandel & Whipple, 1937).

Calls to instill in students a sense of global citizenship, or some variation thereof, have often been renewed in times of conflict and social change. Images and experiences of war, terrorism, and other forms of violence remind philosophers, social scientists, educators, and other interested parties of the need to find other ways to prevent and resolve problems, domestic and international. Perceptions of social, political, and economic upheaval—on local and global scales—also create the need for citizens who can contend with these challenges.

While there may be consensus that "the general purpose of education is to prepare students for the world in which they are living" (Groennings, 1990, p. 11), the perpetual challenge for colleges and universities is to identify effective ways in which to ensure that graduates are ready to live in and contribute to a constantly changing world. In the wake of technological advancements at the turn of the 20th century, during the rise of fascism and Nazism, and in the recovery from World War II, commentators appealed to U.S. educators to make global citizenship a high-priority educational outcome. The Cold War era saw changes in the orientation of international scholarship and education programs, but in the post-Cold War period challenges to that era's assumptions emerged. Most recently, the attacks of September 11, 2001, the ensuing conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the difficulties of global economic integration have accentuated and intensified calls for education for global citizenship, an educational outcome that institutions are pursuing through processes of internationalization.

In the following discussion, I present arguments for education for global citizenship that have emerged over the past 100 years, as well as conceptualizations of what global or world citizenship has meant to its advocates. I begin with the philosophy of Josiah Royce (1908/1988), who advocated for world citizenship through the practice of "higher provincialism." I then discuss the internationalism movement which developed in the midst of World Wars I and II, after which I address how the Cold War affected international education, particularly in the context of higher education. I conclude with discussions of more recent movements in international education, multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism.

Higher provincialism and world citizenship. As fallout from the U.S. Civil War continued into the early 20th century, Josiah Royce (1908/1988) invited Americans "to emphasize … the positive value, the absolute necessity for our welfare, of a wholesome provincialism" (p. 190). Royce defined his higher provincialism as the inclination of regions to maintain local traditions and beliefs; the sum of these traditions and beliefs; and the sense of pride that inhabitants of a province gain from local customs and ideals, which motivates them to aspire for further progress. He contrasted this type of provincialism against "false forms" of provincialism, such as the "sectionalism that … threatened … national unity" at the time of the Civil War (p. 190). To Royce, individuals' focus should be on the improvement and perpetuation of their communities, but a commitment to the local should not preclude loyalty to the nation and beyond. Instead, a sense of provincial spirit and a sense of national patriotism should be cultivated simultaneously. "They cannot," he warned, "prosper apart" (p. 191). Moreover, beyond

calling on Americans to be "provincial as well as patriotic," he asked them to be "citizens of the world" (p. 192).

In his 1908 book *Race Questions*, *Provincialism*, *and Other American Problems*, Royce identified three "principal evils" that he thought were undermining a "true provincial spirit" (p. 193). These concerns continued to resonate in the past century and lend credence to arguments for internationalization of U.S. education today. First, he noted that Americans were increasingly mobile. In addition to doing more short-term travel, they were moving away from their places of birth. These trends, Royce thought, were disruptive to social order. Second, he described the homogenization or "levelling [*sic*] tendency of recent civilization," which was coming from increased communications, access to education, and consolidation of industry and social and political authorities (p. 193). In a critique of civilization that could have been written today, he averred:

> [W]e tend all over the nation, and, in some degree, even throughout the civilized world, to read the same daily news, to share the same general ideas, to submit to the same overmastering social forces, to live in the same external fashions, to discourage individuality, and to approach a dead level of harassed mediocrity. (pp. 193-194)

In contrast, Royce's vision of higher provincialism encouraged the perpetuation of variety within and between communities.

While the ideas of allegiance to one's community and advocacy of variety may seem contradictory, Royce (1908/1988) suggested that encouragement of a provincial identity would provide to citizens a sense of self-respect, out of which they could confront the leveling tendency that he diagnosed. The risk of encouraging the provincial

spirit, however, resulted in Royce's third evil, the "mob-spirit" (p. 195). The mob-spirit

is an "imitative" phenomenon through which one is "hypnotized" by one's social

community and loses one's individuality (p. 196). Although this behavior might be

viewed as an expression of loyalty or patriotism, Royce viewed it as dangerous. He

warned that community members should not assume that their ideals are universal ideals,

suggesting instead that communities might learn and borrow from each other, adapting

what they learn elsewhere (domestically or overseas) for application at home.

Royce (1908/1988) placed great value on engagement with other communities for

the development of a positive provincial spirit, and he encouraged community members

to travel abroad and "use this which they acquire in the service of their home" (p. 200).

He cautioned that communities should avoid two extremes in their education of young

people: (a) insisting that youth can only express their loyalty to their province by ignoring

the knowledge that they might gain from engaging with other cultures, traveling to other

places, or adopting different ideas and traditions; and (b) encouraging the youth of a

community to leave permanently rather than finding ways to entice the best and brightest

to stay for the long term.

Ultimately, Royce (1908/1988) advocated framing the betterment of the world

around a celebration of the local, but he did not deny the need for engagement with the

world. In contrast, he pushed communities to use their new-found mobility and

connectivity to advance their provincial spirit. He resisted the homogenization to which

he thought societies were falling prey, but he saw great value in domestic and

international exchanges. Good citizens, in Royce's view, were individuals with broad

perspective, grounded in their community while aware of their role as citizens of the

world. As World War I unfolded just before his death, "he saw in the integration of the individual with society, of provinces within nations, and in the variety of nations within world order, the hope of peace" (Brown, 1948, p. 30).

Internationalism and academic enclosure. As the 20th century progressed, observers continued to debate the themes that Royce (1908/1988) explored, particularly the effects that scientific advances were having on travel, communication, and self-perception, and the role that education should play in preparing students to navigate their increasingly complex world. Toward the end of World War I, for example, Veblen (1918/1957) argued that the university "is specialized to fit men for a life of science and scholarship" and asserted that responsibility for creation of "citizens of the world" should be left to "lower" and "professional" schools (p. 15).

Until the beginning of the Cold War era, the issue of international education was primarily addressed at the elementary and secondary school levels, as exemplified by NSSE's 1937 yearbook (Kandel & Whipple, 1937). In one essay, Shotwell (1937) echoed Royce's (1908/1988) observations about advances in communications and travel by noting that science, "by its conquest of time and space, carries us out to those who dwell in the far corners of the world" (p. 4). He asserted that although technological progress "may break down the physical barriers to isolation, there are mental barriers that do not yield so readily" (p. 5) and argued that to diminish these mental barriers students and educators must study "international relations."

This volume provided a venue in which primary and secondary education scholars—most of whom were members of the Teachers College (Columbia University) faculty—could discuss the use of education to promote schoolchildren's international

understanding. Its contributors were writing in the aftermath of the Great War, but with

the rise of fascism and Nazism, another conflict loomed. The emergence of such

ideologies and the acceleration of scientific advances caused these educators to fear that,

without intervention by schools, U.S. children would not develop a "sensible world view"

(Whipple, 1937, p. xii). For example, Monroe (1937) placed the onus on teachers to

"develop in the mind of the youth an ability to think and to weigh evidence, to develop an

open-mindedness to all sides of the question and an interest in the outstanding social and

political problems that his generation has to face" (p. 24).

Taking up NSSE's mantle toward the end of World War II, Teachers College

professor Donald Tewksbury (1945) declared, "promotion of international understanding

and cooperation through education, as well as through other means, has become a vital

necessity in our times" (p. 293). Describing the world as a "neighborhood" rather than a

"brotherhood" (p. 293), he echoed Shotwell (1937), arguing that technological progress

had made the world smaller, but it had not necessarily changed people's attitudes toward

the rest of the world. Tewksbury proposed seven ways to engage U.S. students in

international relations, focusing on international cooperation, conflict resolution,

economic development, access to education, integration of vocational and academic

programs, and comparative approaches to the study of cultures and education.

Tewksbury (1945) and the NSSE yearbook contributors before him (Kandel &

Whipple, 1937) aspired for primary and secondary education to instill in students an

awareness of the rest of the world, an appreciation of the world's diversity, and an ability

to function within it. As Royce had argued (1908/1988), such a worldview would not

preclude students from maintaining a sense of patriotism toward their own country.

Rather, as Monroe (1937) explained, the purpose of education is to promote within students positive senses of nationalism *and* internationalism. To Monroe, this outcome should not be pursued dogmatically, however:

> [I]t is not the teacher's business to impart conviction to the student, but rather to impart interest in the subject, knowledge of the diverse answers to the problems that may be given, and an attitude of open-mindedness and of inquiry in approaching any of these problems. (pp. 20-21)

Inherent in this notion is the belief that we *can* learn in this way, although Tewksbury (1945) warned that Americans, as citizens of a young and ambitious country, might be resistant to practicing "reciprocity and mutuality" with other nations (p. 295).

Indeed, Palat (2000) argued that the emergence of regional area studies after World War II could "be traced to [the] vast expansion in the scale and scope of the activities of the U.S. state and business corporations at the outbreak of the Cold War" (p. 68). In contrast, McCaughey (1984) proposed that international studies became a priority because of a popular understanding that the World War II generation had "a peculiar responsibility to ensure that there not be another major war, in which, unlike the case in 'their' war, there would be no victors" (p. 119). In addition, McCaughey suggested that many veterans had an academic interest in international studies, having found "such unexpected exposure to another culture both exciting and worth pursuing" (p. 118).

More broadly, Klitgaard (1981) averred that international studies was encouraged to produce regional specialists to inform foreign policy, enhance international capacities throughout their institutions, engage laypeople in international issues, and advance knowledge on their respective regions of expertise. As the Cold War escalated, though,

international relations scholars in the United States moved away from two of their field's original objectives—enhancing international competencies throughout their institutions and educating the public—in favor of specialization and "enclosure" of their field (McCaughey, 1984). The initiative thus became more politicized—against which Tewksbury (1945) had warned:

> As an instrument of political power, education has grown in importance and in its influence for the good or ill of human society. In light of this situation we must make sure that political power in the field of education becomes in fact an instrument for the building of a better world. (p. 300)

The muddying of broad educational outcomes with specific political and economic ambitions continued in the second half of the 20th century, as international relations scholarship became increasingly sequestered among faculty members who concentrated on teaching graduate students and pursuing their own research agendas—often funded by the federal government, corporations, or foundations—rather than on participating in public service educational activities, although sponsors frequently expected performance of such duties as well (McCaughey, 1984).

Butts (1963) suggested that the field of international relations in the United States progressed through three stages from World War II through the early 1960s. In the first stage, Americans sought to increase "our store of knowledge and understanding about other peoples and informing them about ourselves by means of systematic study … and … cultural and educational exchanges" (Butts, 1963, pp. xvii-xviii). Specifically, Butts cited UNESCO initiatives and the federally funded Fulbright Program as efforts to advance and exchange such knowledge. The second stage was the emergence of USAID

as a mechanism through which the United States provided "technical assistance and advice" to developing countries (p. xviii). The third stage, in the early 1960s, further promoted U.S. influence overseas through the expansion of the "human resources upon which all other national development depends" (p. xix).

These phases are consistent with Mayhew's (1977) description of U.S. higher education's approach to the teaching of international relations during the 1950s and 1960s, presenting it as an "internationalism" that would "prepare American leadership to aid other regions and to deepen appreciation for the Western tradition" (p. 16). Mayhew suggested that this strategy was one that pushed students and scholars toward "a commonly shared body of allusion, idiom, and metaphor" (p. 16). This Cold War-era approach to international education discouraged international relations programs from serving as a "catalyst for curricular innovation" on their campuses—a function that sponsors of the emergent field had envisioned in earlier years (McCaughey, 1984, p. 220). In a 1968 report, for example, Michie stated that international studies centers "have had very little impact on undergraduate education within their institutions" (p. 20). Further, Lambert's 1973 study of language and area studies centers found that while enrollment in these programs was rather evenly split between graduate and undergraduate students, program directors tended to describe their programs as "essentially a graduate program" (p. 237). As undergraduates were more likely to enroll in survey or general education courses, Lambert explained, "consideration is rarely given to the kind of experience the undergraduate … should receive" (p. 238). In contrast, programs attended to graduate students who shared their faculty members' desires to do research and specialize within their fields.

The expansion of international scholarship through the 1970s, therefore, allowed U.S. higher education to fall into a vicious cycle in that it resulted in the professional and disciplinary isolation of many international specialists from the disciplinary communities in which they were trained, as well as on their campuses (McCaughey, 1984). Within their home disciplines, international specialists came to be treated as minorities who had to ascribe to the dominant canon, rather than as regional experts who could inform and expand it. In response, many opted to join area studies centers, which lessened their ability to influence the evolution of their home disciplines more broadly and undergraduate curricular reform at their institutions specifically.

By the early 1990s, U.S.-trained faculty members, their departments, and their disciplines were increasingly accused of operating within a culture of "scholarly ethnocentrism" (Johnston, 1993, p. 15). Arum and Van de Water (1992) associated such an attitude with the United States' geographic location and consequent separation from much of the rest of the world, while Haigh (2002) has argued that it was the result of persistent culture of "chauvinism" that assumed the superiority of U.S. disciplinary perspectives (p. 55; see also Altbach & Lewis, 1998). As the 20th century progressed, though, these explanations and justifications were becoming increasingly inadequate. The interconnectivity of the world was intensifying, and a struggle was emerging within U.S. higher education as to how to contend with the changes that it was causing.

Multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism. The multicultural education movement of the 1980s and 1990s sought to counter one aspect of the ethnocentrism and chauvinism that critics perceived within U.S. higher education: the marginalization of women and people of color within the academy (Banks, 1993). As members of these communities

became increasingly visible on U.S. campuses, they called into question the contents and perspectives included in traditional undergraduate curricula—curricula based on liberal assimilationist notions that "attachments to ethnic, racial, religious, and other identity groups lead to conflicts and harmful divisions within society" (Banks, 2008, p. 131). To multicultural education's advocates, therefore, it was "an education for functioning effectively in a pluralistic democratic society" (Banks, 1993, p. 5). To its detractors, it was a dangerous tool of activist faculty members, who would use students' desires to affirm and develop their own identities to advance a "'race and gender' agenda" against the Great Books canon and for specialized programs in women's studies, African-American studies, and the like (D'Souza, 1991, p. 246). In this view, by taking the focus off the study of Western civilization, multicultural education taught a form of openness to other ideas and traditions that encouraged students to be cultural relativists, without shared values, mutual goals, or a sense of the common good (Bloom, 1987). In contrast, multicultural education proponents argued that the inclusion of perspectives of people who have not traditionally engaged in academic discourse—women and people of color, especially—was consistent with higher education's responsibility for the advancement of knowledge. Multiculturalism allowed for the consideration of "more complete perspectives," which positively affected academia in its entirety (Banks, 1993, p. 6).

University of Chicago philosophy and law professor Martha Nussbaum built on the multicultural education movement in the mid-1990s with her argument for cosmopolitan education. A frequent commentator on education issues whose work is widely read and addressed by other philosophers and educators, Nussbaum defined a cosmopolitan education as one in which U.S. students learn that "they are, above all,

citizens of a world of human beings, and that, while they happen to be situated in the United States, they have to share this world with the citizens of other countries" (Nussbaum, 1994/1996, p. 6). She expressed concern about what she perceived to be within U.S. undergraduate curricula a "morally dangerous and, ultimately, subversive" emphasis on patriotism and American exceptionalism (1994/1996, p. 3). To challenge this practice, Nussbaum advocated for U.S. undergraduate education to be infused with cosmopolitan ideology, which she traced to the teachings of the Greek and Roman Stoics.

> They hold that thinking about humanity as it is realized in the whole world is valuable for self-knowledge…. They insist, furthermore, that we really will be better able to solve our problems if we face them in this broader context, our imaginations unconstrained by narrow partisanship. (Nussbaum, 1997, pp. 59-60)

This worldview does not disallow individuals from having religious, familial, local, national, or other affiliations. Instead, it encourages people to place themselves at the center of a series of concentric circles, with their various affiliations as rings surrounding them.

The implication for higher education is that colleges and universities should "foster respect and mutual solidarity and correct the ignorance that is often an essential prop of hatred" (Nussbaum, 1997, p. 66). As was the case with Monroe (1937), Nussbaum's approach did not rule out the study of one's own history and culture, but her ultimate vision of education for world citizenship—an education that transcends "the inclination of both students and educators to define themselves primarily in terms of local group loyalties and identities" (Nussbaum, 1997, p. 67)—diametrically opposed Royce's (1908/1988) approach. While Royce's higher provincialism argued that good citizens

were grounded in their province and engaged as citizens of the world, Nussbaum's (1997) cosmopolitanism expected good citizens to diminish local connections and become "philosophical exiles" from their way of life (p. 57).

Nussbaum's (1994/1996) propositions have generated many responses, including attempts to "hyphenate" or "root" ostensibly different cosmopolitanisms rather than adhere to her more universalist approach: "The aim would be to produce less 'the world citizen' envisaged by Nussbaum than '21st century Australian, European or American citizens trying to function as world citizens'" (Donald, 2007, p. 306; see also Appiah, 1996; Friedman, 2000; Hollinger, 2001). Critics have also found problematic how Nussbaum related cosmopolitanism to the historical and geographical contexts in which we live (Harvey, 2000; Papastephanou, 2002). Papastephanou (2002) took issue with the concentric circles model because it neglected the fact that human encounters are diachronic (that is, they occur over time and space). Papastephanou asserted that Nussbaum (1997) "confines her consideration of the benefits of cross-cultural encounters and the education that promotes them almost exclusively to the synchronic" (p. 77). Fischer (2007) used pragmatism to elaborate on the hazard of the synchronic approach: "what a thing 'is' is never static but, rather, grows out of past interactions and engages in continual reconstruction, as organism and environment continually modify each other" (p. 152).

Another question that emerged from critics' readings of Nussbaum's work involved how individuals might engage with cultures whose morals differ from their own (Dallmayr, 2003; Friedman, 2000; Papastephanou, 2002; Todd, 2007). Nussbaum (2008) has asserted that an education that will create citizens of the world must be infused

throughout with "capacities for love and compassion" (p. 22; see also Nussbaum, 1997). In contrast, Todd (2007) distinguished between "educating for cosmopolitanism, which entails a faith in principles, and 'thinking cosmopolitan', which entails an aspiration for justice for my neighbors" (p. 27). Like Monroe (1937), Todd was concerned that educators not be given a script from which to lecture students. Rather, she advocated that students be given tools with which to develop their own mindsets so that they can successfully navigate diverse contexts and positively engage in the world.

Nussbaum's vision of cosmopolitan education has also been negatively associated with the phenomenon of globalization (Dodds, 2008; Papastephanou, 2002). Papastephanou (2002) interpreted Nussbaum's recognition of globalization as a rationale for cosmopolitan education as an endorsement of globalizing economic, political, and social trends. I do not believe that this interpretation of Nussbaum's work is appropriate, however. Rather, I understand her as seeing cosmopolitans as what Banks (2008) called "transformative citizens"—individuals who "take action to promote social justice even when their actions violate, challenge, or dismantle existing laws, conventions, or structures" (p. 136).

Recently Nussbaum has distanced herself from the "cosmopolitan" label, although her three desired student outcomes remain rooted in her interpretation of the Stoic ideal: the ability to examine oneself and one's traditions critically, the capability to conceptualize oneself as a citizen of the world, and the aptitude for narrative imagination. She has begun to frame these ideas within the context of higher education for the human development of "decent world citizens who can understand … global problems … and who have the practical competence and the motivational incentives to do something about

those problems" (Nussbaum, 2008, p. 11). This notion of human development for world citizenship prioritized "the humanistic abilities of critical thinking and imagining, so crucial if education is really to promote human development, rather than, merely, economic growth and individual acquisition" (Nussbaum, 2008, p. 4).

Institutional Motivations for Engagement in Internationalization

While the attacks of September 11, 2001, subsequent wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and increasing economic globalization have led U.S. higher education leaders to believe that they should internationalize their institutions to prepare graduates to engage in a complex and integrated world, their language has often been based on the "selling points [of] national security and economic competitiveness," not on the traditional values of mutual understanding and world citizenship (Stohl, 2007, pp. 363-364; see also Banks, 2008; Nussbaum, 1994/1996, 1997, 2008). That being said, this trend predated the tragic events of 2001. In 1990, Groennings asserted that business and political leaders were supporting international education because of "the globalization of nearly everything, most obviously the economy, communications, and national security" (p. 12). Soon after, Johnston (1993) noted that undergraduates had begun "to see their own economic self-interest in international education" (p. 4), which led to higher demand for international education opportunities, such as internationally-oriented courses and study abroad programs. More recently, some scholars (Altbach, 2006; Mestenhauser, 1998; Stromquist, 2007) have explained internationalization efforts as part of academia's entrepreneurial response to globalization, through which institutions of higher education "exploit" global political and economic trends. This explanation was consistent with the faculty perception of "the increasing commodification and commercialization of higher

education and the perceived decline of purely academic values within higher education"
(Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 138), as well as with a trend toward more businesslike
attitudes among academic leaders (Honan & Teferra, 2000).

Many U.S. higher education institutions, however, have expressed their desire to
internationalize as a means to prepare their graduates for lives of "global citizenship"
(Biddle, 2002, p. 7). Biddle (2002) identified three other reasons why U.S. higher
education institutions have felt compelled to internationalize: to remain competitive with
peer institutions, to maintain prestige, as a service to their country and the world. In
addition, she emphasized that a need for revenue generation was an undercurrent in
administrators' discourse on internationalization initiatives at their colleges and
universities.

Also suggesting concurrent motivations to compete and make the world a better
place, Mohrman, Ma, and Baker (2008) proposed an "Emerging Global Model" (EGM)
among research universities. These institutions represented "the leading edge of higher
education's embrace of the forces of globalization" and were characterized by
unprecedented levels of research, as well as "worldwide competition for students, faculty,
staff, and funding" (p. 6). According to these authors, the appearance of this orientation
also pointed to a belief among the leaders of large research universities that "investment
in human capital is good for society and that new knowledge leads to a better world" (p.
6). They anticipated that smaller and more locally oriented colleges and universities
would eventually attempt to follow EGM universities' lead: "[T]he pressures of
globalization and the attractiveness of internationalization will push and pull on [them] to
adapt elements of the EGM to their own circumstances" (p. 25).

One can glean from the observations of Biddle (2002) and Mohrman and associates (2008) that the motivation of college and university leaders to engage in internationalization is driven at least in part by institutional isomorphism, or the tendency for organizations (for example, colleges and universities) in the same environmental context to resemble one another. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) described three types of isomorphism, one of which is especially relevant here: Mimetic isomorphism is an institutional response to ambiguous goals or an uncertain environment (p. 151), such as that which is presented by the complexities of globalization and market demands for higher education. In cases of mimetic isomorphism, some institutions serve— unknowingly or unintentionally—as "modeled organizations" on which other institutions base new practices (p. 151). DiMaggio and Powell suggested that organizations tend to model practices after similar organizations, but the phenomenon of internationalization may present a different scenario. As more colleges and universities seek to respond to global forces, they may adopt internationalization strategies that take after those of larger, more internationally oriented institutions. The risk of emulating these institutions, however, is that their practices may not be an appropriate match for other institution types.

Definitions, Models, and Practices of Internationalization

Different definitions, models, and practices of internationalization emphasize different aspects of the phenomenon. Some conceptualizations and applications prioritize mutual understanding, while others are more technically, politically, or economically oriented. Because of these differences in focus, the definition and/or model that an institution adopts for the design and implementation of its internationalization initiative

will affect the practices in which that college or university will engage during the internationalization process. Indeed, the sources of an institution's motivation to internationalize might influence it to adopt a particular definition, model, or series of practices of internationalization.

   Definitions of internationalization. One of the first scholars to use the term internationalization, Harari (1992; see also Harari, 1989), described it as a "multi-faceted package" (p. 52) that offers an opportunity to integrate all elements of campus life to "transcend disciplines and create a distinct international ethos on campus" (p. 58). Similarly, Ellingboe (1998) defined internationalization as "the *process* of integrating an international perspective into a college or university system" (p. 198), and Mohrman, Ma, and Baker (2008) suggested that it could "be seen as a series of policies and decisions within the control of the inhabitants of the institution — new curricula, international recruitment, joint ventures, and so on" (p. 17). In contrast, Arum and Van de Water (1992) defined internationalization in a way reminiscent of McCaughey's (1984) critique of the field of international studies, describing it as "the multiple activities, programs and services that fall within international studies, international educational exchange and technical cooperation" (Arum & Van de Water, 1992, p. 202). In addition, Van der Wende (1997) directly related internationalization to global economic and political trends, defining it as "any systematic effort aimed at making higher education responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy and labour markets" (p. 18).

   Knight's first definition of internationalization, which she introduced in 1994, situated internationalization within higher education's tripartite mission of teaching,

research, and service for the advancement of knowledge. At that time, she defined it as

the "process of integrating an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching,

research and service functions of the institution" (Knight, 1994, p. 7, quoted in Knight,

2004, p. 9). In an updated definition, Knight (2003) introduced more technical language

and presented internationalization as the "process of integrating an international,

intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-

secondary education" (p. 2).

Knight's conceptualization of internationalization has come to dominate the

literature, with a search on Google Scholar indicating that her 2004 article elaborating on

her 2003 definition has been cited almost 200 times. Her perspective has also been

absorbed by leading higher education associations. For example, the National

Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC; now the

Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities or APLU) used a similar definition of

internationalization in a recent task force report: "integrating international perspectives

and experiences into learning, discovery and engagement" ("A call to leadership," 2004,

p. viii). Likewise, the American Council on Education (ACE) 2006 Survey on

Internationalization of U.S. Higher Education defines it as "institutional efforts to

integrate an international, global, and/or intercultural dimension into the teaching,

research, or service functions of an institution" (Green et al., 2008, p. 95).[2]

For this study, however, I used the definition of internationalization from

NAFSA: Association of International Educators: "the conscious effort to integrate and

infuse international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the ethos and outcomes of

---

[2] In the 2001 version of this survey, ACE used another similar definition: "the incorporation of an
international/intercultural dimension in teaching, research, and service" (Siaya & Hayward, 2003, p. xi).

postsecondary education" (NAFSA Board of Directors, 2010).[3] This definition was more

inclusive and less jargon-laden than Knight's (2003, 2004) definition. In addition, I

agreed with a critique by Sanderson (2008) in which he recognized the usefulness of

Knight's work for understanding internationalization at the macro level, but found it

lacking in ability to inform micro, practice-level understandings of internationalization—

the level on which this study focused, and to which NAFSA alluded through its focus on

"ethos and outcomes."

Models of internationalization. Sanderson (2008) also argued against Knight's

(2003, 2004) conceptualization of internationalization because it assumed that if a college

or university were to establish a framework for internationalization, "the better placed its

teachers, students, and the institution itself should be to operate in an increasingly

dynamic, complex, and competitive higher education environment" (Sanderson, 2008, p.

280). Rather, Sanderson suggested that the organization-level perspective is not

sufficient for understanding or assessing internationalization and argued that there is a

gap in the internationalization literature regarding "how academic staff might

internationalize their personal and professional outlooks" (p. 281).

Rudzki's (1995) description of two models through which colleges and

universities come to engage in internationalization—the reactive and the proactive—

highlighted the potential tensions between these approaches to the process. The reactive

model is a bottom-up model that becomes a top-down model. It begins with the

---

[3] Adherents to institutional theory, however, would argue that internationalization is not a conscious effort by individual colleges and universities as NAFSA's stance implies. Rather, as Schofer and Meyer (2005) averred specifically regarding worldwide expansion of higher education, a "trend toward isomorphism is occurring worldwide, such that flows of students, academic subjects, research agendas, and certified personnel are now treated as routine" (p. 917). Moreover, Boli and Elliott (2008) suggested that "much of the worldwide celebration and promotion of diversity [within institutions of higher education] is the construction of facades that obscure underlying similarity and homogeneity" (p. 542).

establishment by faculty members of preliminary links with overseas colleagues, adjustments to curricula, and international travel. As these relationships are formalized, administrators seek more control of them. This institutional response creates conflict between faculty members and administrators. If such conflict is resolved constructively, internationalization efforts will continue to expand, but if it is not, internationalization initiatives will fade.

Rudzki (1995) discouraged institutional leaders from adopting the reactive model, but he asserted that it is more commonly used. Instead, he recommended that colleges and universities use a proactive model to "ensure the dissemination of internationalization to every level of the institution, devolving power … to those levels where the work is actually undertaken" (p. 436). Beyond delegating, Rudzki encouraged administrative support of academic "staff initiatives and enthusiasm" (p. 437). This model of internationalization begins with a discernment process in which administrators and faculty members consider if it is appropriate for their institution. If they decide to pursue it, they develop a strategic plan and performance measures and allocate resources. What follows are phases of implementation and assessment and a "process of continual improvement" (p. 438).

Sanderson's (2008) model of internationalization emphasized the "local-global continuum" (p. 279) of internationalization's reach, but like Rudzki's (1995) proactive model, he focused on the within-institution and individual levels—the levels at which NAFSA suggests the practice should be assessed ("Internationalizing the campus," 2007). Sanderson's model is consistent with Stohl's (2007) recommendation that "we think of internationalization as how faculty and students (as well as administrators) learn about,

learn from, and learn with others" (p. 369). Stohl juxtaposed his notion of

internationalization—with its focus on learning within a higher education community—

against the approach that calculates an initiative's success via "metrics regarding students

moving across borders, universities offering greater international content, and in general,

the number, geography, and type of cross-border collaborative teaching, research, and

service activities" in which an institution is engaged (p. 369).

Practices of internationalization. Given the diversity within and between U.S.

colleges and universities and the disciplinary traditions that they perpetuate, it is unlikely

that all institutions, academic programs, and individual courses could or should be

internationalized according to one formula. Indeed, flexible application of the word

indicates the variety of strategies that can be adopted to pursue internationalization. The

definitions and models discussed above suggest that practices throughout a college or

university—in all three of higher education's traditional realms of teaching, research, and

service—can be internationalized. That is, international, intercultural, and global

perspectives can be integrated into practices across an institution, which will lead to

changes in the ethos and outcomes of that college or university. The challenge to U.S.

institutions of higher education is to identify internationalization methods that

simultaneously internationalize teaching, research, and service and fulfill stakeholders'

diverse expectations for the initiative.

In addition, these definitions allude to or include the practices that Rudzki (1995)

associated with internationalization in his model: "organizational change, curriculum

innovation, staff development and student mobility, for the purposes of achieving

excellence in teaching and research" (p. 421). To Rudzki, these components function

within a higher education system to accomplish certain outcomes, but he ordered them to indicate each aspect's level of influence within an internationalization process. The institution is the most enduring facet, and the curriculum is the most permanent aspect within the institution. Faculty members follow, and students are the shortest-term participants.

The institution as a whole, its faculty, and its students practice internationalization in a variety of ways. For example, in a recent report on colleges and universities that have excelled at internationalization ("Internationalizing the campus," 2007), NAFSA used these criteria to assess institutions' success in the practice: active support from high-level leadership; breadth and depth of reach across the institution; reform of the curriculum; increased study abroad for students and exchanges for faculty; support of international students and scholars; and "demonstrable results" for faculty and students engaged in the process (p. v).

Internationalization is, however, often pursued via an "additive" approach, which "is consistent with the way curricular change often begins in higher education" (Morey, 2000, p. 28). Although it may be a predictable strategy, commentators (Haigh, 2002; Mestenhauser, 1998; Morey, 2000) have criticized this technique in ways similar to the criticisms of Nussbaum's cosmopolitanism (1994/1996, 1997). The additive approach, they assert, simplifies a complex situation and does not create space for the introduction of new knowledge, perspectives, and modes of thinking. The difficulty of creating such space is not lost on these critics, however. As Haigh (2002) observed, "This is easy to write and very hard to do" (p. 52).

Traditional international education curricula have tended to "focus on *subject-specific* curriculum content based around the identification of knowledge, understanding and skills which are seen to contribute to a more international mindset" (Haywood, 2007, p. 86). Education for an international mindset "stresses the creation of a school-wide learning environment in which subject content is absorbed into the holistic learning experience, which also emphasizes the development of attitudes as well as knowledge, concepts and skills" (Haywood, 2007, p. 86). To instill in students an attitude of what Hill (2000) called "international-mindedness"—a frame of mind that promotes mutual understanding—educators must transcend the disciplinary boundaries that were reinforced by colleges and universities in the latter half of the 20th century.

The key to international-mindedness is that there "is no monopoly on the right way to think and act internationally and the educator ought to avoid any form of indoctrination even if well intended" (Haywood, 2007, p. 85). Monroe (1937) raised concerns about the need to resist indoctrination and dogmatism, and avoiding this tendency should continue to be a priority for diversity and international educators. Educators and institutions that adhere to the ideology that international-mindedness and world citizenship are favorable outcomes for their students are instilling them with the value that "thinking globally and acting locally" is the way in which we should live, but how students apply that value in their everyday lives is an individual decision.

Implications of Internationalization for Faculty

The responsibility of education to encourage peace and mutual understanding remains a prominent theme, although concerns about national security and economic vitality are now also frequent justifications of education for world citizenship. As Harari

(1992) observed, "the argument of economic competitiveness seems to have become an increasingly powerful one advanced by … the business community as well as in universities, and joins the more humanistic and traditional rationale advanced for the internationalization of higher education" (p. 57). Internationalization might, therefore, be seen as having two faces: one justifying international education as a source of global understanding and another justifying it as a mechanism for economic globalization (Haigh, 2003). These rationales do not have to be mutually exclusive, but there exists between them a tension which colleges and universities negotiate as they adopt and go through internationalization processes. This tension is particularly relevant to faculty members' experiences of internationalization, since a "committed and informed faculty is critical to making the types of changes in the curriculum that further the goals of multicultural and global/international education" (Morey, 2000, p. 33).

Haigh (2003) described this atmosphere as one of commercial internationalization in which "academics strive to make the best of a bad situation" (p. 334), seeking to promote understanding rather than appease external market demands or enhance their institution's financial interests. Within a metrics-oriented context (Stohl, 2007), faculty members fear that these initiatives are business endeavors or marketing ploys to be judged on Lyotard's notion of "performativity"— the maximization of the interaction between inputs and outputs—rather than on academic and intellectual achievement (Harris, 2008, p. 348). Beyond challenging their beliefs about the purposes of higher education, however, faculty members' own training and the policies of their institutions may affect their ability to engage effectively in internationalization.

The disciplines are "the gatekeepers of educational change" (Groennings, 1990, p. 11), but faculty members are socialized within disciplinary traditions that have not historically viewed global perspectives as important and that, although they are gatekeepers, are slow to change. Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) suggested that each faculty member's "life develops in predictable ways that are unique to each specialty" (p. 67), but the literature has indicated that a common theme is resistance to internationally oriented content and perspectives. Thus, internationalizing higher education may be challenging to disciplinary traditions—both in the sciences and the social sciences— because the process questions the "universality of knowledge" (i.e., canons and paradigms) and necessitates "extensive discussion of difference, methodology, and epistemology" (Morey, 2000, p. 26). In addition, the Emerging Global Model proposed by Mohrman, Ma, and Baker (2008) suggests that interdisciplinarity is a key component of the response of higher education institutions (research universities, especially) to globalization, and this orientation has particular implications for professors: "Faculty members, as producers of new knowledge, are assuming new roles, shifting from traditional independent patterns of inquiry to becoming members of team-oriented, cross-disciplinary, and international partnerships, with research directed more often than before toward real-world problems" (p. 7).

Prior research on faculty attitudes toward internationalization has intimated that faculty-led, rather than administrative initiatives, "appear to achieve greater concrete effects on faculty behavior" (Finkelstein et al., 2009, p. 140). Indeed, speaking specifically about multicultural education (to which internationalization is an heir), Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) suggested that administrators "impose multiculturalism

on their faculty and expect faculty to know how to cope with the results" (pp. 2-3). There exists a sense among professors, however, that "they lack the necessary skills to do this work or are discouraged by its marginality to what is perceived as 'the real work' of their disciplines" (Johnston, 1993, p. 15). As to how to contend with conflicting priorities,

> Examining and altering assumptions about current practices can provide the impetus for change, but college and university instructors often need appropriate professional development to devise and implement curricular changes…. Faculty … may need both time and practice to learn *how* to change. (Lattuca & Stark, 2009, p. 321)

Based on previous experience with multicultural education, Morey (2000) asserted that institutions should pursue systemic change because global/international education "often changes mission statements, and has an impact on retention, promotion, and tenure decisions through the valuing of multiculturalism and international perspectives in research and teaching" (p. 27). She argued that institutions should encourage their faculties to integrate these topics and viewpoints into the curriculum by offering incentives and training in these areas. In the following section, I discuss prior research on faculty work that speaks particularly to how faculty members are motivated to make decisions about how they go about their work.

Faculty Work

To inform this study of the faculty experience of internationalization, I now turn to a discussion of faculty work. The faculty has many responsibilities within an institution of higher education, all of which contribute to a college's or university's mission of teaching, research, and service: "Their expertise, commitment, energy, and

creativity directly shape the experiences of students, the nature of research, and the impact of the institution on the broader community" (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006, p. xiii). Faculty members are, however, "not understood," are "misunderstood," or are "envied for their apparent autonomy, especially their control of their time" (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, pp. 3-4). Thus, it is "important to study faculty, to learn about not only how they actually behave but also why they behave as they do" (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p. 4). To that end, in this section, I present an overview of expectations for faculty work, after which I discuss scholarship on faculty attitudes toward change and faculty motivations to engage in different aspects of higher education's tripartite mission. In this discussion, I pay particular attention to faculty views of their teaching role, as it is in this area that they have the largest input on the internationalization of their institutions.

Expectations for Faculty Work

A "complete faculty member" is understood to be one who successfully participates in all three aspects of his or her institution's mission at the same time (Fairweather, 2002). As the components of an institutional mission are diverse, so are the ways in which faculty members pursue this mission: by instructing and serving as role models for students, engaging in research, and participating in campus and community outreach (O'Hara, 2009), as well as by developing and updating curricula (Diamond, 1998; Lattuca & Stark, 2009) and perpetuating institutional culture (Richardson, 1994; see also Antonio et al., 2000). Faculty members who can evenly distribute their attention across all these tasks are rare, despite promotion and tenure policies that expect

substantive outputs in both teaching and research, as well as in institutional and other forms of service (Fairweather, 2002; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

Challenges to being a complete faculty member abound, and the assumption that faculty members are "not only free to determine what they do (what they teach, what they study, what they publish), but they have great latitude in when they do it" (Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002, p. 522) has increasingly been called into question, if it ever were an accurate description of faculty life. Geiger (2005), for example, argued that it was the universities of the late 19th century that defined the academic disciplines and the academic profession as they are understood today, requiring that faculty members simultaneously teach and advance the knowledge of their disciplines through scholarly research. In response—and to protect their ability to define the professional rights and freedoms related to their teaching and research responsibilities—faculty members established the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in 1915 (Geiger, 2005; Honan & Teferra, 2000; Lawrence, 2010), an organization that continues to advance academic freedom and shared institutional governance ("About the AAUP," n.d.).

As U.S. higher education expanded in the 20th century, expectations for professors to perform as complete faculty members continued to grow. Achievement of these diverse—sometimes "integrated," sometimes "fragmented" (Colbeck, 1998)—responsibilities seems to constitute a Sisyphean task as pressures to publish, compete for funding, and increase disciplinary specialization contribute to the "perceived turmoil" of U.S. higher education (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p. 3).

Faculty members have often been accused of prioritizing research activities over teaching and service responsibilities (Colbeck, 1998; Fairweather, 2002; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Serow, Brawner, & Demery, 1999; Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2005). Consistent with accusations of a lack of balance in faculty work, surveys conducted during the 1980s indicated that faculty members were placing greater emphasis on research responsibilities than on teaching duties, but these studies also indicated that they viewed their role as teachers as important and were enthusiastic about it (Berman & Skeff, 1988). Schuster and Finkelstein's (2006) analysis of more recent faculty survey data suggested that faculty interest in teaching undergraduate students was rising in the 1990s and 2000s, but more engagement in undergraduate teaching did not mean fewer research activities. Rather, it has meant that faculty members have had to do more teaching and research activities with fewer resources to support their work (Colbeck, 1998; Johnsrud, 2002; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Rosser, 2004; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

Survey data have suggested that this trend has been most pronounced at research universities, but the data have also indicated that faculty members at other four-year institutions have felt pressure to be more productive in all areas of their college or university mission without commensurate institutional support to do so (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Colbeck (1998) observed, however, that most of the literature on faculty members' ability to balance their teaching and research responsibilities disregarded opportunities for professors to integrate the work that they do in support of these roles. In an observation and interview study of 12 physics and English faculty members at an elite research university and a public comprehensive university (with a

unionized faculty), she discovered that the mean proportion of time in which participants integrated teaching and research work was 19%—nearly one-fifth of their work time. Colbeck found the main influences on participants' ability or willingness to integrate these roles to include the purpose of a particular teaching activity, "disciplinary paradigm consensus" (p. 664), disciplinary attitudes toward student participation in research, institutional policies and evaluation rewards, and faculty engagement in decision making. In light of these findings, Colbeck argued that institutions should identify ways to encourage faculty productivity through integration of teaching and research activities.

Discerning means through which faculty members might integrate their work more does not appear to be how U.S. higher education institutions have dealt with concurrent demands for more attention to undergraduate education and more production of knowledge. Instead, colleges and universities have been "unbundling" faculty roles so that some faculty members—often fixed-term or part-time appointees—might dedicate more of (if not all) their time to teaching while others—often tenured professors— commit more of their time to research (Fairweather, 2002; Lattuca & Stark, 2009; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). The unbundling of faculty positions may play to the professional interests and priorities of some faculty members and the financial interests of their institution (since contingent faculty members are less expensive employees than tenure-track or tenured faculty members), but the practice raises serious concerns about consistent participation by the faculty in curriculum development, institutional culture, and institutional governance—key aspects to efforts such as internationalization.

Colbeck and Wharton-Michael (2006) described the unbundled organizational model as the "machine" model of higher education. They argued against this model as a

way to organize academic work because the "substance and meaning of the whole of academic work emerge only as the forms of intellectual activity [i.e., teaching, research, and service] inform and enrich each other" (pp. 18-19). In contrast to the machine model, the professional model—the traditional model of U.S. higher education—emphasizes the value of "highly qualified and flexible workers who handle complex, unpredictable work problems independently" (p. 18). The professional model allows faculty members to approach their work holistically, which in turn allows them to act as role models for students who will learn to "approach complex problems holistically and cooperatively rather than as isolated individuals who focus on discrete tasks" (p. 24).

Moreover, the practice of unbundling risks diminishing faculty members' loyalty to their institutions (Honan & Teferra, 2000), perhaps because they sense that their institutions are less committed to them (Cummings & Finkelstein, 2009; see also Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002). Indeed, the latest Changing Academic Profession (CAP) survey findings indicated that among U.S. faculty members, the percentage of professors who viewed institutional affiliation as important has dropped from 90% in 1992 to 61% in 2007 (Cummings & Finkelstein, 2009). In contrast, the percentage of faculty members who identified their disciplinary affiliation as important has continued to increase, from 92% in 1992 to 96% in 2007 (Cummings & Finkelstein, 2009). Lower faculty allegiance can also, therefore, negatively affect a college's or university's effort to internationalize since such an initiative is usually adopted as an organization-wide vision, and disciplinary traditions often do not share or reinforce this institutional interest in international, intercultural, and global perspectives.

Faculty members are also participating in fewer administrative tasks, which traditionally have been a part of their service role. The "increasing professionalization of academic management," Schuster and Finkelstein (2006) asserted, is allowing professors to reduce their administrative and "academic citizen" roles, which in turn permits them to concentrate on their departmental work and become disconnected from their broader institution (p. 138). It appears, however, that—as is occurring with institutional affiliations—faculty members view their departmental connections as increasingly less important as well. The CAP survey results indicated that from 1992 to 2007 the percentage of professors who view their departmental affiliations as important dropped from 89% to 78% (Cummings & Finkelstein, 2009).

These survey findings and comparative analyses suggest that, across institution types, faculty members are increasingly detached from their academic departments and their institutions. This trend is problematic because prior research has indicated that engagement in shared decision making enhances the possibility that members of a college or university community will follow through on the outcomes of that collaborative process (Lawrence, 2010). The narrowing of faculty roles (into teaching and research specializations), the modification of appointment types (away from tenure-track positions), and the expectation that professors do more with less (whatever their responsibilities are) diminish the likelihood of faculty engagement in institutional—or even departmental—decision making. Faculty members play crucial roles in the successful implementation of innovations adopted by their institutions (Johnson, 1984), and studies on decision making aver that if they are not engaged in the process in which

innovations are developed, they are less likely to contribute to their fulfillment

(Lawrence, 2010).

Faculty Attitudes toward Change

That faculty members are resistant to change is treated as "self-evident truth"

within higher education (Johnson, 1984, p. 496), but this reputation for obstinacy is not

substantiated in the literature. Johnson (1984) suggested that members of the faculty who

are expected to implement changes that they did not help to develop may be viewed as

"noninnovative" if they do not fulfill the change advocates' plans, although the reason for

non-execution may actually be the plan itself or a broader impediment within the

institution (p. 497). Her findings from a survey of faculty members at a large research

university indicated that they are receptive to change (in this context, receptive to a new

type of degree program), as long as it is clear to them that the innovation is academically

sound and likely to succeed (see also Antonio et al., 2000).

In a more recent essay, using data from a larger interview study of research

university faculty, Rhoades (2000) refuted the "received wisdom" that the faculty is

resistant to change—an assumption that, he said, creates the need for a centralized

university administration to push through solutions to an institution's problems (see also

Honan & Teferra, 2000). Rhoades argued against three myths that lend credence to the

necessity of strong administrative leadership, two of which are particularly relevant to

this study. First, Rhoades denied that institutional change can only come from a

university's management, particularly from a "model of central stimulus and

departmental response" (p. 44). Instead, he provided evidence that academic departments

and their faculty members are resistant to monetary incentives, preferring to pursue

innovations of their own design that respond to perceived needs in the external

environment. Second, he challenged the idea that centralized management counteracts

the lack of focus among diverse academic units and "the faculty's fragmented loyalties"

(p. 47). He suggested that "central" administration also lacks focus and suffers from

fragmentation, which is to be expected given the vast activities and pressures of a

research university, and he added that these challenges are exacerbated by frequent

turnover among administrators.

Although hiring practices for faculty members are changing, the faculty still

constitutes, as Rudzki (1995) noted in his model of internationalization, the most

permanent group within a college or university community. Faculty members' consistent

presence on campus and their diverse responsibilities for achievement of their

institution's tripartite mission mean that they are frequently the primary implementers of

changes to their college or university's teaching, research, and service activities—

whether or not they were part of the process out of which changes developed. In the

following section, I discuss what the literature tells us about faculty motivations to

engage in their different roles.

Faculty Motivation

Faculty motivation is understood to have both intrinsic and extrinsic origins

(Berman & Skeff, 1988; Eimers, 1999; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002). Serow and his

colleagues (1999) explained that scholarship on intrinsic motivation has tended to be

based on the assumption that faculty members enjoy more autonomous work lives than

individuals in other professions (see also Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002). That is, professors

can emphasize in their work the aspects of higher education that are most attractive to

them as individuals. Intrinsic motivation comes from the personal enjoyment that one

receives from engaging in teaching, research, or service for the sake of doing it (Eimers,

1999), but too much focus on this type of motivation can create "individual barriers" to

change (Berman & Skeff, 1988, p. 115). This risk is of particular concern at a time when,

as discussed above, external pressures for faculty members to exhibit more balance

between their teaching and research (and, to a lesser degree, service) roles abound.

As these pressures mount, it is taken for granted that faculty members are resistant

(i.e., not motivated) to change and require external sources of motivation to modify their

behaviors and fulfill the public's expectation that they lead more evenly distributed work

lives. Extrinsic motivations for faculty work include verbal support from institutional

leaders (Berman & Skeff, 1988), receiving recognition for the work from external

sources, and advancing professionally because of it (Eimers, 1999). College and

university leaders seek to capitalize on faculty members' extrinsic motivations by

institutionalizing policies and practices to encourage faculty engagement in institutional

initiatives. In a review of the literature on how to motivate faculty to engage in multiple

forms of scholarship (teaching, research, service), for example, O'Meara (2005)

identified four types of policy reforms that institutions tend to adopt to provide external

motivations to faculty members: (a) changes to planning documents and mission

statements, (b) modifying promotion and tenure standards and/or contract stipulations, (c)

accommodating needs for flexible schedules and workloads, and (d) offering grants in

support of the initiative.

The focus on the necessity of extrinsic rewards is consistent with one of the myths

refuted by Rhoades (2000)—that the faculty is fragmented and needs the policies of a

strong, centralized administration to keep it focused on institutional priorities. A focus on extrinsic rewards also recalls the critique by O'Meara, Terosky, and Neumann (2008) which argued that scholarship on postsecondary faculty has perpetuated a "narrative of constraint" that emphasizes how institutional policies and procedures—rather than faculty members' personal motivations and ambitions—drive and improve professors' work lives. Within the literature, however, there has been a debate as to the extent to which extrinsic motivations do influence faculty decision making, or if they can be distinguished from faculty members' intrinsic motivations to set priorities for their teaching, research, and service roles.

In a survey study of faculty motivations for improving teaching—administered at the time when critiques of imbalances in faculty work life were at their peak—Berman and Skeff (1988) found that although faculty members prioritized research more highly than teaching, they viewed their teaching responsibilities as being very important. That being said, fewer faculty participants expressed interest in improving their teaching skills, contending instead that they did not feel the need to do so. Faculty members who reported high enthusiasm for teaching (beyond the view that teaching is important) were keener to enhance their abilities in that area. Berman and Skeff identified this desire to improve as an intrinsic motivation, explaining that while most faculty participants did not share it, the larger group of faculty members was not opposed to participating in activities to improve their teaching. Resistance to doing so emerged from faculty concerns about a lack of time and the absence of extrinsic motivations such as institutional recognition for good teaching. The authors proposed that institutions interested in encouraging faculty

development of teaching skills need to take advantage of some professors' intrinsic

motivation while also expanding opportunities for external rewards for participation.

Studies in the 1990s continued to explore the intrinsic and extrinsic motivations of

faculty members. In their 1995 survey study of faculty motivation, for example,

Blackburn and Lawrence offered a theoretical framework which suggested that faculty

members engage in different teaching, research, scholarship, and service activities

according to a variety of motivations. These motivations are affected by a number of

sources, including "by interest, by self-knowledge concerning their competence and their

chances of success, and by the social knowledge they trust with regard to what students,

peers, and administrators value and reward" (p. 106). Engagement in different activities

and behaviors leads to different products, "such as a new syllabus, a published article, a

painting, a monograph, a chapter in a book, a software program, a musical score, a video

for explaining a difficult concept in a course" (p. 30).

Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) found the strongest predictors of faculty

productivity to be faculty members' self-assessment of their ability to perform a task or

fill a role, their level of interest in performing a task or filling a role, and their perception

of their institution's expectations about their performance of a task or fulfillment of a

role. They suggested that these predictors work together to inform faculty behavior:

Faculty behavior results from the interaction of faculty self-knowledge about their

abilities and interests with their knowledge of their institution's preferences. This

process is "dynamic…, not a static set of conditions" (p. 288).

In another survey study, Eimers (1999) similarly found that intrinsic and extrinsic

motivations are often interrelated. Eimers surveyed faculty members at 20 highly

selective liberal arts colleges to explore how "intrinsic enjoyment of work, satisfaction with the extrinsic recognition from work, and satisfaction or dissatisfaction with job conditions contribute to both teaching and research effectiveness" (p. 125). Although it is difficult to establish causality with survey data, findings of this survey indicated that external recognition—not intrinsic enjoyment—best explained professors' research and teaching effectiveness. The findings also suggested that intrinsic enjoyment of teaching came from external recognition, while the time spent on research contributed to intrinsic enjoyment of research. There appeared to be a reciprocal relationship between intrinsic enjoyment of research and teaching as well, in that those who experienced intrinsic enjoyment in one also experienced it in the other. Eimers concluded that intrinsic enjoyment and external motivations may be connected, and "intrinsic enjoyment 'in and of itself' may not exist without reference to external cues and stimuli" (p. 128).

Qualitative research findings have also indicated interplay between internal and external motivations. Serow, Brawner, and Demery (1999) conducted an interview study of faculty motivations for involvement in a teaching development program at four research universities that were participating in an engineering education coalition. They found that, for many interview participants, it was difficult to distinguish between intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. The faculty members who focused on intrinsic motivations expressed an affinity for the teaching program's goals, while those who emphasized extrinsic motivations concentrated on the potential institutional financial resources that participation might bring to their academic programs. Serow and his colleagues noted that the faculty members who described intrinsic motivations tended to be from departments with more resources than those professors who specifically

mentioned funding as a motivation for participation. More frequently, however, interviewees articulated both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations, indicating that this program provided them with the resources to pursue more fully an activity in which they were already engaged. The professors who were both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated tended to be more oriented toward the teaching and service roles of the faculty, including work on curriculum committees within their institutions and their disciplinary associations. These findings highlighted the diverse motivations that drive faculty members to engage in a development opportunity. In light of this study's findings, Serow and associates suggested that rather than assuming that external motivators are the key to faculty participation, leaders should explore the particular motivations that might encourage faculty members to engage in activities such as teaching development.

In another survey study of faculty members, Antonio, Astin, and Cress (2000) explored intrinsic and extrinsic motivations to engage in the role that seems to be the most undervalued within higher education's tripartite mission: service—and community service, in particular. In response to the rise in popularity of civic education and service learning programs on U.S. campuses, they sought to "identify specific personal characteristics and values as well as types of institutions that promote faculty engagement with and commitment to community service" (p. 377). While they found that nearly 80% of undergraduate faculty reported participating in community service, the amount of time that they dedicated to these activities was below five hours per week. Among all institution types and disciplinary affiliations, the faculty members who were most likely to engage in community service were "altruistic, service oriented, and community oriented"; use student-centered pedagogies; engage in research on race and ethnicity

issues; are female; and are of lower academic rank (p. 388). Antonio and his colleagues

expressed concern regarding this trend: "As long as most service activities are being

practiced by marginalized faculty, those activities will remain marginalized in academe"

(p. 388).

In another exploration of a faculty engagement in a growing movement in U.S.

higher education, Colbeck (2007) conducted a qualitative study of a combination of

tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty members at research and non-research

universities to learn about professors' motivations to participate in a National Science

Foundation (NSF) program to promote teaching-as-research (TAR).[4] She asked local

leaders of the grant program to identify faculty members who were actively engaged in

TAR and interviewed them about their motivations to participate, their practices of TAR,

and the effects that participation was having on their professional lives. In a preliminary

report on 16 faculty members, Colbeck identified three professional identities that they

employed to navigate between their teaching and research roles. First, she described

three "synergetic" professors, all of whom were tenured or tenure-track at research

universities. Their "sense of who they were was integrally bound with their sense of

purpose," and they were intrinsically motivated to use their research skills to the benefit

of their students' learning (pp. 6-7). The second group, consisting of four tenured or

tenure-track professors at research universities, was the "compartmentalized" group.

These faculty members valued TAR practices, sought to incorporate them into their work,

and acknowledged their benefits. They often felt, however, that they needed to separate

their teaching and research responsibilities from each other, primarily because of

---

[4] TAR is "the deliberate, systematic, and reflective use of research methods to develop and implement teaching practices that advance the learning experiences and outcomes of students and teachers" (Colbeck, 2007, p. 2).

disciplinary expectations for publication. Third, Colbeck identified a teaching-focused group of nine faculty members, seven of whom had positions with heavy teaching expectations—four non-tenure track professors at research universities and one tenure-track and two non-tenure track professors at non-research universities. (The two other faculty members in this category were tenured professors at a research university and a comprehensive university.) For all members of this group, the practice of TAR "already was or had become the focus of all their research" (p. 9). Unlike the synergetic and compartmentalized groups, the teaching-focused group viewed TAR as a burden that did not enhance student learning, but Colbeck observed that opportunities such as the NSF program were giving teaching-focused faculty members "some degree of confidence, support, and collegial credibility for engaging in scholarly research on teaching" (p. 11). Colbeck also found that while some faculty members were intrinsically motivated to engage in TAR, others needed encouragement from peers to do so. Further, she noted that "early career academics in all categories were perhaps the most innovative, energetic, motivated, and successful" in maximizing the benefits of TAR for their students and their own careers (p. 11).

Other recent research corroborates Colbeck's (2007) finding regarding the motivation of early-career academics. In an interview study of 16 Generation X faculty members (born between 1964 and 1980) at three institutions, Helms (2010) investigated faculty members' attitudes toward their work and perceptions of intergenerational clashes between "Gen X'ers" and their older colleagues. Gen X'ers are stereotyped as noncommittal to jobs and unmotivated to achieve in their work. Helms's findings defied these generalizations. Participants expressed great dedication to their work, although

their notions of success may differ from their older colleagues' understandings,

particularly as success relates to productivity. Further, while Gen X'ers did acknowledge

that they differed in levels of formality (X'ers wanted less), as well as in comfort with

technology, interest in interdisciplinarity, and desire for collaborative work (X'ers desired

more of all three), they did not describe their relationships with older colleagues as

confrontational or tense. Rather, they expressed desire to create long-term professional

and personal communities in which they could produce "quality" work (as opposed to

quantities of work), establish mentoring relationships, and pursue a work-life balance.

Helms discerned from her participants that their decisions around their work were

motivated primarily from a desire to create and maintain a sense of community. Policies

such as tenure assist in achieving these priorities, but so do X'ers' preferences for

interdisciplinarity and collaboration. These interests are also conducive to

internationalization, which asks educators to transcend disciplinary boundaries and create

teaching and research communities around the world.

Summary

Despite more than a century of commentary advocating education for world or

global citizenship, U.S. faculty members are still often socialized into disciplinary

traditions that do not emphasize the value of international, intercultural, or global

perspectives within their fields. In the early part of the 20th century, Royce (1908/1988)

called on educators to enhance their communities by preparing youth to be "provincial,"

"patriotic," *and* "citizens of the world" (p. 192) through engagement with other cultures

and adoption of new traditions that might be beneficial to their communities. Following

World War I, scholars of primary and secondary education continued to advocate for

students to learn about other countries as well as their own so as to be better prepared to live and work in an increasingly interconnected world (Kandel & Whipple, 1937; Monroe, 1937; Shotwell, 1937; Tewksbury, 1945; Whipple, 1937).

With the escalation of the Cold War following World War II, motivations for international education seemed to become less altruistic and more strategic (Butts, 1963; Klitgaard, 1981; Mayhew, 1977; McCaughey, 1984; Michie, 1968; Palat, 2000). Similarly, today's institutional internationalization initiatives are often viewed with suspicion because of questions surrounding colleges' and universities' motivations for pursuing them—whether they are doing so to enhance student learning or to increase their revenue stream. Whatever an institution's motivation for pursuing internationalization, however, for the effort to be a success, its faculty must be motivated to engage in the process.

Faculty motivation is a complex affect that may vary by career age (Colbeck, 2007; Helms, 2010) and perhaps also by institution type (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Clark, 1987) and life experiences. Prior research has suggested, for example, that women and faculty of color tend to use different instructional styles. Similarly, interests in internationalization of the curriculum may be influenced by an array of factors. Identifying sources of faculty motivation has the potential to help advocates of different types of institutional initiatives (such as internationalizing the curriculum) because faculty members are pressed for time to fulfill all the roles that academia and the public assign to them.

Integration of internationalization into higher education curricula and co-curricula requires that internationalization be practiced throughout the college or university, not

just at the periphery by faculty members who are intrinsically motivated to participate. The literature tells us that institutional leaders should capitalize on professors' internal drives, but they must also discern ways in which to (a) reward personally motivated faculty members for their participation and (b) attract faculty members who require external incentives to get involved in activities that are outside the scope of their "normal" routines or require additional time and effort. Challenges to faculty effectiveness emerge as well when colleges and universities adopt initiatives in which professors are not professionally prepared to engage, in which they are not personally interested, or around which they discern personal or professional disincentives for participation. Identifying ways to overcome a lack of preparation, interest, or motivation is difficult, particularly when relations between different types of motivation are so complex.

The faculty in its entirety contributes in diverse ways to the achievement of higher education's tripartite mission, and its members still have some flexibility in how they prioritize their work. Public perceptions that professors emphasize research over teaching have, however, placed pressure on institutions and their faculties to reconsider the time and effort that they dedicate to undergraduate education. Concern for faculty contact with students is not without merit, as the literature indicates that effective performance of teaching responsibilities are crucial to a college's or university's success because professors "may play the single-most important role in student learning" (Umbach & Wawrzynski, 2005, p. 176; see also O'Hara, 2009).

Rather than emphasize these impediments to internationalization—understood as "the conscious effort to integrate and infuse international, intercultural, and global

dimensions into the ethos and outcomes of postsecondary education" (NAFSA Board of Directors, 2010)—in this dissertation study I explored the motivations that have led faculty members to engage in their institution's internationalization effort. I also investigated how these professors have put internationalization into practice and what their predictions are for their institutions' internationalization efforts. The findings of this inquiry both expand our understanding of faculty motivation to engage in internationalization and reveal how individual faculty members view their institution's internationalization program and their place within it. In turn, internationalization advocates will be able to use this information as they seek to engage faculty members more effectively in their efforts. In the following chapter, I outline the methods that I will use to achieve a greater understanding of the faculty experience of internationalization.

Chapter 3

Methodology and Methods

Myriad factors are at work as faculty members discern whether and how to engage in an institutional internationalization initiative. Given the complexity of the process and the absence of research on internationalization that investigates the motivations and influences that lead faculty members to make these decisions, in this study I employed a qualitative, exploratory approach to address three interrelated questions:

1. What motivates faculty to engage in internationalization efforts? Are personal or institutional influences more influential in their decision to participate?

2. Which of faculty members' teaching, research, service, and other professional activities do they connect to their institution's internationalization initiative?

3. What do faculty members identify as the facilitators and/or impediments to their engagement in these internationalization efforts? How do these facilitators and/or impediments influence their decisions about engagement and affect their motivation to engage in internationalization efforts on their campus?

Qualitative research methods do not permit generalizations to a population, but their use "allows for and facilitates the emergence of new themes and issues in the course of data collection and analysis" (Helms, 2010, p. 18). In contrast, while survey research is useful for gaining a general understanding of a population, it is not practical for detecting nuances or distinctions among individual respondents' experiences or opinions. Researchers in the area of internationalization have recognized this weakness. For

example, the authors of ACE's 2006 *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses* survey recognized as a weakness of their instrument that it "does not provide an adequate vehicle to probe the many qualitative aspects of internationalization, such as … the integration of international perspectives" into the curriculum (Green et al., 2008, pp. 4-5). By employing a qualitative approach, this study sought to fill in some of the blanks left by prior survey research on internationalization.

To gain a fuller understanding of the experiences that promote faculty participation in internationalization initiatives, how individual faculty members practice internationalization, and their visions for future involvement with internationalization, I conducted a phenomenological interview study of faculty members at two higher education institutions with formal internationalization programs or initiatives. Below, I describe how I identified research sites and participants, collected data, and analyzed that data to achieve the goals of this study. Throughout, I relate this dissertation plan to pilot work that I completed during the spring 2010 semester.

Site and Participant Selection

My review of the literature indicated that scholarship on internationalization and faculty motivation has often concerned faculty working in large research universities. It is important to diversify beyond this type of institution because faculty attitudes toward internationalization, motivations for engagement, and practices may differ by institutional type. Scholars who study faculty work have argued that institutional affiliation is a crucial variable in faculty experience, as are disciplinary training (Clark, 1987) and individual characteristics (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). That being said, the literature has also suggested that faculty members, regardless of their place of employment, possess

personal agency that motivates them in their decisions about their work lives (O'Meara et al., 2008). The changing nature of faculty work—such as increasing pressures for tenured and tenure-track professors to do more with less and unbundling of roles among contingent faculty members—affects the decision-making processes of faculty members throughout academia, however, and higher education research should explore the diverse environments in which professors navigate these challenges. By expanding our understanding of faculty members' internationalization experiences beyond research universities, this study contributes to the literatures on internationalization and faculty motivation.

Site Selection

The institutions that served as my research sites were private institutions located in the northeast United States and focused on undergraduate education. Each institution had established formal internationalization policies including faculty grants for internationalization of the curriculum. (Additional information on each site is included in Chapter 4.)

My desire to study the faculty experience of internationalization at undergraduate-focused universities was based on my understanding that while tenured and tenure-track faculty members at these institutions may be more inclined to prioritize teaching over research, they may not be motivated to internationalize their teaching. Moreover, as my literature review indicated, faculty members at all types of institutions are being expected to do more work with fewer resources, so by looking at professors at teaching-oriented institutions, I expected to obtain a sense of how and why faculty members approach and prioritize their instructional responsibilities as they do.

Both research sites chosen for this study had maintained internationalization efforts for several years. I chose to complete this study at institutions that had longer standing internationalization programs for two reasons. First, persistence of their faculty grant programs suggests institutional commitment. Second, I assumed that an initiative in existence for an extended period would be better integrated within the institution, meaning that more members of the institution may be aware of and involved with the program.

In August 2010, I began to approach prospective research sites. I contacted 11 higher education institutions regarding the possibility of pursuing my study on their campuses. (See Appendix A for my letter of introduction, which I usually sent to a university's chief academic officer unless I had been advised by an institutional contact to submit it to another official.) Nine institutions refused my request to pursue my study on their campuses.

After my request was declined by the first two institutions that I approached, in November 2010 I attended a regional conference of NAFSA: Association of International Educators to network with international education professionals in the northeast. Through the conference, I made three contacts with whom I followed up regarding the possibility of pursuing my study at their institutions. One of these contacts was successful, contingent on approval by its institutional review board (IRB). I next initiated a wider Internet search of institutions throughout the northeast United States that were of comparable size to the first institution that I secured and met the other site criteria that I had established. After eliminating two institutions from consideration because of

logistical concerns, I contacted representatives of four additional universities, and one of these institutions agreed to participate, again contingent on approval by its IRB.

After the IRB at each institution approved my application, I submitted to the Pennsylvania State University Office for Research Protections requests for modifications to my existing approved research study (IRB #33041, the pilot study that I completed during the spring 2010 semester). Upon receipt of approval of these modifications, I began to identify and recruit participants from each research site.

Participant Selection

Participants in this dissertation study were tenured or tenure-track professors who had engaged in their institution's internationalization initiative through receipt of a grant to internationalize the curriculum and/or other activities identified by their international office head.[5] I recruited tenured or tenure-track professors because they bear full responsibility for achievement of a university's tripartite mission.[6] Moreover, perpetuation of institutional culture and development and reform of curricula—the "ethos" and "outcomes" of internationalization—are primary tasks of tenure-line faculty members. By identifying participants who had received internationalization grants or been active in internationalization of the curriculum in other ways, I developed a pool of participants who had been motivated to engage in their university's internationalization effort.

---

[5] Please see Chapter 4 for profiles of research participants. In this section, I delineate how I came to recruit these participants.

[6] In my pilot study, all five participants were grant recipients. Four participants in my pilot study had received tenure; two were full professors, and two were associate professors. One participant was not in a tenure-track position, but I did not realize his status until after I recruited him. He was, however, a graduate faculty member with administrative and teaching responsibilities in an undergraduate minor within his college.

Criteria for selection also included being among the earliest internationalization grant recipients at their institution and having long-standing reputations for involvement in international work. My rationale for recruiting interviewees from among the earliest program participants is that these faculty members had had some time to incorporate (or not) their grant experience into their work. Alternatively, if they were not grantees, they had had time to develop other ways to internationalize the curriculum. In my pilot study, I found that participants were able to describe and reflect in detail on personal, professional, and institutional facilitators and impediments to ongoing engagement in internationalization, such as family commitments, time constraints, funding limitations, research commitments, and overall institutional support even several years after they had received their grant.

Three participants in my pilot study were U.S. born, and two were foreign born, although one foreign-born participant was a naturalized U.S. citizen. Recruitment of international faculty members is one way in which colleges and universities pursue internationalization, so including foreign-born professors in this study had the potential to provide useful insights into the faculty experience of internationalization. Since a key aspect of this study is to discover the experiences that motivate faculty to engage in internationalization, however, I also recruited U.S.-born faculty members, with the idea that their academic preparation may not have instilled in them the value of international, intercultural, and global perspectives, while foreign-born faculty members' personal experiences and academic preparation were more likely to have done so.

I desired to recruit faculty members from different disciplines and fields, including the social sciences, natural and physical sciences, and humanities, as well as

business, engineering, and education. As I discussed in my literature review, internationalization may be challenging to some disciplinary traditions and paradigms, and the findings of my pilot study provided some support for this argument. By engaging faculty members from a wide range of fields, I could explore the diversity of and similarity between the experiences of faculty members in different disciplinary traditions. This strategy differs from that of Stromquist (2007), who premised her case study of the relationship between globalization, internationalization, and internationalism on the assumption that "business, vocational, and professional programs have benefited most from globalization" (p. 86). She limited her study to professional schools of business, communication, and engineering within one large, private university. In this study, I included faculty members from a variety of disciplines and fields to learn where their experiences of internationalization merge and diverge—findings that would lend broader insights to our understanding of faculty motivations to participate in institutional initiatives such as internationalization, faculty perspectives on these programs and their involvement in them, and ways in which advocates of these efforts might encourage more faculty involvement to enhance its chances of success.

Participant Recruitment

Upon receipt of permission from the Pennsylvania State University Office of Research Protections to engage in this study, I requested from the head of each institution's international office a complete list (including contact information) of faculty recipients of grants to internationalize the curriculum, as well as a list of names (and contact information) of faculty members who were known to be involved in internationalization of the curriculum. (See Appendix B for my request for participant

recommendations e-mail text.) From these lists, I identified faculty members to invite to participate in interviews, according to the criteria that I described above. I intended to recruit 16 participants (eight from each institution), but ultimately I secured 15 (seven from one site and eight from the other). I contacted individual faculty members first by e-mail and then by telephone if I did not receive an e-mail response from them within several days. (See Appendices C and D for recruitment letters and Appendices E and F for telephone scripts.) What follows is an explanation of how I prioritized invitations to different faculty members, as well as the specific processes that I used for each research site.

In late December 2010, the head of the international office at the first of my research sites provided me with the names and contact information of all four faculty members who had received internationalization grants, as well as six other faculty members who had been involved in internationalization of the curriculum in other ways. In mid-January 2011, I contacted the four grant recipients and four of the other professors whom my contact had recommended.

From this initial round of invitations, the four internationalization program grantees all agreed to speak with me, as did three of the four non-grantees. I opted not to invite the other two faculty members whom the international office head originally recommended because they were in the same fields as and involved in projects with two of the non-grantees who had already agreed to participate. As disciplinary diversity was an important criterion for participant selection, I sought new recommendations from my international office contact, who provided me with two additional faculty recommendations, neither of whom agreed to meet me. By this point, however, I was

interviewing participants, and several of them referred me to their colleagues. Unfortunately, none of those leads was successful, either. As I had recruited a diverse group of seven participants (four female, three male; three foreign-born, four U.S.-born; five tenured, two tenure-track) in a variety of academic fields, and I was about to begin recruiting at the second site, my advisor and I decided I should cease recruiting at the first site.

In early April 2011 the director of the international office at the second research site provided to me a list of five internationalization grant recipients and seven other faculty members whom I could contact regarding my study. My contact had been in touch with prospective participants to confirm their potential availability for my study, and he warned me that several had "expressed concern about the time commitment," particularly since I had intended to hold at least one round of interviews before the end of the spring 2011 semester. Despite these concerns, all seven individuals whom I contacted from this original list of 12 prospective participants of agreed to engage in my study.

This group was diverse in a number of ways. Five participants were female, two were male; three were foreign-born, four were U.S.-born; and four were tenured, three were on the tenure-track. The participants also represented a variety of academic fields that corresponded approximately to the fields of the participants whom I had recruited at the other site—a connection that I thought might be useful for comparing faculty experiences. I decided not to invite the other five faculty members whom my contact had recommended. One was not in a tenure-line position, and I had hoped for more disciplinary diversity in the group. I requested additional suggestions from my contact,

and he followed up with the names of two female pre-tenure internationalization grant recipients, both of whom agreed to participate in my study. Thus, when I began interviewing faculty members at the second site, I had secured nine participants there (seven female, two male; four foreign-born, five U.S.-born; four tenured, five tenure-track; six grantees, three non-grantees).[7]

Data Collection and Analysis

I collected data from study participants through two semi-structured interviews with each faculty member and focus groups with two to five participants from each institution. Throughout these interviews and focus groups, I sought to collect from faculty members "raw data … of concrete descriptions of specific experiences" (Giorgi, 2009, p. xiv) with and around internationalization to gain a more thorough understanding of what it was like for faculty members to engage in internationalization and what it meant for them to do so.

Data Collection

Using a modified version of Seidman's (2006) model for phenomenological interviewing, I interviewed each participant two times and involved 13 of the 15 participants in focus groups.[8] Seidman described phenomenological researchers who depend on single meetings with interviewees whom they do not know as skating on "thin contextual ice" (p. 17). In contrast, phenomenological researchers and study participants who meet repeatedly over time were able to "plumb the experience and … place it in context" (p. 17). The first interview explored the interviewee's life history to provide

---

[7] One of these participants was eventually dropped from the study because she was not available for the second interview and focus group.

[8] Seidman (2006) recommended a three-interview series, which my dissertation committee discouraged because of the time commitment required of participants. The committee thought that a more productive use of participants' time would be a combination of interviews and focus groups.

insight into the context in which he or she experienced the phenomenon of internationalization. It also provided opportunities for the participant to "reconstruct the details of [an] experience within the context in which [the phenomenon of internationalization] occurs" (p. 17). The second interview allowed the participant to reflect on the meaning the experience of internationalization had for him or her. The focus group offered a setting in which participants could reflect on their experiences and discuss with colleagues how their university might engage the overall faculty more effectively in internationalization of the undergraduate curriculum.

The sequence of two interviews followed by a focus group allowed study participants to describe the context, details, and meaning of the experience of internationalization in their academic work and professional lives, as well as how they envision internationalization progressing (or not) at their institution. After obtaining informed consent at the start of the first interview (see Appendix G for informed consent form), I briefly recounted the purpose of the study and asked if the participant had any questions. I then asked faculty participants for an overview of their workload, after which I asked them to provide life histories in which they were to focus on the experiences that motivated them to engage in their institution's internationalization initiative (and participate in their institution's internationalization grant program, if applicable). From there, I asked participants to describe how they put this interest into practice in their teaching, research, and service roles. In the second interview, I asked participants if there were anything that they would like to add from our previous meeting, after which I asked them to reflect on the meaning of internationalization within their work lives and describe where they envisioned themselves heading professionally in the

future. (See Appendices H, I, and J for interview guides.) In the focus groups, participants were invited to introduce themselves, after which they engaged in a facilitated conversation about their impressions of why more colleagues were not engaged in internationalization and what their universities might do to improve the situation. (See Appendix K for focus group discussion guide.)

Most interviews lasted approximately one hour, although some were as brief as 30 minutes or as long as two hours. All interviews were recorded digitally and transcribed. Focus groups lasted one hour each and were recorded digitally. Following each interview, I provided each participant with an interview summary of no more than two pages. Interviewees were invited to modify, correct, or omit anything that they said during our conversation. In addition to providing an initial member check, writing these summaries offered me a structured way to review transcripts and identify follow-up questions and needed clarifications, adjust the interview protocol for the next interview accordingly, and write reflective memos to document my thinking process and preliminary thoughts about the analysis. In my pilot study, I was limited to one interview with each participant. I recognized that if I had been able to schedule multiple meetings with the faculty members, I would have been able to obtain richer data by building up rapport with the participants and by having the opportunity to pose follow-up questions to information that they shared in their interviews. (See Appendix L for summary check e-mail text.)

It had been my intention for there to be breaks of one to two weeks between each interview with each participant, although, due to limited participant availability and other logistical issues, I had to spread interviews and focus groups across a much longer

timeframe. I was able to make day trips to my first site, which meant that I could be more flexible in terms of identifying meeting times with faculty members there. I began interviewing participants at this site in late January 2011 and concluded those interviews in early April 2011. Due to participant schedules, I was unable to schedule focus groups until the fall 2011 semester. One focus group, with five participants, occurred in early September 2011, and the second focus group, with two participants, occurred in mid-October 2011.

Data collection at the second site required overnight travel. I visited this site for the first time in mid-April 2011, and during this trip I conducted six first interviews. I followed up with a second trip at the end of April 2011, during which I conducted two first interviews and six second interviews. I did not return to the campus until September 2011, when I made two separate trips to campus. During these visits I held three more second interviews and two focus groups. Each focus group included three participants; two participants did not participate in focus groups because of the incompatibility of their schedules with the majority of participants' and my availability. (See Appendix M for text of e-mail following up on focus groups.)

Data Analysis

Crucial to a phenomenological approach to data analysis is the practice of bracketing or *epoché*, the process of setting aside one's beliefs, knowledge, and/or experiences of a phenomenon during the analysis of another's description of his or her experience of that phenomenon (Giorgi, 2009; Van Manen, 1990). "One may very much be aware of past personal experiences relevant to the ongoing experiential encounter or favorite theories leading to comfortable interpretations about the ongoing experience,"

Giorgi (2009) observed, but the expectation for phenomenological analysis is that the researcher will distance himself or herself from this prior knowledge to focus on the data provided by study participants (p. 93).

Moreover, in his explanation of his approach to phenomenological interviewing, Seidman (2006) warned against engaging in in-depth analysis of data until all interviews are complete. His explanation is that he wants to "avoid imposing meaning from one participant's interviews on the next" (p. 113). To this end, I tried to limit my data analysis to the preparation of interview summaries (described above) until the end of data collection. As my timeframe for data collection continued to extend, however, I began during summer 2011 to engage in more in-depth analysis of the data that I had gathered. Throughout this process, and particularly when I returned to the sites to complete data collection, I sought to bracket my own experiences of internationalization, as well as those of participants, so as not to let these experiences cloud what other participants were telling me.

Giorgi (2009) advocated a process of descriptive analysis that "attempts to understand the meaning of the [interviewee's] description [of an experience] based solely upon what is presented in the data" (p. 127). It is this approach that I employed in my interview transcript and focus group analysis. While Giorgi (1985b, 2006, 2009) originally developed his method for use in psychology, the approach can be applied to qualitative research questions around experience and meaning in any human science. Giorgi (1985a) conceptualized phenomenology in this way:

> The guiding theme of phenomenology is to go 'back to the "things themselves"'
>
> (Husserl, 1970/1900, p. 252) and for a phenomenological psychologist one

interpretation of that expression means to go to the everyday world where people

are living through various phenomena in actual situations. (p. 1)

In Giorgi's language, I went into the everyday world of higher education where

professors were living through diverse roles within their university's tripartite mission,

but I focused particularly on their experiences of their institution's internationalization

efforts to understand what motivated them to engage in internationalization, what

internationalization meant and looked like to them, and what enhanced or impeded their

continuing participation in internationalization.

Giorgi's (1985c, 2009) method of descriptive phenomenological reduction

involves four steps and can be used in analysis of single cases or across cases. First, I

read the entirety of each interview and listened to each focus group recording to obtain its

general meaning. Second, I returned to the beginning of the text to identify "units of

meaning" (Giorgi, 2009, p. 129). This phase required the adoption of a "disciplinary

attitude," which "brings the proper sensitivity to the analysis and … provides a

perspective that enables the data to be manageable" (Giorgi, 2006, p. 354). For this

study, I used the disciplinary lenses of higher education by employing the literature on

faculty work and faculty motivation that I discussed in my literature review, and I

employed Atlas.ti data analysis software to facilitate identification and labeling of

meaning units. In the third phase, I again returned to the text to "interrogate" the

meaning units to discern how to articulate "in a more satisfactory way" the implications

of participants' descriptions of their experiences of internationalization for educational

theory and practice (Giorgi, 2009, p. 131). Part of this step is "free imaginative

variation," a process in which the researcher removes elements from a participant's

description of an experience to discern which elements of that experience are essential to the phenomenon, as opposed to "partial objects" of its fulfillment (Giorgi, 2009, p. 133). In some cases, multiple rearticulations—what Giorgi (2009) calls "transformations"—of meaning units were required before the most explicit articulation of the lived experience of internationalization emerged.[9]

The fourth and final phase of Giorgi's method of phenomenological reduction was the writing of the "structure"—the term that Giorgi uses instead of "essence"—of the experience of internationalization. The structure was not intended to be "a definition of the phenomenon" (Giorgi, 2009, p. 166). Rather, it was to be "the identification of the constituents [dimensions] that are essential for the phenomenon to manifest itself … as well as an understanding of how the constituents relate to each other" (Giorgi, 2009, p. 200). Giorgi (2009) suggested that one or more structures may be developed from the data; if the researcher were to find the data to be disparate, he or she may need to write multiple structures (if not one for each participant) to reflect accurately the lived experience of the phenomenon as it was described by study participants. The structures that I identified through this data analysis process can be found in Chapters 5 and 6.

Throughout this process of phenomenological reduction, I sought to bracket my knowledge of theory and findings from the literature, my personal and professional experiences, and my beliefs about the phenomenon of internationalization and the practice of faculty work. Moreover, I attempted to bracket my knowledge and experience of the institutions at which I engaged in this study so as to focus on the experiences of the faculty participants as individuals. In addition, concentrating on the participants'

---

[9] I used this approach to data analysis in my pilot study, and I struggled with truncating, rather than reducing, the text.

descriptions of their experiences of internationalization—rather than on the institutional contexts in which they occurred—was crucial for understanding the structure(s) of the faculty experience of internationalization.

Giorgi (2009) explained that in phenomenological inquiry the researcher "does not posit the existence of the object [phenomenon] but sees it simply as a presence to be explored" (p. 90). That is, by selecting particular research sites according to the criteria outlined above, I took as a "given" the presence of internationalization programs at these universities. Through my interviews with faculty participants, I did not evaluate their institutions' internationalization initiatives. Rather, I sought to enhance the understanding of faculty members' lived experience of internationalization by identifying the key elements that constitute that experience.

Validity Issues

While some phenomenological approaches endorse the use of outside experts and member checks to enhance validity of findings, Giorgi (2006) opposed both practices. Regarding the use of outside experts, Giorgi argued that all that their input might provide is "face validity" as findings are "justified on the basis of all of the new data collected, not on the past experience of experts" (p. 357). He elaborated more on why phenomenological researchers should not use member checks. He did not believe that these checks are "trustworthy" because he does not concur with the assumption that "the experiencer is also the best judge of the meaning of the experience" (p. 358). First, he argued that participants present their experiences "from the perspective of the natural attitude," not from the phenomenological and disciplinary attitudes that the researcher employs. Thus, "eidetic [detailed, vivid] findings … can only be checked by

phenomenological procedures" (p. 358). Second, he suggested that the intent "of the research is not to clarify the experience that the individuals have for their own sake, but for the sake of the discipline" the attitude of which the researcher applies to the analysis (p. 358). It is, therefore, the responsibility of the researcher to ensure internal validity of the study by adhering as closely as possible to the phenomenological method of analysis and reduction.

I followed Giorgi's (2006) recommendation that a phenomenological researcher not consult outside experts, but I did engage study participants in member checks. These member checks, however, were intended to confirm my understanding of facts that participants presented to me in the course of our interviews. I did not invite participants to provide feedback on my analysis and reduction of the experiences that they shared with me in the course of the study.

Ethical Issues

Participants in this study were faculty members at two higher education institutions, and in compliance with human subjects protections I was required to protect both the "external" and "internal" confidentiality of the participants (Tolich, 2004). Tolich (2004) conceptualized confidentiality as an iceberg, with external confidentiality being the tip—what we can easily recognize—and internal confidentiality being the massive part underneath—what we do not see. More formally defined, while external confidentiality is the "traditional" sort in which names are disguised, internal confidentiality is "the ability for research subjects … to identify each other in the final publication of the research" (p. 101). "Connected persons," Tolich explained, "are

vulnerable to harm because potential harm from internal confidentiality is not recognized" (p. 102).

Therefore, I intentionally disguised the identities of study participants, although I was aware, as Guenther (2009) warned, that the use of pseudonyms can give researchers a false sense of security about protection of participant identity. Guenther noted that using "pseudonyms in place of the real names of individuals is so dominant in the social sciences that both authors and readers often assume that pseudonyms are in use" (p. 413). I invited each participant to suggest a pseudonym that he or she felt would be appropriate for me to use when referring to him or her. By asking the participants to choose their own pseudonyms, I sought to assure them that I was making every effort to protect their identities. In addition, since the participants in this study came from a variety of backgrounds, I did not feel comfortable choosing pseudonyms for them. In the few cases in which participants invited me to assign pseudonyms to them, I confirmed that the name that I chose was acceptable to them.

Beyond the use of pseudonyms, I sought to protect participants' identities by disguising their institutions' names and their departmental affiliations. If necessary, I also concealed their places of origin and other personal or professional identifiers. To encourage pre-tenure participants to participate openly in focus groups, I either grouped them with other pre-tenure participants, or I received permission from them to group them with tenured colleagues. Lastly, I provided excerpts of the document in which they were personally depicted so that they could provide feedback as to whether their identities are sufficiently disguised. (See Appendix N for faculty member check e-mail text.)

Summary

This dissertation study investigated the faculty experience of internationalization at two private, teaching-focused universities in the northeast United States. With 15 faculty participants, I explored what motivates faculty members to engage in their institution's internationalization effort, how they practice internationalization in their work, and how they envision (or not) participating in internationalization in the future. The findings of this study seek to contribute to our understanding of faculty motivation and decision making, faculty engagement in internationalization, and convergence and divergence of individual and institutional goals within the context of an institutional initiative. My research will offer a set of propositions, based on the findings of this study, that can be explored in future research, as well as recommendations for future research design. In addition, it will, as Giorgi (2006) argued, "describe an essential finding that is intrinsically general" (p. 356). That is, the findings may provide insight for advocates of internationalization as they seek to engage more faculty members in their efforts and to researchers as they continue to explore the phenomena of internationalization and faculty work.

As this study focused on individuals' experiences of a phenomenon, I employed a phenomenological approach to my research. This approach included a series of two interviews with each participant and one focus group with multiple participants in which I asked each faculty member about his or her life history, work, and plans for the future as they relate to the faculty member's experience of internationalization, as well as ways in which they thought their institutions could enhance faculty participation in internationalization. I analyzed interview transcripts and focus group recordings using an

approach to phenomenological reduction that includes bracketing and imaginative

variation, as well as the application of disciplinary lenses that will help me to elucidate

the structure of the essential constituents of the faculty experience of internationalization.

Chapter 4

Profiles of Research Sites and Participants

As I discussed in Chapter 3, I chose to pursue this study at private institutions that focused on undergraduate education and had established formal internationalization initiatives including faculty grants for internationalization of the curriculum. My desire to engage in this research at such institutions came from on my assumption that while their tenured and tenure-track faculty members may be more inclined to prioritize teaching over research, they may not be particularly motivated to *internationalize* their courses and programs. The presence of institutional policies and incentives for internationalization, however, may enhance faculty motivation to do so. In addition, as my review of the literature in Chapter 2 indicated, research on internationalization and faculty motivation has most frequently been conducted in large public research universities. Consequently, by situating this study within Prudens University and Astutus University, this study sought to expand the literatures on internationalization and faculty decision making in terms of institution type and sources of motivation.

Scholars of faculty work have argued that institutional affiliation, as well as individual characteristics (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995) and disciplinary training (Clark, 1987), are crucial variables in the faculty experience. To create a context for the research findings that I will present in Chapters 5 and 6, I provide in this chapter brief profiles of the two institutions of higher education and the 15 tenured and tenure-track faculty members who participated in this study. After introducing Prudens and Astutus

Universities,[10] I describe the personal backgrounds and professional characteristics of the participants from each institution. In some cases, per participants' request, I refrain from describing participants by academic discipline or field to protect their identities. In addition, I refer to them by their chosen pseudonyms. These profiles begin to explain how participants' personal and professional experiences have shaped their interest in internationalization and make meaning of their involvement in the enterprise.

Prudens University

Founded in the early 20th century as a Roman Catholic men's college, Prudens University is situated on an urban campus in the northeastern United States. Like many small men's colleges, it became coeducational in the early 1970s. Today, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's basic classification for Prudens is "Master's L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)," meaning that Prudens awarded at least 200 master's degrees in 2008-2009. In 2010-2011, however, the University's undergraduate enrollment of almost 4,000 students greatly overshadowed its graduate enrollment of nearly 700 master's students (70% of whom were part-time students).

Prudens is a highly residential institution, with the vast majority (95%) of undergraduate students living on or within walking distance of campus. As of 2010-2011, the student body was rather homogeneous in terms of race and ethnicity, with approximately 75% of undergraduates identifying as White, 10% as people of color, and 1% as nonresident aliens. (The remaining undergraduates' race and ethnicity were unknown.) Within the most recent freshman class (the class of 2015), 93% of students

---

[10] The enrollment data and the strategic plan information for Prudens and Astutus Universities that are included in these introductions came from the institutions' websites. Additional information came from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/).

were from New England and the Mid-Atlantic; 3% were from other states; and 4% were

international students, dual citizens, or permanent residents. Almost 60% of Prudens

undergraduates were women, and up to 80% of Prudens students identified themselves as

Roman Catholic.

In an effort to diversify undergraduate enrollments, Prudens has been developing

a stand-alone strategic plan for diversity that includes initiatives to recruit and enroll

more students of color and international students. To this end, some policies under

consideration at the time of this study included revised admissions criteria and the

institutionalization of additional support mechanisms for these student populations.

Beyond increasing the number of international students at Prudens, internationalization is

not part of this strategic plan for diversity, nor is it integrated into the University's current

general strategic plan. The latter document, however, includes diversity as one of the

University's five main institutional concerns and notes the need to promote global

perspectives within the curriculum as part of that priority.

One key way in which Prudens has sought to internationalize the curriculum is

through its international studies major, which was instituted in the past decade. In a

testament to the success of this program, it recently received a national award for its role

in internationalizing the University. Both the founding and current directors of this

program participated in this study.

In 2008, Prudens created a centralized international office and hired of a

professional staff, led by an academic dean. Previously, international programs (such as

study abroad and international student recruitment and advising) were spread across the

campus, with one administrator responsible for study abroad and another responsible for

international students. When reflecting on how international programs operated at

Prudens prior to the creation of the international office, one participant observed, "I think

we had more attention to the way coffee was ordered … than we did to international

studies."

The establishment of the international office at Prudens coincided with the

introduction of a faculty grant program for internationalization of the curriculum. The

international office has offered a small number of these grants since the 2008-2009

academic year. As of the summer of 2011, four grants had been awarded (one each in

2009 and 2010; two in 2011), and as of the fall of 2011, the international office was

recruiting applicants for 2012. With one exception, the faculty recipients used their

grants to participate in International Faculty Development Seminars offered by the

Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE).[11]

The internationalization grant opportunity is not presently listed on the Prudens

international office's website because of a data migration issue during the launch of the

University's new website. When I first identified Prudens University as a potential

research site in the fall of 2010, it was included on the international office's website, but

when I returned to the (redesigned) site in the fall of 2011, I discovered that the

information was no longer there. As of this writing, the only information confirming the

continuation of the grant program that I have been able to find on the Prudens website has

been a press release describing the work of the most recent grant recipients and indicating

that prospective applicants should contact the international office for information. My

international office contact assured me that they were simply in the process of updating

[11] Founded in 1947, CIEE is a non-governmental international education organization that has been offering International Faculty Development Seminars since 1990. See http://www.ciee.org/ifds/ for information on seminar opportunities.

the website and hoped to update this information and other aspects of the website during

the summer of 2012. After my study began, the office also awarded two additional

grants.

Beyond the founding of the international office and the development of faculty

internationalization grants, Prudens has witnessed significant changes in institutional

policies concerning study abroad. Participants attributed these reforms to the leadership

and advocacy of the international office staff,[12] but as Ogden (2010) observed, they were

also in line with "national and institutional momentum" to encourage study abroad,

particularly in the form of short-term programs (p. 1). A participant suggested that in the

past study abroad had been "discouraged"; in our interview, he was able to delineate

policy changes that now encourage students to spend part of their undergraduate careers

overseas. For example, Prudens made financial aid portable so that students can apply it

to study abroad programs, and it loosened on-campus housing policies so that students

can commit to semester-long, rather than only year-long, housing contracts. In addition,

the University recently received grants to promote overseas internships and to encourage

underrepresented students to study abroad. Prudens also created a list of "recognized"

study abroad programs, with positive results: This list has diversified the destinations to

which students travel, and it has facilitated better integration of study abroad into

students' overall undergraduate experiences. The international office has also worked

with faculty members to create "embedded" programs, through which professors and

students go overseas for approximately 10 days as part of a semester-long course, and

"Maymester" programs, through which professors and students spend about a week on

---

[12] Participants also acknowledged shortcomings of the international office and other challenges to
internationalization at Prudens, which are discussed in Chapters 6 and 7.

campus in intensive study before traveling abroad for one or two weeks of site visits and

further study.

The faculty members whom I recruited for this study had participated in all these

aspects of Prudens's overhauled international programs. I spoke with the four recipients

of internationalization grants, as well as with professors who had designed and/or led

Maymester and study abroad programs and who had worked with international students.

Prudens University Study Participants

As of the fall of 2011, Prudens employed almost 300 full-time and 100 part-time

faculty members. Approximately 35% of full-time faculty members were women.

Among the seven Prudens participants in this study, four were female, and three were

male. Two participants were on the tenure track, and five had been awarded tenure. (See

Table 1 for a summary of Prudens participant characteristics.) A brief profile of each

participant follows.

Table 1

Prudens University Participant Characteristics

	Tenure Status		Rank			U.S.- or Foreign-Born	
	Pre-Tenure (n = 2)	Tenured (n =5)	Assistant Professor (n = 2)	Associate Professor (n = 4)	Full Professor (n = 1)	U.S-Born (n = 4)	Foreign-Born (n = 3)
Male (n = 3)	1	2	1	1	1	3	0
Female (n = 4)	1	3	1	3	0	1	3

Franklin. Franklin's association with Prudens University has lasted over four

decades, including six years as an undergraduate and graduate student there. Earlier in

his career he held substantial administrative responsibilities at Prudens, but he came to

eschew administrative work, focusing instead on teaching: "The best part of the university is the classroom…. The action is working with students." A full professor of physics, Franklin received one of Prudens' internationalization grants, which he used to support experiential learning projects for undergraduate students. These projects focused on the development of practical solutions for problems that "go beyond our community," such as addressing problems of sanitation and girls' education in West Africa. In the summer of 2011, a number of students traveled with Franklin to West Africa to implement these projects.

Kip. Kip was an associate professor and chair of Prudens' social work department. Prior to coming to Prudens, she directed a program for the mentally ill in a major northeastern city. As full-time practitioner, she also regularly taught social work courses as an adjunct instructor. Over time she began to feel that she had managed to apply to her clinical work everything that she herself had learned as a social work student. At that point, she decided to transition to a full-time career in higher education. Kip lived and maintained a psychoanalysis practice in the city in which she previously worked, and she commuted weekly to Prudens. Her main internationalization work involved an internationally funded grant that she and colleagues in two other states obtained to promote the exchange of social work students between the United States and Europe, although she also taught internationally focused courses in her field and for the international studies program.

Lucia. Lucia was an associate professor who also served as chair of the foreign languages department. Before being elected chair of her department, Lucia was the first director of Prudens's international studies program. Originally from Europe, she came to

the United States to teach after completing her doctorate. Lucia was a recipient of one of Prudens' internationalization grants, which she used to attend a CIEE faculty development seminar in Spain and Morocco. She saw this program as an opportunity to enter a "world" where she had never been before (a Muslim country) and noted, "It's what we expect from our students" when they go abroad—to let go of prejudice and engage with a different culture.

Marcsi. Marcsi had been a member of the Prudens faculty for almost two decades and was chair of the history department. She described teaching as her "avocation," and Prudens has recognized her talents by awarding her its annual teaching prize. She has also received a Fulbright grant, through which she lectured in American Studies at two universities in the Central European country of her birth, which her family fled when she was a young child. Marcsi's teaching duties included internationally themed courses in her field, but her primary contribution to Prudens's internationalization effort has been the development of a Maymester program during which she and a colleague would lead students in a one-week intensive course on campus followed by a ten-day tour of Europe during which the class would visit the sites discussed in the course.

Molly. Also originally from Europe, Molly was a tenure-track assistant professor at Prudens. She identified the experience that "changed [her] life" and inspired her desire to "do something" as the year that she spent as a high school exchange student in the United States. She subsequently returned to the United States to pursue her doctorate under the auspices of the Fulbright program. Molly received an internationalization grant

through which she attended a CIEE faculty seminar in Europe, which she hoped would help her design an embedded or short-term study abroad course for her students.

Myles. A Prudens alumnus, Myles was a pre-tenure associate professor and director of the international studies program. Myles' interest in internationalization emerged during his graduate studies, when he began to consider connections between local and global phenomena, such as human migration and climate change. His first teaching position after finishing his doctorate also led him to become "more and more immersed in the idea of understanding global issues through a local community-based lens." Since returning to Prudens, he has been pursuing this idea within the international studies program. He was a recipient of an internationalization grant, with which he traveled to Central America for a CIEE faculty seminar, out of which he developed an embedded study abroad course that he hopes to offer in alternating years.

Stephen. Stephen was a tenured faculty member at Prudens. Fascinated by languages from a very early age, Stephen had several chances to study abroad during his undergraduate and graduate studies. Since coming to Prudens, he has sought to create similar opportunities for his students through overseas study trips. In addition, for several years Stephen has been responsible for an interfaith dialogue program at Prudens, a role that has opened up numerous opportunities for him, including attendance at an international conference, out of which he and his dialogue partner developed a lecture series at Prudens and designed co-teaching programs for local faith communities.

Astutus University

Coeducational from its founding, Astutus University was chartered at the end of the 19th century. It is a secular, private institution in the northeastern United States whose main location is a suburban campus, although it also offers some programs at sites around its wider metropolitan area.[13] Its basic classification within the Carnegie system is "Doctoral/Research University," meaning that Astutus awarded at least 20 doctorates during 2008-2009. In 2009-2010, Astutus enrolled nearly 5,000 undergraduates and almost 3,000 graduate students.

Astutus is a primarily nonresidential institution, with fewer than 25% of its undergraduate students living on campus. As of 2009-2010, approximately 55% of undergraduates identified as White, 25% as people of color, and 3% as nonresident aliens. (The remaining undergraduates' race and ethnicity were unknown.) Almost 70% of Astutus undergraduates were women. Within the most recent freshman class (the class of 2015), 85% of students were residents of the state in which Astutus is located, 12% were from other states, and 3% were international students.

At the time of this study, Astutus was in the midst of implementing a strategic plan that emphasized intellectual creativity, global relevance, student success, and affordability. Astutus aimed to become more globally relevant by promoting an internationally focused honors program, integrating international and global themes into curricular and co-curricular offerings, encouraging faculty to participate in international and global research, and establishing an office dedicated to international programs.

---

[13] Faculty members teach throughout the network of Astutus campuses; I met with all Astutus participants on the main suburban campus.

Unlike Prudens's international office, Astutus's international office has not assumed responsibility for international student advising (which has remained under the supervision of student affairs personnel). Instead, the office's roles have been limited to the administration of study abroad and overseas internship programs, collaboration with professors on the development of study abroad programs, and oversight of a faculty development grant program for internationalization of the curriculum. Since the international office was created in 2008, it has employed three different directors. The office struggled at first because of inconsistent leadership, but with the hiring of the current director, the office and its constituencies have reportedly enjoyed more stability, and its programs, particularly those involving the Astutus faculty, have begun to grow. The general consensus among study participants at Astutus was that the director was "doing a great job."[14]

Astutus's study abroad activities were also consistent with the trend toward short-term programs identified by Ogden (2010). Among the faculty-led initiatives that the international office has been promoting have been "winter intersession" or "January term" study abroad programs. As the name suggests, these programs are short-term, three-credit courses that run for one to two weeks between the fall and spring semesters. Other faculty members have created and run study abroad courses of three to four weeks during the summer.

Astutus has offered faculty development grants for internationalization of the curriculum since the 2008-2009 academic year, with two grants offered annually during this time. As was the case with most of Prudens's internationalization grant recipients,

---

[14] Participants also described challenges to engaging in internationalization at Astutus, which are discussed in Chapters 6 and 7.

Astutus's grantees have participated in CIEE's International Faculty Development

Seminars. The grant program has been clearly listed on the international office's website,

including application guidelines, grant opportunities, and selection committee

membership.

The Astutus faculty members whom I recruited for this study had participated in a

number of the Astutus international office's activities. I interviewed five of Astutus's

internationalization grant recipients, as well as professors who had designed and/or led

winter intersession and summer study abroad programs.

Astutus University Study Participants

As of the fall of 2011, Astutus employed approximately 330 full-time and 660

part-time faculty members. Over 50% of full-time faculty members were women, and

almost 60% of the full-time faculty possessed tenure. Among the eight Astutus

participants in this study, six were female, and two were male. Four participants were on

the tenure track, and four had been awarded tenure. (See Table 2 for a summary of

Astutus participant characteristics.)

Table 2

Astutus University Participant Characteristics

	Tenure Status		Rank			U.S.- or Foreign-Born	
	Pre-Tenure (n = 4)	Tenured (n = 4)	Assistant Professor (n = 4)	Associate Professor (n = 3)	Full Professor (n = 1)	U.S-Born (n = 5)	Foreign-Born (n = 3)
Male (n = 2)	1	1	0	2	0	1	1
Female (n = 6)	3	3	4	1	1	4	2

Candy. Candy was a tenure-track assistant professor in her third year at Astutus. She explained that she was recruited to Astutus as part of an effort to address "global aspects or issues in the curriculum," which were "lacking." When she frst came to the United States, she worked for a Middle Eastern cultural organization before pursuing her doctorate and beginning her faculty career. Candy has contributed to Astutus's internationalization effort through her design and leadership of a winter intersession study abroad course to the Middle East. She has also received an internationalization grant, with which she attended CIEE's faculty seminar in Spain and Morocco, an experience that she has been able to integrate into her courses.

Carol. Carol was a tenure-track assistant professor of foreign languages. Carol began to study foreign languages at a young age, but they were not her "first passion." Rather, she continued to study languages in college in an effort to maintain and expand her skills. She "ended up" pursuing a master's degree in foreign languages, during which she had to teach the language. She discovered that she loved teaching and "changed very rapidly what [she] thought [she] wanted to do with [her] life." After teaching English in Europe, she returned to the United States to pursue her doctorate with a desire to reorient the study of foreign languages toward civilization and cultural studies (vs. literature). Carol was a recipient of an internationalization grant, with which she traveled to Europe for a CIEE seminar on anti-Semitism and Islamophobia, issues that she hoped to incorporate into her courses.

Celeste. Celeste was a tenure-track assistant professor of art education and director of that program. Her first overseas experience was a CIEE faculty seminar to Mexico, in which she participated using an internationalization grant from Astutus. As

an undergraduate, she received a scholarship to study abroad in Europe, but because it did not cover all her expenses, she decided not to go—a decision which she now views as "unwise." She has since encouraged her own students not to repeat her "mistake." Celeste had been teaching non-Western art courses for some time before participating in the seminar, but the experience allowed her to transform her courses by incorporating materials that she collected while in Mexico as well as resources recently acquired by Astutus. She said, to have "non-Western, non-male examples was amazing."

Evelyn. Evelyn was a tenure-track assistant professor of applied linguistics. Her interest in internationalization began "well before" she arrived at Astutus; a "focus on internationalization was really key" for her early in her career, and it "very much connects" with her work now. After college, she taught English as a second language to adults before pursuing her master's degree. She student taught in Mexico, which she described as "an "opening time" for her. Later, she wrote her doctoral dissertation on "gender identity shifts and language acquisition among [Asian] women." During that time, she learned an Asian language and lived in Asia for a year. With her internationalization grant, Evelyn participated in a CIEE seminar in Jordan on Middle Eastern women, a topic that connected to her dissertation.

Jamie. Trained in geology, Jamie was associate professor and graduate coordinator of environmental studies at Astutus. She said that she has "always had wanderlust" and has at times "done things just to travel," and she expressed hope in instilling those values in her students. To that end, she and four colleagues (all field scientists) have developed a 24-day, three-credit course in Australia for both undergraduate and graduate students. The goal was "to lead a research course," but the

program has also opened "up to [the students] a type of travel they didn't know existed," such as using public transportation and staying in youth hostels. Jamie contrasted this program against more highly "facilitated" study abroad opportunities that she suspected are less academically rigorous and more inauthentic experiences.

Leonardo. Leonardo was a tenure-track associate professor of psychology who had only recently arrived at Astutus. Born in Latin America, he came to the United States at age 10. This experience made him feel like "an outsider visiting [the United States] permanently" and encouraged his interest in identity issues. At his prior institution, he had designed a graduate course in multicultural counseling that he offered in Southern Europe for nearly a decade; he never taught the course within the United States. Soon after arriving at Astutus, Leonardo received an internationalization grant with which he traveled to Turkey to participate in a CIEE faculty seminar. He expressed hope that he might use contacts that he made there to develop another multicultural counseling course for Astutus students, but more generally, he observed, "I think [the seminar] just helps me conceptualize a little bit more deeply … how people … construct their own sense of identity or how it is constructed for them."

Rachel. Originally from Israel, Rachel was a full professor of social work. She has been at Astutus for almost 20 years, having moved to the United States to live with a boyfriend as she was finishing her doctoral work in Israel. Prior to obtaining her doctorate, she had a successful 20-year career as a psychotherapist, certified in individual, group, and family therapy. Having been born, raised, and educated abroad, and having established a career overseas as well, Rachel suggested that "it was almost a given" that she would find ways to incorporate international and global themes into her

academic work. In the past two decades, Rachel has continued to collaborate with

colleagues in Israel, but she has also gone to Africa as part of a consortium of schools of

social work seeking to train social workers who are "immigrant-savvy" and has had two

Fulbright grants to Asia. These experiences led Rachel to apply for an

internationalization grant to attend a CIEE faculty seminar in China/Tibet. Tibetan

culture was of particular interest to Rachel because one of her main areas of expertise

was trauma, and she suggested, "the entire culture is traumatized." She has drawn on this

and her other exchange experiences in her courses, most of which focus on research

methods, trauma, and immigrants.

William. William was an associate professor of theatre, teaching classes on

theatre history and acting and directing one production each year. Prior to coming to

Astutus, he spent over 20 years as a working actor: "I've never done anything in my life

since the age of 26 that was not in the theatre. Not a day of it." William described

himself as an anglophile, a fascination that grew from his theatre work. He studied,

performed, and taught Shakespeare, all of which have made the Bard's works "second

nature" to him. The English theatre has always been "the ideal" for William, and he was

planning to take a group of students to London for a winter intersession course. He

described his interest in internationalization as "project-specific" to this London trip. He

suggested that, unlike other professors, he did not have "a vested intellectual interest in

international education." Rather, his goal was for the students who would travel with him

to be inspired in their studies and careers.

Summary

Both Prudens University and Astutus University were founded around the turn of the 20th century. In the past 100 years, Prudens has maintained its Roman Catholic, predominantly undergraduate, liberal arts mission, while Astutus has expanded its undergraduate mission and residential focus to include numerous graduate-level programs and campuses around its metropolitan area. While they are very different, in the early 2000s both institutions decided that they needed to make international education a more significant part of the teaching and learning opportunities available to their faculties and students.

To that end, in 2008 the two institutions established central international offices and hired international education professionals to staff them (Prudens having more initial success than Astutus in this regard). Through these offices, Prudens and Astutus sought to develop new study abroad programs for their students, including short-term experiences led by faculty members. They also instituted faculty development grants for internationalization of the curriculum, with which faculty members could participate in seminars that would help them to revise existing courses and develop new courses around international and global themes.

The Prudens and Astutus faculty members who participated in this study have engaged in many of the opportunities offered through their international offices, including designing and leading short-term study abroad programs, administering student exchanges, and participating in faculty development seminars. As the brief participant introductions offered above suggest, these individuals come from diverse backgrounds and are at different points in their professional careers. What they share, however, is a

passion for international education. In the next chapter, I describe their motivations to engage in internationalization, many of which predate their institutions' establishment of an international office or introduction of internationalization initiatives.

Chapter 5

Sources of Faculty Motivation for Engagement in Internationalization

Institutions of higher education adopt internationalization policies for a variety of reasons, both academic and entrepreneurial. The intensification of political, economic, and social globalization in recent decades has led many U.S. college and university leaders to believe that their institutions must be infused with international, intercultural, and global perspectives so that their students will be prepared to engage in a more complex and integrated world. In some cases, students have also recognized these trends and in response have demanded more from their schools in terms of internationally oriented academic opportunities. Institutional interests go beyond the desire to serve the country and the world just as a student's sense of global citizenship may go beyond the hope to be a well-rounded person. Through internationalization, colleges and universities also seek to remain competitive with their peer institutions, maintain their own prestige, and generate revenue (Biddle, 2002). Students are also aware of the potential economic benefits that engagement in international education may present to them over time (Johnston, 1993).

No matter the motivations of a higher education institution or its students to engage in internationalization, it is primarily the responsibility of that institution's faculty to implement the policy through individual faculty members' teaching, research, and service activities. Thus, the first questions of this study concern faculty motivations for participating in internationalization: What motivates faculty to engage in internationalization efforts? Are personal or institutional influences more influential in their decision to participate?

In the following discussion of experiences that have motivated study participants to get involved in internationalization, I identify themes by dividing motivations into two types, *intrinsic* and *extrinsic*. This approach is consistent with much prior research on faculty motivation, which I outlined in Chapter 2 (Antonio et al., 2000; Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Eimers, 1999; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Serow et al., 1999). Employing this strategy in my analysis provides insight into whether such a dichotomous conceptualization of motivation, which has been called into question by some scholars (Berman & Skeff, 1988; Eimers, 1999; O'Meara, 2005; O'Meara, Terosky, & Neumann, 2008; Serow et al., 1999), is useful for understanding why faculty members pursue this particular type of teaching and interaction with students.

Participants from Prudens and Astutus Universities described a variety of personal and professional experiences that provided them with both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations to participate in their institution's internationalization effort. The majority of these experiences occurred prior to the institution's adoption of an internationalization initiative rather than in response to that initiative. In this chapter, I delineate the sources and kinds of motivation that participants in this study identified as important to them for this work.

Intrinsic Motivations

Intrinsic motivation originates from the personal satisfaction that a faculty member experiences from participating in teaching, research, or service for the sake of doing it (Eimers, 1999). Among the participants in this study, intrinsic sources of motivation played a large—but not exclusive—role in their decisions to engage in their institution's internationalization effort. With few exceptions, these intrinsic motivations

originated in experiences that occurred outside of and in interests that existed prior to their institution's internationalization initiative.

"That's Who I Am"

A number of participants described deeply personal motivations for their engagement in internationalization that resulted from their experience as a refugee, immigrant, or descendant of immigrants.[15] As Stephen observed, the questions that academics ask often have personal origins and relevance. These participants attributed to these experiences different perspectives that led them to gravitate toward particular fields and ask specific questions within those disciplines. They also expressed a desire to share their perspectives and knowledge with their students and institutions.

For example, Marcsi's family fled Central Europe in the late 1950s, settling in the United States when she was a girl. Growing up, she was surrounded by family and friends from whom she learned by "osmosis" about international relations and history. She subsequently pursued a career in diplomatic history, explaining, "As somebody … who felt intimate connections between historical forces and my own family's personal history, I've always been interested in the whys: Why did these things happen? Why did they happen the way they did?"

A participant who described herself by saying "I was born an immigrant child" noted that because of this experience she "never felt the sense of belonging." She continued, "this was partly why there … was this interest to pursue this further…. It comes from so many different parts of me, from … being so entangled in this stuff since I was born. And that's who I am." Another participant whose family immigrated to the

---

[15] In addition to the participants discussed here, two other participants, Lucia and Rachel, were immigrants to the United States. They did not, however, specifically identify their immigrant experiences as sources of motivation for engaging in internationalization.

United States when he was a child also described a lack of sense of belonging: "I think that [being an immigrant] had a big influence on me, having this international perspective and … an immigrant perspective…. Inevitably, I guess I have to say I always feel like I'm not from the U.S. I'm an outsider visiting permanently." A third participant who immigrated to the United States as an adult asserted that she was intentionally trying not to integrate. She explained, "I want to maintain my peculiar status of kind of being neither here nor there…. It might not be the wisest thing to do, but … I would like to get people to learn about what's out there through me." Feeling like outsiders and wanting to play the role of outsider led these individuals to focus their teaching and research on such issues as citizenship, identity, and human rights.

In contrast, Stephen felt a strong sense of connection to the tight-knit community in which he grew up, and his early exposure to foreign languages in a religiously affiliated school encouraged a long-term interest in other languages. He recognized this early instruction as a way to perpetuate ethnic identity, which for him turned into academic pursuits in the humanities.

"I Get to Go"

Participants' motivation to engage in internationalization also came from their passion for travel. For some, participation in internationalization—and in study abroad initiatives, especially—has allowed them to return to the country of their birth or ancestors, but the opportunity to return "home" did not appear to be a particular incentive for participants. Rather, involvement in institutional internationalization initiatives has provided chances to share international experiences with students in the hope of instilling in them a passion for travel and curiosity about what other parts of the world are like.

That is, participants expressed a belief in the value of teaching in and about international contexts, and the opportunity to do that teaching has increased their personal satisfaction with the internationalization enterprise. It should be noted, however, that even this personal benefit entailed huge professional responsibility for their students, for whose safety they were potentially liable, as they traveled.

A number of participants described travel as an essential part of their identity and lifestyle. Lucia simply said, "I'm a traveler," while others described travel almost as an addiction. Rachel said, "Summer—people know here that my priorities [are] going abroad, doing my research, everything else. The order is very clear. People don't ask, 'Do you travel this summer?'" Rather they ask her, "'Where are you going?'" About international exchange in particular, Rachel said, "[It] has the taste of more," meaning that every time she does an exchange of some sort, it makes her want to do more. Similarly, Leonardo said, "I always wanted to travel. I always felt like I didn't travel enough…. I always felt like I wanted to travel more and more. Even though I enjoy living in the United States, I just like traveling." Jamie also observed, "I hadn't ever made the connection until just this moment, but I've always had wanderlust.… There are times that I have done things just to travel, gone to a meeting that maybe I didn't really care about, but I did get to travel."

Rachel, Leonardo, and Jamie were among the participants who had led study abroad programs for their students. For some participants, motivation for leading study abroad trips came in part from their own desire to travel, although Jamie pointed out, "The complexities of life would naturally deter me from doing these things only for travel experience." Since travel disrupts everyday life, Jamie needed additional incentives to

lead study abroad. Through her internationalization work, she has had the opportunity to expand her students' learning, conduct her research, and also travel.

Indeed, several participants articulated ulterior motives for leading study abroad programs. In discussing her motivations to lead a study tour to Europe, beyond the benefits that it would have for her students, Marcsi plainly said, "I get to go." William went so far as to describe his study tour to England as an "evil plan" that would provide his students with exposure to London and British theatre while also giving him a chance to visit London and see British theatre—while being paid to do so. Furthermore, William explained that after the study trip he would be able to visit his daughter, who lives in England. More reluctantly, Stephen acknowledged that his study trips to Europe provide him with chances to travel and visit relatives abroad following his programs with his students.

"That Experience Really Changed My Life"

When discussing leading study abroad programs in particular, a number of participants referenced their own study abroad and other travel experiences—or lack of such experiences—as motivation for their involvement in study abroad. Participants' understood value of these experiences came from the opportunities that they provided for individuals to learn from and about each other and address problems anywhere on the local-global spectrum. Faculty members who had had the opportunity to travel overseas during their high school, undergraduate, or graduate careers expressed a desire to provide their students with similar opportunities, while participants who had not had the chance did not want their students to miss out in the same way.

Two participants, Molly and Kip, studied abroad during their high school years. Molly came to the United States as an exchange student in the mid-1980s and was challenged by Americans' lack of knowledge about her home country specifically and international relations in general. She described this discovery as activating a "cognitive dissonance" in her because "citizens that make the decisions … that are going to affect the rest of the world are completely disinterested in the rest of the world." At the same time, the experience allowed her to meet and get to know other exchange students from around the world, and she related stories of positive encounters between Argentinean and British students whose countries were fighting the Falkland Islands War and Black and White students from Apartheid-era South Africa. About this year in the United States she said, "I guess that experience really changed my life and made me understand that I wanted to do something…. Ultimately, I guess, I chose to become an academic because I think that maybe this is where I can have the most impact."

Kip spent her junior year of high school in Europe, studying at a sister school of her convent school—an experience that led her always to associate travel with educational exchange. The order of nuns maintained a network of schools throughout the world, and girls could choose where to spend their junior year. Kip explained that many girls wanted to go to southwestern United States for horseback riding, but the global nature of the order's schools instilled in her "a global mentality at a time when one didn't even just construct conceptualizations like that." Kip also studied abroad in college. She said, "I had the opportunity—and seized it—to take a semester studying comparative welfare states." Kip subsequently developed an exchange program for her social work students and their peers in Europe based on her experiences. While it has remained

difficult for her to recruit Prudens students to participate in this program because of student (and parent) concerns about international travel and the limited time frame in which social work students can be off campus, she has continued to identify prospective students and expressed hope that she will soon send several Prudens students abroad through her program.

Like Kip, Marcsi portrayed herself as "always [having] been very international in [her] outlook and approach to [her] studies and to learning." It was natural, therefore, for her to spend her junior year of college studying abroad in Europe. Marcsi's upbringing in the United States as a refugee from Communist Europe infused in her an interest in international affairs. Unlike other participants, she did not describe her study abroad experience as particularly important or "life changing." Stephen, in contrast, described a junior semester in Europe as transformational. He had inherited stories of the "old country" of great-grandparents whom he never knew, which led him to develop idealized notions of what his country of ethnic origin was like. Soon after arriving, however, he discovered that the country did not correspond to the vision that he had constructed, and that the American immigrant and local cultures were quite different. While his academic interest remained in history, he became more interested in contemporary local life and politics, and he has continued in his teaching to make connections for his students between the ancient and the modern. In addition, as a master's student, Stephen participated in a study tour in Europe that greatly influenced him. Upon returning, he envisioned leading a similar program for his own students someday. To date, he has led several similar trips for Prudens, which he reported to be very fulfilling because he was able to see his own students have experiences similar to his own.

A number of participants also enjoyed academic exchanges during and soon after graduate school. As graduate students Molly and Stephen received Fulbright grants that allowed them to travel abroad (to the United States and Europe, respectively). During her Ph.D. studies Lucia also had a grant that sponsored research visits at several universities around the world.

Following Carol's master's program, she went abroad for the first time to teach English in Europe. This experience motivated her to rethink how foreign languages are taught in the United States and encouraged her to return to graduate school for her doctorate. She explained,

> I remember my landlady … was making fun of me because I didn't know the word for dishrag. And that was a kind of wakeup call for me in the sense that I felt very cheated by my education…. Nobody was teaching me anything about political parties, reading newspapers, anything about the culture and civilization—nothing that you actually needed to consider yourself proficient in the language. And so that kind of is when I started thinking about, "This is not right."

When Carol returned to graduate school, she discovered that there was already movement from a literary perspective to a cultural studies approach to foreign language teaching, but making foreign language study relevant to her students and the broader Astutus community has continued to be a priority for her.

Yet another perspective came from Jamie, who did not study or work abroad but spent a summer backpacking around Europe during her college years. Frustrated with the "prepackaged" study abroad programs in which many students enroll now and

disappointed that "you don't hear about people going off for a six-week or a two-month adventure," Jamie had a strong bias against what she called prepackaged programs. That bias came from her preferred way of traveling, but it also was substantiated by her mother's experience leading this type of program and by her own observations of similar programs while co-leading her students on a field research trip. In particular, she questioned the academic rigor and authenticity of experiences provided by prepackaged programs. In designing their trips, Jamie and her colleagues have sought to introduce their students to hostelling and other modes of travel that may not be that comfortable but provide students with a cost-effective way to travel and meet new people, just as she did while a student.

Other participants who did not have the chance to study or work abroad were also supportive of their students' having opportunities to do so. Myles, for example, reported that while he was an undergraduate at Prudens, study abroad was "discouraged" because of housing and financial aid policies and a lack of formal relationships with overseas institutions or study abroad programs. He was pleased that since his return to Prudens, these impediments have mostly been removed, and one major requires its students to study abroad, which most students do through programs that are recognized by Prudens.

A number of other participants attributed their inability to study abroad to their own financial difficulties during college (e.g., Celeste, Carol, and William) and expressed the desire to create such opportunities for their students and help their students to find solutions to their own logistical hurdles to studying and working abroad (although William remained concerned that the expense of his program would deter students from participating). Celeste explained, "When I was a kid, it seemed like something wealthy

people did, like exchange student kind of stuff." She called herself an "idiot" for not taking out a loan to study abroad, and she said, "So … when I see students like that [i.e., in a situation similar to her own] I try to … help." Specifically, she has become a strong advocate of studying and working abroad. Similarly, Carol described advising students on the career opportunities that will be available to them if they possess foreign language skills.[16]

"Local Relationships … Opened My Eyes to Global Happenings"

Several participants described U.S.-based experiences that have motivated their engagement in internationalization. Specifically, they talked about influential encounters that they had with refugees and immigrants, as well as non-immigrants such as international students and scholars, living in the United States.

Evelyn, for example, noted an experience with a student as motivation for engaging in internationalization, particularly in pursuing a grant to go to Jordan to study Middle Eastern women. She described a difficult experience with a female Arab student whose personal life was very troubled. She said that her student's difficulties "really made me quite interested to find out more about this, to … figure out … what's the reality here, and what are stereotypes."

Other encounters changed participants' worldviews and motivated them to engage in internationalization as well. Myles talked about an experience during graduate school in which he worked with Southeast Asian immigrants and refugees. He explained,

> Working with refugees in local, community-based work was the first time I really
> immersed myself in thinking about the global dimensions of communities,
> [which] led me to think about the internationalizing and the globalization of our

---

[16] Participant practices are discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.

worlds. So it was really local relationships that opened my eyes to global

happenings.

His interest in internationalization was reinforced early in his career, when he worked

with an international fellows program that brought activists to the United States to

explore issues of democracy and civil society and a subsequent teaching collaboration in

which he was mentored in leading his first study abroad program.

Another example of a U.S.-based influence is Stephen's work in interfaith

dialogue. A local non-Christian religious leader contacted the Roman Catholic diocese

about finding a dialogue partner, and the diocese referred him to Prudens. One of

Stephen's colleagues was already working in interfaith dialogue, but she could not carve

out time for another initiative. Stephen had not been looking to engage in interfaith

dialogue, and although he grew up in a rather homogeneous immigrant community, a

foundation had been laid through encounters with non-Christians through family business

contacts and a marriage in his family. Formal dialogue found him, though, and it has

become a substantial part of his work at Prudens and has affected how he teaches.

A less formal example of an informative experience came from Carol, who met a

French engineer at an Astutus event. They discussed differences in the U.S. and French

educational systems and how academic training affects one's work style. Carol related

that the engineer said,

> "I actually thought that I was superior to the American engineers because I had
>
> had this training, and they were just kind of…" seemed to her to be all over the
>
> place. But she said, "After working there, I realized that we just had different

workplace modes, but that those workplace modes also resulted in different

concrete approaches to problems."

This conversation reinforced Carol's belief that it is important to study other cultures and

work with people from other cultures, a theme that she continues to pursue at Astutus.

"The Problems that We Face Are Global Problems"

Research participants frequently noted increasingly globalized political,

economic, social, and professional environments, and the challenges and benefits

associated with these trends, as a motivation for engaging in internationalization of the

curriculum and other aspects of their work. Molly, for example, explained that her

graduate experience instilled in her the value of approaching her field from a comparative

perspective, a strategy that allows scholars and practitioners in one country to learn about

how their peers in other countries address similar problems or issues. She observed that a

comparative approach prevents us from "trying to reinvent the wheel." Other participants

advocated a global rather than a traditional comparative approach to problem solving.

Myles argued, "The problems that we face are global problems—if you think about

climate change or global poverty, or … public health issues, HIV and AIDS—[and they]

aren't issues that have national boundaries." Myles viewed such boundaries as arbitrary,

and he specifically suggested that students need to be taught to engage with the world and

its challenges using what Nussbaum called a cosmopolitan perspective (see Nussbaum,

1994/1996). Similarly, Candy described a "step-by-step process" from the local to the

regional, national, international, and global and expressed a desire for her students to

appreciate the interconnectivity of the world. She expressed hope that this perspective

would cause them to "feel … compassion toward others" and begin to grasp the

complexities of such phenomena as poverty. She explained, "Poverty on the global level is very much part of the same kind of economic system as poverty in the United States. They're both part of global capitalism."

Franklin also articulated a desire to address global challenges through internationalization of his teaching and research: "Having spent some time in developing countries, in different circumstances, you see these problems, and you know that they shouldn't exist because they can be tackled." He is especially concerned about sanitation issues in Africa, but his work has the potential to transcend geographic boundaries and address this challenge globally. Contrasting his initiative against Prudens's plan to open a study abroad center in Western Europe (which he also thought was a good idea), Franklin suggested that his work in Africa would have a more global impact—from which both his students and people in developing countries could benefit. He asked, "Where is the future? Is the future in [Europe]? Is the future in the UK? The future is on the African continent and in the Middle East … and in Asia." Based on Rachel's experience during overseas work, she also acknowledged a need to expand Americans' knowledge of specific regions. She said, "There are two parts of the world [about which] we know less than we need: Africa and Southeast Asia."

Current events point to why an understanding of different parts of the world—and the connections between them—is so important for contemporary students. In noting recent U.S. military actions overseas, Marcsi observed, "Americans need to know why we're involved in those wars; how well have the reasons for those wars been articulated, how clearly, how honestly; how well [have they] been prosecuted…; and will [they] achieve [their] goals." She wanted her students to ask such questions and saw her role as

providing them with the tools to begin to answer them. Within the workplace, such

critical thinking skills will also serve students well, as Myles expressed: "The jobs that

they'll be having 20 years from now probably don't even exist now, so to develop the

skill set that they will need to be effective global actors, they need to have an

internationalizing experience as a part, really a core, of their college experience."

"Ruin Them for Life"

As mentioned previously, participants expressed a desire to instill in their students

a sense of compassion and empathy that they would carry with them into their personal

and professional lives after college. Aware of how their own international and

intercultural experiences have benefitted them, and knowledgeable of the world in which

their students will live and work upon graduation, participants were also motivated to

instill in their students a passion for travel and a more open-minded worldview. Indeed, a

number of participants described their students' current worldviews as a motivation for

their work in internationalization. They wanted to challenge their assumptions and

expand their horizons in ways that would permanently affect them.

Jamie related an experience that she has carried with her since her doctoral

student days. She was talking with an undergraduate about what he would do after

graduation. He responded with a formulaic answer about getting a job and settling down,

to which she responded, "Are you going to go anywhere?" He quickly responded that he

would never leave his home state. Jamie continued, "He said, and I quote—I'll never

forget this—'I might like it better someplace else, and then I couldn't come back and be

happy.'" This response shocked Jamie: "My motto since then really has been to ruin

them for life." That is, Jamie wanted to instill in her students an appreciation for travel and for the different perspectives that one accumulates through travel.

Describing a different sort of insularity, Marcsi observed that her students at Prudens "are so ahistorical, very ahistorical." Similarly, her colleague, (04), observed that his students do not understand why they should study history if they aspire to careers in business, law, etc. Moreover, he expressed concern that his students harbor a subtle bigotry against non-Christian traditions, which comes out during his undergraduate classes. He noted that students may think that they are open-minded, but they are actually very near-sighted in their worldviews.

Combating student prejudices and stereotypes is a motivation for participants to engage in internationalization, but these faculty members expressed understanding of their students' biases. At both institutions, participants described students with such terms as "naïve," "provincial," and "sheltered." Regarding these characteristics, Molly asserted, "It's not their fault. It's not that they want to be provincial." Rather, she and other participants attributed this worldview to their upbringing and described how receptive they are when given the opportunity to expand their horizons. Molly said, "I know that there are students who are comfortable having a female role model of someone who has traveled the world and talk about where to start." In describing sharing her own travel experiences with her students, Lucia reported, "Students … are very excited when … you come from, like, an experience abroad … And share with them and bring it to them. It's kind of like another … bridge that you are able to build to that world."

Molly and Lucia viewed themselves as role models for students, as did several other participants. William said about his short-term study abroad trip, "I just want [my

students] to understand what a wonderful and exciting world I, and they wish to, inhabit. I'm here already. They want to be here." Jamie also described what she and her colleagues hope that their field research trips teach their students: "I would hope that [they will learn] by example and by exposing them to other cultures and … seeing how we … lead this trip—interact with people as equals, not as oddities."

"I … Will Not Do Something that Doesn't Matter"

Participants frequently expressed a desire to make a difference in their students' lives, but their interest in making a difference transcended their campuses. Franklin, for example, said, "My motivation is that I … will not do something that doesn't matter. I won't waste any time…. I'm at a stage at my life where I don't have to worry about tenure and promotion and so on, so I only work on projects that really matter. I only work on projects that really can make some kind of a difference." He views his work on sanitation issues in Africa as a way to tap "human potential" and "get the … field leveled a little bit" so that Africans, particularly girls, can succeed academically and professionally. Speaking as a scholar and practitioner of applied systems science and applied physics, he asserted, "There isn't anything that can't be dealt with. I mean…, if it makes sense to do, if it has meaning, then you can always figure out a way."

As a social work faculty member, Kip is also concerned with empowering people and improving their quality of life. Specifically, she is preparing students to work with human services organizations, and she wants her students to learn to do this work in such a way that it strengthens the people with whom they are working. She said, "I want [my students] to be knowledgeable about the stages for grassroots organizing so that wherever they go in a particular location they know the steps to stop, wait, look, and listen and

generate something that's organic to that community and do it in such a way that it doesn't seem as if they're generating anything, that the community is doing it."

In Jamie's environmental studies courses, she talks about how environmental degradation directly affects people's lives as a way to encourage her students to think about the relevance and implications of their future work. For example, she explained, "We usually don't go much into cultural differences…, but you can…, when you talk about China…, where the mountains are deforested, and you have people living at the base of a mountain that's basically been mined…, you have a village in front of the plateau that's just waiting to be [crushed]."

"They Need People Like Me"

A number of participants expressed a belief that they have a specific role to play or duty to perform in the internationalization of their institution. Some participants were aware that they were recruited specifically to fulfill this role, while others thought that it was their responsibility to engage in internationalization because of particular institutional and student needs. Most participants were committed to carrying out this role, but for some, their motivation was slipping, or they anticipated that it might diminish.

At Astutus, Candy and Leonardo identified themselves as part of a cadre of new faculty members who were hired because of the potential contributions that they could make to internationalization, and they were dedicated to this task. Candy noted, "Part of hiring me was to … include global aspects or issues in the curriculum, which was somehow lacking…. I just really sincerely feel that I have to [develop myself

professionally] in order to … carry out this goal of [Astutus] to internationalize the curriculum at large."

Molly, a pre-tenure Prudens faculty member, said about her institution, "They need people like me." That is, she sees her role as being to push the institution and her department in terms of their curriculum and identity. She expressed frustration, however, at the responses that she has received from colleagues and administrators: "It's been hard. At the same time, I know that this is probably where I'm more needed." Franklin, a senior faculty member at Prudens, also described his role as confronting the institution's parochialism. He said, "It's so conservative. It's not a very diverse place…, although we're sort of getting a little bit better. How can I involve my students in more meaningful ways in the developing world and also in international experience?"

As a Prudens alumnus himself, Franklin had a distinctive grasp on its student culture, even if he graduated decades ago. Although Carol was not a graduate of Astutus, she described a particular affinity that she feels toward her students because of her own upbringing. She explained, "I came from an environment … [that] for many of my students is very similar…. Things were very abstract to me, but [foreign language study] took me all kinds of places that I never anticipated going." She hoped that she could make foreign language study more accessible to her students so that such ideas as living abroad, moving away from home, etc., might not be so intimidating to them.

As highly intrinsically motivated as many of this study's participants appeared to be, some expressed doubt about their roles in and commitment to internationalization at their institution. For example, one participant prefaced a comment about areas in which she sees herself as able to effect change with "If I remain [here]…." Another participant

indicated that if his institution's internationalization efforts did not meet his standards, he would search for a new position elsewhere. A third suggested that if she did not see reciprocation by its leadership, she would reprioritize her work: "I'll put my money and my energy into my research, and I'll just show up three days a week and do the bare minimum." Such comments were few and brief, but the fact that participants mentioned them at all indicated that extrinsic sources of motivation are also important to their work. A discussion of participants' extrinsic motivations follows.

Extrinsic Motivations

Faculty members are often understood to be resistant to change, a characteristic which is said, in turn, to lead them to expect incentives—that is, extrinsic motivators—to change (Rhoades, 2000). Extrinsic motivation for faculty work comes from external recognition of one's efforts, such as professional advancement because of one's endeavors (Eimers, 1999), verbal support from institutional leaders (Berman & Skeff, 1988), and the perception that involvement in certain activities is important to the institution (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). The few participants who discussed extrinsic motivations, however, did not appear to engage in internationalization in response to these motivations. That is, an expressed need for incentives or rewards was not a consistent condition for study participants' engagement in internationalization. Instead, they generally desired affirmations of the value of their work that would encourage them to continue the efforts in which they had already chosen to participate.

Pre-tenure participants, whose long-term employment with their institution was undecided, articulated more interest in external affirmation. Tenured participants did cite extrinsic motivations for engagement, but their perspectives on the matter differed from

their junior colleagues' views. In both cases, though, they were aware that extrinsic

motivations contributed to their institutions' engagement in internationalization.

"This Is Why I'm Good"

The literature generally suggests that faculty members are extrinsically motivated

to engage in particular activities because of perceptions of what their institutions value

(Eimers, 1999). The findings of this study challenge that assumption, at least when it

comes to internationalization activities. Participants, particularly those who were pre-

tenure, had difficulty identifying how participating in internationalization would help

their promotion and tenure applications when the time came, and they expressed concern

that their involvement might be disadvantageous to their cases. They remained involved,

though, because of the intrinsic motivations described above.[17]

Three pre-tenure participants, one at Prudens and two at Astutus, spoke at length

about their concerns about how their engagement in internationalization might affect their

tenure applications. The pre-tenure participant at Prudens who described this concern

proposed that because she is an internationalist by training, her colleagues may take for

granted that internationalizing the curriculum does not require extra work on her part.

She refuted this assumption, asserting instead that it is "a lot of work in terms of man

hours," although the level of effort is "kind of immeasurable." She observed, "I have no

institutional way of saying, 'Okay, this is why I'm good.'" Moreover, she questioned

whether anyone but a few "international-minded colleagues" would see it as important.

One pre-tenure participant at Astutus similarly described how she dealt with the

discovery that her involvement in internationalization did not "fit" into any particular

---

[17] The lack of clear placement of internationalization in promotion and tenure considerations also calls into question its status as an integrated institutional priority, an issue that will be explored more in Chapter 6.

area of her review materials. Ultimately, she posed the question to her dean, who advised her that this work would fit into all three areas of teaching, research, and service. She expressed ongoing concern, however, that the promotion and tenure committee will considered her involvement in internationalization of the curriculum to be less valuable than her research productivity.

Astutus's other pre-tenure participant who spoke about this issue talked about wanting to get more involved in internationalization and her hesitancy to do so:

> I don't know that that would be advantageous for a new faculty member. I mean…, if somebody approached me and [invited me to participate in a study abroad program], I would be all over that. But … I'm not sure that it's the best use of my time, given all the other concerns, to do that immediately.

In all three cases, participants talked about the tension between time spent on teaching (and specifically on internationalization of the curriculum) and time spent on research and publishing. The participant at Prudens said, "Sometimes I feel that the time I invest in … students [i.e., teaching and advising], it's time that's taken away from stuff that would be much more strategic for my career." Similarly, the first participant at Astutus observed, "You could … be the most successful teacher, you could have the best … student evaluations, you could do all these study abroad programs—your … service actually—but if the research is not coming along, you know that's going to be taken into account." The second Astutus participant described feeling "inadequate" because of her decision to prioritize her work in a way that might be less risky for her tenure application but also limits her participation in activities in which she is very interested.

Regarding tenure criteria, Jamie remarked that she was unaware of work in internationalization being considered favorably or unfavorably in promotion and tenure considerations at Astutus. Franklin questioned the appropriateness of explicitly articulating a role for internationalization in the promotion and tenure criteria outlined in a faculty manual. His perspective on this issue came from two sources: his experience on Prudens's promotion and tenure committee and his work with universities in Africa. He explained, "The people who sit around that table, they do have the faculty manual, they have the rules and so on, but there are broad areas … where this sort of thing would be acknowledged … for credit. But it's just a question of where." This flexibility contrasts with what he witnessed in Africa, where institutions follow such strict formulae for awarding tenure that he doubted that he—as a full professor—would receive it.

"If We Are Encouraged…"

Participants' reports suggested that some sort of guidance on the priority of internationalization in promotion and tenure deliberations could be an extrinsic motivator—and a relief—for pre-tenure faculty members, as well as an aid for promotion and tenure committee members who might not be aware of the nature of this work. Participants described other sources of extrinsic motivation that were absent, but desired, at both institutions. These forms of external motivation are also noted in the literature: articulation of their institution's expectations for involvement in a certain activity (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995) and verbal support from institutional leaders (Berman & Skeff, 1988).

For example, Lucia said, "We're just kind of … left alone. So we're not bothered, but … we're not fully … supported." While she and Kip articulated some

advantages to being able to operate "under the radar" at Prudens—focusing their internationalization work on in-class activities and outside grant work, specifically— Lucia also expressed an interest in more verbal support: "It's not that we need to be paid for every single thing we do. No. But if we are encouraged, and we are invited, and we'll feel more important. That's the truth."

Jamie described a similar challenge at Astutus. Recognizing the intensive labor that will be required for her institution to internationalize successfully, she said that the "real issue" concerns who will do the work. She responded to her own question by saying that the problem could be solved if leaders were to say, "'We need this done. We're … going to ask you to do it. We know it's a lot of work. We'll pay you—not much.'" Regarding payment, though, Jamie said, "[It's] not the money; it's the statement," and she quickly followed with the observation, "What's frustrating is that … it's like everybody's waiting for somebody else to … do it when you really need … direction from the administration."

"How Are You Going to Be the Definitive Winner?"

Although study participants did not appear to be particularly motivated by external recognition for their efforts, they articulated their impressions that their institutions' leaders—from whom they would like more verbal support—have chosen for their institutions to engage in internationalization in part because of a desire for external recognition. Moreover, participants suggested that institutional leaders might intensify these efforts if they knew it would further enhance external recognition. Participants identified three areas of external recognition that they believed were of particular

importance to Prudens and Astutus: student recruitment, institutional recognition, and disciplinary expectations.

"It will be a market decision." Two participants from Prudens discussed moves that the institution was making or needed to make to attract students who are interested in international issues. Specifically, Myles described the origins of Prudens's international studies major, explaining his impression that the admissions office was discovering that some prospective students were opting not to enroll because of the absence of such a major: "There was kind of the strategic sense that [the major] is something that will make [Prudens] more marketable."

At the same time, Molly expressed concern that Prudens was not doing enough to retain internationally oriented students. She spoke from several experiences with talented first-year students who were interested in transferring to institutions "where they can have a greater scholarship and internship opportunities to deal with international stuff." Molly reported that these students were not disappointed with their professors at Prudens, but they shared that they were frustrated with their fellow students, who were "disinterested" in international affairs. These students, Molly explained, wanted "to be in an environment where … they're interested, they're more cosmopolitan, they're more plugged in, they're more passionate about those things." She wondered if internationalization at Prudens might accelerate once institutional leaders understood that students were leaving because of its absence, saying, "It will be a market decision."

"They want to have international recognition." Participants at both Prudens and Astutus discussed their institutions' interest in internationalization as being part of a broader desire to encourage institutional recognition. For example, Kip suggested that

Prudens has been responding to an "environment that is wanting, asking for, and requiring an internationalized curriculum and international activities." Since she anticipated that the market will continue to demand it, her belief was that Prudens would continue to pursue internationalization.

At Astutus, participants talked specifically about an institutional desire for increased prestige. Carol observed, "I think to some extent because we're so close to [another institution] there's a, a kind of competition … because … the universities are roughly the same caliber and competing for the exact same market of students. So then how are you going to, how are you going to be the definitive winner in that market?" Internationalization is one way in which Astutus seeks that position, but to Leonardo, this ambition transcends regional recognition. He said, "They want to be seen not just … as … the best university [in the area]…. They want to have international recognition…. That's what the University needs to do and wants to do."

Summary and Initial Conclusions

Although the literature on faculty motivation suggests that professors need extrinsic motivations to change their teaching, research, and service practices, this study suggests that within the contexts of internationalization at Prudens and Astutus, the faculty was fomenting changes to which their institutions were catching up. Study participants articulated a variety of intrinsic motivations for engagement in internationalization, such as their personal backgrounds, their interests in helping their students and others, and their desires to advance their institutions. Participants did not identify many extrinsic motivations for their involvement, particularly in terms of institutional incentives and support. Instead, they articulated a desire for more

institutional sources of support to affirm and expand the activities in which they were already engaged and suggested that they would persist even if such support did not appear.

These findings corroborate what Rhoades (2000) described as a myth about institutional change: that change can only come through a strong, centralized administration. While senior leaders at both Prudens and Astutus had expressed a desire for internationalization of their institutions, faculty members who were actually engaged in internationalization indicated that they were doing so because they wanted to—not because of explicit administrative guidance or support. Moreover, these findings support the critique by O'Meara, Terosky, and Neumann (2008), who argued that scholarship on higher education faculty perpetuates a "narrative of constraint" that emphasizes how institutional policies and procedures—not faculty members' personal motivations and ambitions—direct and enhance professors' work lives.

Consistent with the assertions of O'Meara and associates (2008), these findings suggest that a dualistic approach may not be an appropriate way in which to conceptualize faculty motivation. That is, faculty motivation may not be as dichotomous as higher education scholars and practitioners have traditionally assumed. In addition, faculty motivation may not be as dependent on external incentives as previously supposed. As Serow and colleagues (1999) averred, rather than presuming that external rewards are the key to faculty engagement in activities such as development programs, these findings indicate that academic leaders should explore and exploit individual motivations for faculty participation in institutional initiatives.

A limitation of this interpretation of my findings may come from the way in which I selected participants. When requesting recommendations for prospective participants from Prudens's and Astutus's international offices, I asked for the names of faculty members who had received internationalization grants and faculty members who were known within the institution for their engagement in international activities. My assumptions were that faculty members who had earned a reputation for engagement in internationalization would be more intrinsically motivated than those who had received grants, and that by using the grant program (that is, an external incentive) as a selection criterion, I would be able to recruit some faculty participants who required extrinsic motivation to engage in internationalization activities.

As it turned out, almost all grant recipients had been involved in internationalization prior to receipt of a grant. Only one grant recipient (among the 10 grantees whom I interviewed at both institutions), Celeste, had not participated in internationalization activities previously. Her inability to get involved earlier had to do with financial and health constraints, not a lack of interest or motivation. Moreover, among non-grantees (five participants between both institutions), William was the only participant who claimed *not* to have an "intellectual commitment to … international education per se," although he clearly believed in the value of taking students abroad and providing them with an intercultural learning experience, explaining that his involvement was more "project-driven" than an integrated approach to teaching and learning. Consequently, these findings do not provide much insight into how institutions might promote participation by faculty members who are not predisposed to internationalization—those professors who very well may need more extrinsic motivation

to get involved. Surveying or interviewing those faculty members with little interest in internationalization, however, may prove to be an exercise in hypotheticals.

Limitations of my study design and implications for future research are explored in more detail in Chapter 8. Despite these limitations, the preceding discussion does indicate that among these study participants, intrinsic motivation outweighed extrinsic motivation for engagement in internationalization, even for the limited number of faculty members for whom it was a new activity. It appears that at both Prudens and Astutus institutional change is coming about through faculty members whose interest in internationalization predates their universities' investment in the enterprise. Through personal experiences, participants have come to recognize that they, their students, and their institutions are not adequately informed about other places; that the world faces challenges that they, their students, and their institutions can address; and that it is their professional duty—as well as their personal interest—to provide their students and their institutions with a more global perspective on teaching and learning.

Chapter 6

Faculty Practices of Internationalization in Their Institutional Contexts

For the purpose of this study, internationalization is understood to be "the conscious effort to integrate and infuse international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the ethos and outcomes of postsecondary education" (NAFSA Board of Directors, 2010). In the previous chapter, I identified the influences that study participants reported led them to engage in internationalization efforts. I now turn to how they put this interest into practice in pursuit of their and their institutions' goals for the initiative. Just as this study's findings regarding faculty motivations support O'Meara, Terosky, and Neumann's (2008) assertion that a "narrative of constraint" subverts our understanding of the role of personal motivation in professors' work lives, this study's findings concerning practices of internationalization affirm that professors are challenged to perform as "complete faculty members" who successfully participate in all three aspects of their institution's tripartite mission at the same time (Fairweather, 2002). That is, participants described at length how they sought, successfully and unsuccessfully, to put internationalization into practice within and beyond their respective institutions.

In Chapter 5, I discussed study participants' motivations for involvement in internationalization efforts. In that chapter, I briefly mentioned some of the teaching and advising practices that flowed from these motivations. In this chapter, I elaborate on the practices of internationalization in which participants reported they engaged, relating them to the institutional contexts in which they have pursued these activities. Specifically, I describe aspects of institutional context and how participants identified these influences as enabling or discouraging their engagement in internationalization. In

this way, I address the second and third research questions of this study: Which of faculty members' teaching, research, service, and other professional activities do they connect to their institution's internationalization initiative? What do faculty members identify as the facilitators and/or impediments to their engagement in these internationalization efforts? How do these facilitators and/or impediments influence their decisions about engagement and affect their motivation to engage in internationalization efforts on their campus?

As I outlined in Chapter 4, Prudens and Astutus Universities have chosen a variety of methods to engage in internationalization, including identifying international and global education as a priority in strategic planning documents and establishing international offices led by professional staffs. Since these units were founded in 2008, their international education specialists have successfully advocated for changes in institutional policies to facilitate student participation in semester- or year-long study abroad programs, collaborated with faculty members on the development of new short-term study abroad experiences, and secured funding for faculty development grants to encourage internationalization of the curriculum.

The changes that both universities have introduced to promote faculty engagement in internationalization are consistent with two of the four types of policy reforms that O'Meara (2005) observed institutions often adopt to provide external motivations to professors: changing planning documents and offering grants in support of internationalization. Neither university, however, has incorporated the other two changes that O'Meara identified—modifying promotion and tenure standards and/or contract stipulations, and addressing faculty needs for flexible schedules and workloads—in support of internationalization.

As my discussion of faculty motivations in Chapter 5 indicated, however, my participants' involvement in internationalization has not relied on external sources of motivation. Indeed, 13 of the 15 participants reported that they had been internationalizing their work prior to their institution's reforms, driven mainly by personal experiences that predated their university's policy changes and related incentives. Since the introduction of their institutions' initiatives, participants have invested in these efforts. Specifically, seven of the 15 study participants have collaborated with their international office staffs to create short-term study abroad programs, and 10 participants have received internationalization grants.

Participants expressed appreciation for these opportunities and their institutions' interest in internationalization, but they also noted that their institutions could do more to support them and their colleagues in their efforts to fulfill their individual, as well as institutional, internationalization agendas. This finding again corroborates Rhoades's (2000) identification of a fundamental myth about institutional change: that change can only come through a strong, centralized administration. Change was underway at Prudens and Astutus Universities, and it was not reliant on strong leadership from the administration. Rather, faculty members appear to have been leading the way in internationalization, taking advantage of institutional opportunities as they emerged but not depending on them to participate. At the same time, however, participants did express a desire for more high-level involvement in internationalization initiatives to facilitate their overall success.

The findings presented in this chapter provide insights into faculty members' experiences of internationalization, as well as into the alignment of faculty and

institutional goals for the initiative (or the lack thereof). Understanding faculty members'

individual experiences and their perceptions of the relationship between their and their

institution's goals is important because of the key roles that the faculty plays in the

achievement of higher education's tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service—

all of which should be integrated into an institution's internationalization effort (see "A

call to leadership," 2004; Ellingboe, 1998; Green et al., 2008; Harari, 1989, 1992; Knight,

2003, 2004; NAFSA Board of Directors, 2010). In the following discussion, I situate

participants' practices of internationalization within their understandings of their

university contexts. In this process, I provide insights into how they have experienced

internationalization on both individual and institutional levels.

Navigating Institutional Culture

Among the traditional responsibilities of the faculty is the perpetuation of

institutional culture (Richardson, 1994; see also Antonio et al., 2000), which can be

understood as the "assumptions, beliefs, and feelings that [an organization's] members

share," which find "expression in what is done, how it is done, and who is involved in

doing it" (Farmer, 1990, p. 8). Internationalization, however, is a process that requires

the integration and infusion of international, intercultural, and global perspectives into the

ethos of higher education (NAFSA Board of Directors, 2010). As such, it may

necessitate changes to an institution's character. Depending on an institution's existing

culture, advocates may face challenges, even if their institution has formally adopted an

internationalization initiative. As Farmer (1990) warned, "Failure to understand the way

in which an organization's culture will interact with various contemplated change

strategies thus may mean the failure of the strategies themselves" (p. 8).

Participants at Prudens and Astutus Universities reported such difficulties in their efforts to advance internationalization on their campuses. In particular, they suggested that the limited worldviews of administrators, faculty members, and students could impede their work. As one Astutus professor observed, "[Soon after my arrival], I started realizing from my colleagues and from the students that they all have lived very sort of sheltered lives," while another Astutus participant asserted, "At a smaller university, if a lot of people are local, and you're making a shift, it can be trickier." Similarly, a Prudens faculty member averred, "At [Prudens] and other similar colleges, you can't assume that people have a lot of knowledge of the rest of the world."

More generally, among the descriptors that participants used to portray their institutions were such words as "parochial," "myopic," and "conservative." Participants attributed these characteristics to a variety of institutional features, including institutional mission and identity, academic leadership and vision, and faculty culture. As advocates for internationalization, they appeared to be navigating these traditions—trying to find their way through them, as well as trying to steer them in a particular direction—as they sought to bring international, intercultural, and global perspectives into their work.

Institutional **Mission and Identity**

While Prudens University participants appeared to be very aware of their institution's Roman Catholic, liberal arts mission and identity, Astutus University participants did not seem to connect their institution to a particular mission and identity. In the former context, it seemed that close adherence to institutional mission has impeded the progress of internationalization efforts. In the latter context, a lack of a sense of institutional mission appeared to have had a similar effect.

"The mission constrains the internationalization effort." A number of Prudens faculty members attributed challenges to internationalization to the University's Catholic mission and identity. As one participant explained, "The Church doesn't change, doesn't go with the times, and … the Catholic identity is so strong [at Prudens]…. It's not changing, it's not adapting to the … times." Other participants shared a similar perception, suggesting that adaptation to the times required an expansion of perspectives with which Prudens as a whole was not comfortable. One participant remarked, "The mission constrains the internationalization effort…. To be international means sometimes to contemplate the possibility that the rest of the world does not share in Catholic values," while another warned, "When you try to take on the institution and get to the core mission of an institution, there's … going to be pushback."

Pointing to their awareness of the possibility of such resistance, participants noted how they have sought to situate reform initiatives within the University's Catholic mission and identity. One participant described how she and other members of an undergraduate curriculum review committee—whose responsibility included development of a cross-cultural learning outcome—began their deliberations with an exploration of how Prudens's Catholic traditions influenced its educational values and distinguished it from other liberal arts institutions. Another participant tried to connect new course offerings on social justice issues to Church teachings to enhance its likelihood of being approved. Both participants reported limited success in these efforts, citing challenges within institutional and faculty cultures, which I address shortly.

"This university … catches up to what it should be." In contrast, at Astutus, participants did not articulate an awareness of a specific institutional mission or identity,

the absence of which appeared to also be impeding internationalization. Astutus's

endowment was very small, which has made the University a tuition-driven institution.

This circumstance appears to have led Astutus to introduce multiple initiatives

simultaneously or in quick succession so as to raise the institution's profile and increase

enrollments (and thus revenues). At least in terms of participants' perceptions, these

campaigns do not appear to have been grounded in the University's mission. One

participant suggested that these efforts have been reactive, rather than strategic: "This

university kind of catches up to what it should be, where it should be."

Another participant wondered about how consistent Astutus has been in setting

different institutional priorities—a question that emerged from her interaction with a new

academic initiative to which a lot of resources have been dedicated. She said, "We have

this [new health sciences program] that we're trying to get off the ground…, despite the

fact that we're also trying to promote global awareness, civic engagement," and other

initiatives. This participant had reached out to the health sciences program to see if she

and other internationally and globally oriented professors might be able to assist its

faculty in internationalizing the new program, but the program faculty had not responded

to her overtures. This experience led this participant to conclude, "just because you say

something is a goal, it doesn't mean it actually can be understood as an important priority

for all parts of the University."

Academic Leadership and Vision

Academic leaders play an important role in interpreting institutional mission and,

in light of that mission, articulating a vision for their institution (Hendrickson, Lane,

Harris, & Dorman, 2012). As the Astutus participant who made overtures to the new

health sciences program suggested, however, identifying a goal or defining a vision is not sufficient for achieving that goal or vision. Instead, academic leaders must make tangible commitments to the effort. At both Prudens and Astutus, some progress has been made through international office staffing changes, study abroad policy reforms, and faculty grant opportunities, as well as through the inclusion of internationalization and related themes in planning documents. While participants acknowledged that institutions of higher education tended to be "quirky" and slow to change, they expressed frustration with bureaucratic structures and administrators' decision-making methods and interactions with faculty members. The concern among participants at the two universities was summarized by one Astutus faculty member: "We get this lip service about how the University wants to become something wonderful, and when you do the things that should be higher profile, we don't get the support."

"There is a huge disconnect between the administration and us." Prudens faculty members spoke of difficulties in faculty-administration relations in two ways, both of which pointed to a divide between the two groups that had the potential to impede internationalization.

Regarding the faculty's general view of the Prudens University administration, two participants suggested that there existed among their colleagues a broad consensus that the University's administration was "top-heavy." One of these participants observed that the number of administrators had "mushroomed" in recent decades, although "the number of students hasn't changed." He recognized that "it's a more difficult college to run" now, but he shared that "a little bit of cynicism among the faculty" existed because of the seeming imbalance between faculty and administrative positions. The other

participant attributed this top-heaviness to an institutional tendency to be "very attentive to forms and paperwork and litigation consequences." The first participant made a similar observation about conservative tendencies within the administration, noting:

> When an innovative program comes along, my hope … would be that they would … give into a little risk. Give into a little risk because if they take a risk, take a little gamble with a handful of programs, one or two of those are going to surface that's going to really make … them stand out.

The challenge that he saw, however, was that his university's leadership was risk-averse—a trait that he argued was not conducive to internationalization and other forms of innovation.

In terms of relations between the administration and specific faculty members who were engaged in internationalization, one Prudens professor suggested, "I think faculty do not necessarily see the administrative actions as being supportive of … the things that really make a difference." Another participant was more specific, asserting, "There is a huge disconnect between the administration and us." She suggested that academic departments that provided courses for the core curriculum or were more visible in other ways were more "highly rewarded." As a result, she said, "You do your thing…. Occasionally you might get ... a small grant, so you're happy. So a little cynical, but … it's what it is." One of her colleagues averred, however, that there existed "some advantages [to] being a marginalized program," in that being somewhat disconnected from the broader institution has allowed it to pursue an agenda that, at times, challenged what academic leaders may have intended internationalization to mean.

This faculty member also described the current Prudens president as "really supportive of internationalizing the curriculum," explaining that his "formative experience as an undergraduate was studying abroad for a year." In addition, this participant suggested that the provost was also "really supportive" of internationalization. He proposed, however, that there existed "a tension … between internationalizing the whole campus or having a really strong program that has an international focus"—the international studies major. Another Prudens participant asserted that internationalization was not incorporated into the University's vision: "It's not integrated, it's not comprehensive, and it's not part of a vision…. It's not discouraged. It's not punished. It's not undermined. But it's not recognized and rewarded, either."

While Prudens's president may have advocated for internationalization—driven by a personal experience not different from the motivational experiences that some participants described—the lack of integration of the initiative into the University's vision suggested that this perspective was not yet shared by other senior academic leaders and faculty members. In addition, his enthusiasm for the effort may not have generated buy-in within the University or communicated to the community that the institution would tolerate risk taking to advance the effort.

"We are information deprived here … on an extreme level." The issue of allocation of resources was also a source of faculty-administration tension at Astutus, although participants' views on the issue varied.

Specifically regarding internationalization at Astutus, one participant suggested that there was a lack of "will" to pursue the initiative more fully, particularly when one compared it to the aforementioned new health sciences program. She said, "It seems to

me that we could do more than what we're doing." Another participant questioned whether academic leaders were effectively communicating the importance of internationalization to the University as a whole. Contrasting internationalization with the health sciences program, she said, "It's very clear where [the health sciences program is] heading…. It's not clear with internationalization efforts. I mean, it's quite clear to most of us who work in this area that it's not clear" to the broader University community. Participants were unsure of what they could do to encourage their academic leaders to articulate their vision for internationalization more explicitly, however. As the same participant observed, "I can't do much myself to essentially clarify the goals of this. Most of it has to do with high-level administrators…, in terms of where they're going with this because it has to do with resources, too." The challenge, according to another Astutus faculty member, was a "lack of vision at the senior level," which she attributed to her perception that the University's president was not a "big thinker" and the fact that the provost had spent her entire career at Astutus (and thus had a limited perspective on practices and trends in higher education).

This participant was very critical of the Astutus administration: "Everybody wants to see wonderful programs occur, but nobody wants to pay for them." She asserted that there was a lack of understanding within the administration about the time and energy that was required to internationalize on-campus courses and design study abroad programs—and, in turn, a lack of recognition of these efforts. She also noted a lack of transparency in budgeting as a problem for internationalization, since clear criteria did not exist for developing international programs. She stated, "I would hope that … the

University will ultimately see [study abroad] as something that is educationally rewarding and important for our students' growth rather than as a cash cow."

Another Astutus faculty member suggested that the process of obtaining approval for a new study abroad program was "political" and involved institutional "players." At the same time, he recognized that there might be some resistance to innovative programs, particularly when proposed by a new faculty member whose work is not well known within the institution. In his view, it was the responsibility of that professor to foresee and deal with those challenges.

In contrast, several Astutus faculty members were positive about administrative support for their internationalization efforts. One participant, for example, reported, "Personally … I cannot remember a situation that I was interested in doing something international, reached out to the leadership of the school, and the University and didn't get support." Similarly, another Astutus participant shared her impression that the University "is a place where you can get things done," and "there is support for new energy."

These reports—both negative and positive—suggested that while members of the Astutus faculty might not be receiving specific direction from senior academic leaders regarding internationalization, if an individual had the "will" to pursue an initiative, he or she could receive support. That being said, the ways in which and reasons why these individual efforts were supported were not transparent to the broader University community, nor were they integrated into a cohesive institutional vision for internationalization.

International Office Support

As I explained in Chapter 4, neither Prudens nor Astutus hosted a central international office prior to 2008. At present, the international office staff at Prudens oversees study abroad, international student affairs, and faculty development and exchanges, while their Astutus counterparts are responsible only for study abroad and faculty programs. The consensus among participants at both institutions was that the establishment of these professional offices on their campuses was a positive step for internationalization of their universities, although Prudens faculty members also expressed some concerns about staff practices and office policies, which appeared to be symptomatic of issues of institutional culture and administrative leadership discussed above.

"I'm glad we have him." Prudens and Astutus participants were generally forthcoming with praise for the directors of their international offices. As one Prudens faculty member simply put it, "I'm glad we have him." Several participants described the work of the offices and their directors as "phenomenal," pointing to efforts to integrate study abroad into students' broader academic experiences and to work with faculty members on study abroad programs. Many also noted the offices' introduction of faculty grant programs for internationalization of the curriculum as a positive development (see Chapter 7).

One Prudens participant described the director of her office as "a really good second set of hands" for faculty members who were engaged in internationalization. Another Prudens professor suggested that the office director aspired to do more but needed more support from senior administrators to do so: "I see [him] having a great

vision…. And I think that obviously he'll need more support … to enhance faculty participation in international experiences and also help support faculty who'd like to develop those kinds of initiatives on campus."

While Prudens has enjoyed consistent leadership of its international office since its founding, at the time of this study, Astutus was on its third international office director. Astutus participants reported that the preceding director did not provide adequate support or encouragement to faculty members who approached him about developing international initiatives, but as one participant put it, "by the third time, they had it right." She observed, "The individual that is in place makes a big difference … to these kinds of … collaborations."

"What is that $200 fee for?" One area in which there seemed to be a particular lack of transparency within the Prudens international office concerned a $200 fee that was charged to students who were participating in study abroad programs. A number of participants expressed concern about this fee for several reasons. First, the fee added to the expense of studying abroad, and while a seemingly negligible amount, they were concerned that could affect students' ability to participate. Second, participants did not understand what students were paying for through this fee, as they felt that the faculty was "doing all the work" to create study abroad programs.

One participant said that the international office explained that the $200 fee was intended to cover administrative support from the office, but he described it as a "delicate issue." Another participant reported, "You ask them…, 'What is that $200 fee for?'" and are told, "'Well, you know…, even though [students are] traveling abroad, they still have their e-mail and access to the Internet.'" This explanation did not make sense to this

participant since students have access to their e-mail all the time. "I get the sense that no one has really thought about it—thought about the logistics, thought about it from the perspective of the student and the person who's trying to coordinate [the program]." Consequently, this fee seemed to be a source of tension and resentment between participants and the international office.

Faculty Culture

At Prudens, participants tended to see themselves as being different from colleagues who had not traveled abroad or been engaged in internationalization.[18] One participant described the members of the faculty who were involved in internationalization in this way: "We're like a group. We like each other, too." Similarly, another participant depicted colleagues who were interested in internationalization as "kindred spirits" and being "on the same wavelength." Other faculty members made similar comments indicating this perceived distinction. At both institutions, participants described aspects of faculty culture that reportedly discouraged broader faculty engagement in internationalization.

"The thing that you have to figure out is … how to encourage people to innovate." The process of internationalization requires innovation in teaching, research, and service at both the institutional and individual levels because it requires the integration of diverse perspectives into these practices throughout a college or university. While study participants at Prudens identified such innovation as one of their professional priorities and pointed to ways in which their university was trying to innovate, they also noted aspects of faculty culture that discouraged innovation by the faculty as a whole. As one Prudens professor observed, "The thing that you have to figure out is … how to

---

[18] Participants at Astutus did not speak in detail about faculty culture or climate.

encourage people to innovate…. In a campus of … hundreds of scholars we should see … some really outrageous innovations every year. We don't."

"A zero-sum game." Several Prudens participants suggested that some colleagues had been clamoring for more international offerings at the University for some time. One participant asserted that younger, and some senior, professors had been arguing for internationalization for years, which she interpreted as "momentum" for its continuation. Another Prudens professor suggested that a generational shift was underway within the faculty, although specifically regarding the international studies major, he noted that some faculty members advocated for the program for a long time, but it was not instituted until prospective student demand began to rise.

According to participant reports, however, faculty support of internationalization was not consistent throughout Prudens. This lack of support from and engagement by some professors appeared to be symptoms of a traditional, conservative, and risk-averse faculty culture (much like the broader institutional culture described above). One Prudens faculty member explained some colleagues' resistance to internationalization as coming from their perception of it as "a zero-sum game" in which they would have to answer the question, "'What do I take away from these things that I'm doing now that are all so essential?'" In another example, a Prudens participant shared a portion of the faculty's debate over a proposal to allow student internships to count toward their cross-cultural learning requirement. She explained, "They thought, 'Oh, it's going to get too complicated,' and rather than, 'That's a good idea, how do we make it work?' they were like, 'Oh, it's too complicated. Let's not do it.' … But you have to start somewhere."

This professor attributed her colleagues' hesitancy to internationalize the curriculum in part to their attitude toward their students and their responsibilities to them. She observed,

> One of the reasons [students] go to college is because they want to understand themselves better and figure out what it is that they want in their lives and what's important to them, and a lot of faculty are focused on content and concepts and might not necessarily be interested in the … personal individual…, or don't feel capable or qualified or comfortable addressing those things.

When I suggested that these professors might not think that it is their job to do so, either, she concurred. She seemed disappointed that more colleagues did not appear willing to provide the internationalized curricular and co-curricular opportunities that she and other participants asserted students wanted.

Similarly, another Prudens participant, speaking about newer faculty members, said,

> In the discussions we've had over the last several years on curriculum, I've noticed that a lot of the faculty are [*sic*] asking the question of what it means for them and the classes that they teach; not so much, "What does it mean for the student?"

He was troubled by such questions since they were in opposition to the liberal arts tradition of the University. His observation, however, is consistent with the latest Changing Academic Profession (CAP) survey findings, which indicated that the percentage of U.S. faculty members who viewed institutional affiliation as important dropped from 90% in 1992 to 61% in 2007 (Cummings & Finkelstein, 2009). That is,

they were more concerned about having a job—and what job they might have in the future—than where they were working and that institution's specific mission.

Promoting Internationalization through Service

At both Prudens and Astutus Universities, participants noted that their institutions had high expectations for faculty service, and most of them described ways in which they were able to integrate their interest in internationalization into their service activities. Some participants did so through formal administrative roles; many did so through participation on internationally oriented committees and in co-curricular activities. Serving as a mentor to colleagues also offered opportunities for participants to engage in internationalized service. A number of participants also engaged in off-campus service activities.

"I'm Committed to Leading the Department"

As the director of the international studies program, Myles was hired to serve Prudens in a program with an internationalized orientation. In contrast, as chair of the foreign languages department, Lucia has had to push it in a more internationalized direction. She explained, "I'm committed to leading the department … to a more cultural studies major that approaches foreign language … as a holistic entity and [not] just a purely academic discipline." She was also seeking to increase the department's engagement with the local immigrant community through outreach activities, and she was trying to increase its visibility on campus through co-curricular events. In addition, Marcsi described her efforts to use hiring as a tool to internationalize the history department, although administrative support (i.e., funding) has been limited.

In contrast, Kip, another Prudens participant who was a department chair, lamented that she had not been able to push her internationalization agenda: "I haven't been able to do anything in the past two years … just because of our reaccreditation." When she did have time, she found that her colleagues "recognize and support" her interest in internationalization, although she perceived them as thinking, "'If that's what she wants to do and spend time doing, as long as she can do the rest of the work for the department, that's fine.'"

"It's a Good Place to Be if You Want Things to Happen"

Both Prudens and Astutus maintain committees that advise their offices of international programs, and a number of participants have served on those committees. According to participants, committee members provide insights on such matters as internationalization of the curriculum and co-curricular programming. In addition, when the most recent directors of the universities' international offices were recruited, one participant sat on a search committee, while another was asked to provide informal feedback on candidates. One Prudens participant was also part of a group that was working on creating a University-sponsored study-abroad center in Europe.

Beyond committees that relate directly to their institutions' international programs, participants also serve on other committees in which they are in a position to advocate for internationalization. The Prudens participant who served on the committee that recently reviewed Prudens's core curriculum participated on a subcommittee that developed a cross-cultural competency learning outcome. At Astutus, one participant was serving on the strategic planning committee, where she hoped she might advocate for "curricular grants" that would encourage faculty members to internationalize their

courses according to a model that the University is presently using for technology grants. In addition, one participant was on Astutus's academic affairs committee, which reviews proposals for new courses, majors, and minors. Another participant at Astutus joined the faculty senate, noting, "It's a good place to be if you want things to happen."

"I Try to Spread the Word"

Beyond mentoring and advising students, several participants discussed mentoring their colleagues. Rachel said, "I serve as mentor to many of my younger colleagues." Celeste specifically resisted calling herself a mentor to her peers, but she said, "I try to spread the word because sometimes people don't know [about opportunities available to them]." She also explained how she has offered advice to several colleagues who applied for internationalization grants after she received one. She said, "I was excited that … some of the subsequent female winners who were also looking at gender issues had e-mailed me…. I felt really … psyched that they then won…. In my small way, I helped."

"Working with Folks from All Over"

Participants also were involved in organizations beyond their campuses. These activities had an international orientation but tended to be directly related to participants' fields. Jamie, for instance, has served on international environmental advisory panels about which she remarked, "You are literally working with folks from all over the nations…. It was a challenge, it was so exciting, it was also frustrating at times around cultural issues, especially being the only woman in the room." Rachel shared that she planned to spend part of her next sabbatical in Asia working at "a young and struggling … school of social work."

In off-campus service activities closer to home, Celeste volunteered in local schools, which provided an opportunity to work with teachers on diversifying their art education curricula to make them more accessible and relevant to their students, who come from very diverse backgrounds. She explained, "Where are … these students from? Let's include Frieda Kahlo…. Let's include Japanese artists as well and talk about their names and say their names … so … that name could be as familiar as Vincent Van Gogh."

In a different approach to off-campus service, Lucia explained how she volunteered with her students as they participate in experiential learning activities for her courses. She said, "I love these kinds of collaborations where all of us get involved, like students, myself, the community partners." For Lucia, these experiences provide her with "a true understanding of what the students are going through…, and [I] become myself a learner as well."

Pursuing Internationalized Research Agendas

The majority of Prudens and Astutus participants' main professional responsibility was teaching,[19] but a number of participants were also engaged in research, much of which they reported was internationalized. Participants described the types of research in which they were involved, as well as ways in which they pursued their research agendas. As they spoke of their research activities, they also identified ways in which institutional policies facilitated and impeded their scholarship—an issue that was of particular concern for pre-tenure participants.

"You Can't Do Absolutely Everything"

According to participant reports, Prudens and Astutus Universities placed different levels of emphasis on publications as a tenure criterion, but there were also within-institution discrepancies about the importance of research productivity in the tenure process.

Specifically, at Prudens, tenure and promotion are separate processes that are evaluated according to different criteria. Participants explained that a faculty member achieves tenure by proving his or her teaching ability. If a tenured faculty member were to seek promotion, his or her research productivity would be a key component of the application. Alternatively, if a tenured faculty member were to continue to focus on teaching, he or she could remain an assistant professor for the duration of his or her career at Prudens. One Prudens participant, however, asserted that her department did

---

[19] The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's enrollment profiles for Prudens and Astutus Universities are "very high undergraduate" and "majority undergraduate," respectively. Most participants' primary role was teaching bachelor's degree-seeking students. Two study participants from Astutus, Rachel and Leonardo, have taught undergraduates in the past but currently teach graduate students exclusively. Their insights into developing and teaching internationalized courses remain relevant to this study, however, so their experiences are included throughout this discussion.

not necessarily adhere to these tenure criteria, instead considering research productivity as well as teaching effectiveness. She expressed frustration with this situation, observing, "You can't do absolutely everything, especially with a 3/3 load."

While this Prudens participant's experience may have differed from that of her colleagues, it resembled that of two pre-tenure participants at Astutus. These faculty members suggested that the University was in "transition," recalibrating its promotion and tenure criteria to put more emphasis on research productivity. As one of them explained,

> When I first moved here…, I didn't think that this was going to focus so much on scholarship as it would on teaching because I felt, 'Well, this is a four-year liberal arts college…, concentrating on teaching and connecting with the students.' … I thought, 'This is a very intimate setting, and so there's a lot of stress on that interaction between students and teachers.' … [Colleagues] did say that [the standard teaching load] went down from 4/3 to 3/3, which of course is still a lot because full-fledged research institutes would not require more than two courses per semester.

The placement of more emphasis on faculty scholarship appeared to be another example of Astutus's effort to raise its status or profile without integrating the initiative into institutional policies—particularly those related to released time for research—in a coherent way.

Participants at Astutus confirmed that released time was available to engage in research, but they also suggested that the time available was inadequate, especially for

faculty members who wished to engage in internationalized scholarship.[20] Pre-tenure

faculty members at Astutus could take up to nine credits (three courses) of released time

for research purposes during the entire pre-tenure period, and only two of these course

releases could occur in consecutive academic years. One pre-tenure participant

summarized why this policy was challenging for pre-tenure professors who were

interested in internationalization:

> To … internationalize the curriculum not only puts … demands on teachers to try
>
> to design a course that would incorporate … material that is international in
>
> nature, but also that the teacher is equipped … to do that in … all aspects,
>
> including scholarship…. To do that effectively, the teacher also needs to feel that
>
> they could travel, go abroad, that they could be funded for such travel, which we
>
> don't have yet.

That is, a one-course reduction would not facilitate international travel, and institutional

funding was not available for international travel, in any case. Beyond these limitations

of course reduction opportunities, a tenured Astutus participant suggested that the

administration awarded released time "on the fly." She also described the policy of

limiting pre-tenure faculty members' course releases as "insane" because it provided

inadequate time for productive research.

Despite these limitations, or perhaps because of them, a number of participants

had managed to identify ways to engage in research that complemented their teaching

obligations. Others, however, were not able to find such synergies. Participants spoke of

opportunities and challenges to connecting on-campus and overseas teaching activities

---

[20] Prudens faculty members did not report that released time for research is available to them, but given the University's general lack of emphasis on research productivity, the absence of such a policy was not surprising.

with their research, as well as ways in which they brought their students into their research. Perhaps unsurprisingly, participants with lighter teaching loads were more successful in pursuing their research agendas.

"I Really Connect … the Classroom with My Research"

While several participants identified synergies between their teaching and research activities, others indicated that such connections were not so organic for them. Lucia, for example, reported, "My teaching interests … and research interests … overlap in different disciplines…, and I really connect what I do in the classroom with my research." In addition, Jamie described how she and her field research trip colleagues were designing projects that tied into the overseas research program that they have developed for their students. She explained, "What we're trying to do … is set up research that we can continue when we go back [for another field research trip]." For Jamie, this strategy was more feasible than fully participating in another research project abroad: "I was supposed to go [abroad], but I couldn't get the time off from teaching."

Similarly, given their myriad professional obligations, a number of other participants sought to be strategic in maximizing their time by linking their research agendas with their teaching duties. For example, an Astutus participant who was preparing to go up for tenure needed to develop a new research project for her annual review. While she would have liked to have pursued a more internationalized topic, she opted to focus on a project for which she could collect data on campus. The subject is one in which she is genuinely interested, but she also said, "A part of it is that's … going to be an easier thing to collect data on."

Several participants expressed a desire to make more connections between research and teaching, but they were precluded from doing so for other reasons. One pre-tenure participant observed, "If I were more of a pedagogue, I could see … trying to make it all … overlap more." In contrast, another pre-tenure faculty member pointed to her department's standards for academic research: "It has to be … a theoretical question, and an empirical strategy in order to test the hypothesis…. When you write about [pedagogical issues in my field], some people don't think that's research at all. I personally think it is."

"A Great Way for Students to Really Get Attuned"

Beyond connecting their teaching with their research, several participants discussed engaging their students in their research projects. Lucia described this effort as "a great way for students to really get attuned to not just research but also the importance of collaboration." Lucia's students have been involved in her linguistic discrimination research project, which has exposed numerous negative implications of linguistic discrimination, such as "whether limited proficiency of English affects job opportunities and integration, social integration for immigrants." In the process of learning about collaborative research, these Prudens students have been participating in an intercultural experience that may increase their internationalized learning outcomes.

Franklin's department requires majors to take research credits, so his students regularly participate in his research projects. He is currently overseeing four research projects for application in Africa, and students are working on all of them: two waste conversion projects, a sanitation project, and a library automation project. Students have

gone with him to Africa during the summer to implement these projects, with one of them receiving special funds from Prudens to support travel expenses.

Curricular and Instructional Strategies Supporting Internationalization

Beyond the transformation of an institution's ethos or character, internationalization also requires the integration and infusion of international, intercultural, and global perspectives into the learning outcomes of higher education (NAFSA Board of Directors, 2010). Consequently, adoption of an internationalization initiative may require an institution, through its faculty, to modify curricula to address these themes. These reforms can be difficult, however, since an institution's curriculum is often viewed as an articulation of its "mission, purpose, or collective expression of what is important for students to learn" (Lattuca & Stark, 2009, p. 1).

Participants at both Prudens and Astutus reported that they have encountered a variety of challenges to internationalizing the curriculum and their teaching. Student culture, for example, has heavily influenced the ways in which they have sought to internationalize their courses and approach teaching internationalized course content and perspectives. In addition, participants at both institutions discussed recent modifications to their universities' general undergraduate curricula that may support internationalization, although their perceptions of the relevance and effectiveness of these changes varied. Participants detailed the on-campus and overseas courses that they have developed or modified in support of internationalization, as well as the learning goals which they had for these courses. They also described their efforts to mentor and advise students in ways that would encourage them to pursue an internationalized education.

Student Culture

Although prior research has indicated that student experience is one of the last issues that professors take into account when designing courses (Stark et al., 1990), participants in this study reported that consideration of their students' personal backgrounds, academic interests, and professional goals heavily influenced the ways in which they approached internationalization of their teaching and advising responsibilities. They were generally positive about their students' responses, suggesting, for example, that "if you challenge them, they will just rise, and they'll do it." Participants frequently spoke of relationships with their students that were based on "trust" in which they viewed their students as "adults" and "collaborators" and implied that their relationships with their students differed from those of their colleagues.

"It's not that they want to be provincial." Among Prudens and Astutus faculty members alike, there was consensus that their students had grown up in "sheltered" environments that had provided a "provincial" worldview. One Astutus participant asserted (not entirely jokingly), "We get some outstanding students that way—out of parochialism and fear." Specifically, students' parents "don't want them to leave the nest," so they live at home and attend the University. Similarly, Molly asserted, "It's not that they want to be provincial." Rather, as Lucia observed empathetically, "We don't know any other reality until we get exposed to it."

Participants suggested that at least some of their students were aware of their limited perspective and wanted to change. About Prudens students, Franklin observed, "I think that we have students here … who see the importance for them to widen their horizons." Similarly, Candy reported, "My students tell me how sheltered their lives

were … until they came to [Astutus]. That's when they started to really open up and learn more about diversity, about different cultures..., to experience multiculturalism through study abroad."

At the same time, being raised in this fashion led students to be fearful of studying unfamiliar cultures and visiting unknown places. In light of these anxieties, participants considered it to be their role, as Molly put it, to "allay [students'] fears in terms of what's out there." Molly described herself as a "female role model … who has traveled the world and [can] talk about where to start." Similarly, Lucia thought of herself as a "bridge," saying, "Students … are very excited when … you come from … an experience abroad … and share with them and bring it to them."

In addition to serving as a role model or a bridge, participants also talked about the role that they played in encouraging students to interact with unfamiliar people and venture to unfamiliar places—to disrupt what William called their "weaving … like a caterpillar, their own cocoon." In one of Evelyn's courses at Astutus, for example, each student was required to participate for 10 hours as a conversational partner with another student who was learning English. She described it as "eye opening" for her students, some of whom "are still going to be scared to [leave the suburbs] because ... some of [the people in the city] don't speak English." At Prudens, Lucia required her foreign language students to participate in service learning activities in the community to engage with the local immigrant population. "What I do hope that they get out of [it] is … seeing a connection between the theory [of linguistics] and the application, the practical application, and also understand better the reality of our society."

Study abroad programs have also become important ways in which participants have challenged their students' provincialism. Celeste described encouraging her students to consider studying abroad, a position that she believes is more legitimate as a result of her participation in the internationalization grant program. She said, "I'm like, 'Please go. It's amazing.' And I tell them every time…, 'Go on an Italy trip…. Go student teach abroad…. If you can't find a job…, look for a good place to … teach English … for a year so you have that experience." Celeste described her advocacy as a "limited effort," but she believed that it was important to share her perspective with her students.

Beyond promoting semester- and year-long study abroad, the international offices at both Astutus and Prudens have worked with faculty members to develop new short-term study abroad programs, such as embedded, winter intersession, and Maymester courses, project-driven study trips, non-credit study trips, and field research courses. Despite these innovations, however, difficulties remained with encouraging positive engagement in study abroad, according to participants. William, for example, described a "scuttlebutt" around one of Astutus's long-standing study abroad programs in Europe and his interpretation of what was going on:

> The kids ... don't really want to change. They don't really want the experience…. They say they want it, but they don't want it.... They want to be in [Europe] and afraid. You see, they don't want to be [there] bravely ... because the provincialism won't leave them even when they leave the province. It's branded upon their souls.

He, however, was in the process of designing a winter intersession course in London, through which he hoped to coax his students out of their "shell" and reassure them that there was "no need to be afraid."

At Prudens, Kip explained that student resistance to studying abroad through her social work program came less from fear of traveling (although that was a concern for some students and parents) than from an annual event on campus that many juniors did not want to miss. Given the inflexibility of social work majors' course schedules, the only time during which they could study abroad conflicted with this event. She remarked, "I find this to be an incredible reason to not go abroad to study, but … I roll my eyes and say, 'My God, what culture do I offend?'"

"You want to be relevant." Beyond helping students to confront their fears and branch out to unknown cultures and places, participants sought to assist their students in seeing how an internationalized education could be useful in their lives. Marcsi noted that students were more likely to retain what they learned if they felt that it related to them, "so you want to be relevant."

Prudens and Astutus participants described their efforts to teach in ways that connected to their students' everyday lives. For example, in the process of designing courses, they reported considering students' prior knowledge of course content, or lack thereof. In the classroom, they drew on their students' and their own personal experiences to connect local and global happenings. In addition, they incorporated diverse readings and other forms of media into their classes. Participants consistently observed that these teaching strategies required a great deal of time and forethought, but

they also expressed confidence in their effectiveness for internationalizing the curriculum and connecting it with their students' experiences.

"A blank slate." Myles explained that the international studies program at Prudens has sought "to build the curriculum around students' experiences." The primary way in which Myles and his colleagues collected this information from their students was through autobiographies in which students describe "their understanding of and experience of globalization."[21] Molly has also begun courses by drawing on students' prior knowledge. In introductory courses, she has asked her students to write autobiographies, on which they follow up at the end of the semester. In addition to helping Molly learn about her students, the process allows her to gauge their progress throughout the course. At times, however, participants expressed a need to assume that their students know little to nothing about international issues, and as Molly said, "give it in a way that does not overwhelm students," or, as Candy suggested, give them time to "process the information and then provide concrete examples."

Sometimes opportunities to draw on students' prior knowledge have been serendipitous. Evelyn, for example, described a classroom discussion in which her students were talking about evolving approaches to foreign language teaching. She asked several Asian students about their experiences in their home countries, and they shared their perspectives with the rest of the class. Similarly, Celeste prepared a lesson on Manga comic books.[22] She said, "I came in really not knowing enough about but wanting to explore with my students." She then discovered that one of her Chinese

---

[21] When compared to other Prudens students, however, international studies students may enter the University with more international experience, or with more awareness of and interest in global issues, on which they and the program faculty can draw. (See Ogden (2010) for a discussion of the role of student self-selection in international education, specifically study abroad.)

[22] Manga is a comic book style that originated in Japan.

students was "almost an expert." Celeste described that classroom experience as "amazing…, very concrete, like … internationalization right in this room, right now."

"I just tell them … to look at their pants." Beyond incorporating students' prior knowledge into course content and perspectives, participants tried to make their internationalized courses more tangible to students by connecting course content to their daily lives. As Jamie explained, "A lot of that is about my attempts to relate the material to … everyday life and help them see meaning in what they're studying."

Other participants spoke of this method as connecting local experiences with global phenomena. For example, Candy explained, "When we talk about the global economy and what it means to them, I just tell them … to look at their pants…, the labels on their shirts and … their shoes.… I list down the countries where all these products and things we consume are made." This exercise provided Candy with the opportunity to show her students that "it is impossible to separate yourself or isolate yourself from what is going on around the world."

Myles also spoke about how Prudens's international studies program has "a really unique focus on understanding global issues through a local, community-based lens." Lucia has operationalized this approach through an international studies course in which students "look at the city and boundaries and neighboring cultural relationships" and compare those experiences to similar global happenings. One of the international case studies that Lucia used for this course came from her internationalization grant experience.

Participants also tried to connect historical events to their students' everyday lives, which Marcsi viewed as crucial because her students were often very "ahistorical"

in their worldview—a perspective that another participant described as "a static view of the world." To confront this trend, one participant described her desire for ideologies such as Nazism and Communism not to be "abstract or part of … a museum repertoire." Her students researched U.S.-based neo-Nazi websites or the website of the Communist Party USA, and "they realize these ideologies are not dead." Stephen has also sought to help his students understand the contemporary conflict over the status of Jerusalem by explaining its historical religious significance for the three Abrahamic faiths. He has also drawn connections between this conflict and the debate over the Muslim community center that supporters hope to build in New York City,[23] suggesting that it is a new struggle over sacred space—one that will perhaps resonate more clearly with his students.

"That's not going to give me bread on my table." According to participant reports, the issue of future employment was of particular concern to Astutus students. One faculty member explained, "The concern is more with grades and with finishing up and starting a job than it is with … a passion for intellectual discourse, whether on a local or global level," while another observed, "They're going to want to know more about how they can use what they have learned." Both professors were sympathetic to their students' anxieties about their future employment prospects, but they—and other Astutus participants—also expressed concern about a lack of intellectual curiosity and critical thinking skills among their undergraduates.

William, the theatre professor, described his role as being "to somehow get [his students] to a point where they will not be crushed like a bug by a hobnailed boot when they enter into the most competitive business they could possibly have chosen." To

---

[23] As of this writing in 2012, plans for the construction of Park51, formerly known as Cordoba House, in Lower Manhattan were still underway.

William, however, preparing students for careers in the theatre was not exclusively focused on technical skills. He asserted,

> They are thoroughly digitized, and they can't even use the digital systems well because they don't know how to ask the key question…. I say to them, "Look, if you can't form a question … and answer the question in a paper, how can you solve the question of how you're going to survive when you graduate? Where are you going to Google that?"

William hoped that his winter intersession course to London would inspire this type of curiosity and motivation in his students: "I just want them to understand what a wonderful and exciting world I [inhabit] and they wish to inhabit."

Celeste described a different approach to her students' relationship to reading and research. She explained, "It's not enough for me to say, 'You should read John Dewey.' They really want to know why." Consequently, Celeste has rethought how she approaches reading assignments. Now students prepare presentations so that they can engage with the readings in a deeper way. In addition, she builds on readings by incorporating relevant online resources and artifacts into the discussion. She explained, "It's … beyond even digital literacy, more of … a multi-literacy or multisensory kind of experience." In these ways, she has begun to model for her students different pedagogical approaches that they will be able to use in their classrooms.

Carol described her efforts at encouraging students to study foreign languages. She said, "I have this conversation at least twice a week with a student who will come into my office … and start saying…, 'I like language, but I don't want to be a teacher, and … my parents are like, why would you take this language instead of that language?'"

Carol responded to these students by explaining to them how knowledge of another language can benefit many types of careers. She noted, "I need to tailor it to each student, obviously, so it's … very time-consuming. But I like doing that. My hope is that somehow a lot of that will trickle down to dorm mates and roommates and friends."

General Education Requirements

At the time of this study, Prudens was in the process of revising its core undergraduate curriculum, which has traditionally focused on the traditional Western humanities canon. Astutus had not embarked on a comparable reform of its undergraduate curriculum, but it had recently introduced a two-year foreign language requirement for all undergraduates pursuing a bachelor of arts degree. Both initiatives had the potential to advance their respective institutions' internationalization efforts, but participants seemed unsure as to whether they would do so.

"The core curriculum … isn't conducive [to] internationalizing the campus." Among the reforms to Prudens's general education requirements was the introduction of a cross-cultural learning outcome, but participants questioned how influential this change would be within the overall core curriculum. Two participants quoted the University's president as describing the core as "non-negotiable," meaning that its primary focus would remain on the canon. Another participant acknowledged that the core was "foundational" to the University and explained why it was problematic to internationalization advocates: "It can be contradictory to some of the things we are trying to do…, which is giving students … a more global perspective on the world and thinking about the different influences aside from a Western tradition."

Many of these core courses are team-taught, and participants have sought to collaborate with like-minded colleagues to develop general education course sections that expand the traditional canon of authors and artists and incorporate more diverse materials, including non-English language literature in translation and foreign-language films. In a less promising development, however, in focus group meetings at the beginning of the Fall 2012 semester, participants described the Prudens core curriculum committee's responses to the new courses and overseas experiences that they had proposed to fulfill the cross-cultural competency requirement of the revised core. All participants who submitted proposals reported a negative experience, with one remarking that the committee members needed "an imagination."

"Those things don't seem to go together without us making that connection." The foreign language requirement at Astutus was a recent development that applied only to bachelor of arts students. Carol, a member of the foreign languages faculty, was unsure of its origins (i.e., who led the initiative and why). In addition, she identified a lack of integration of this reform into the University's internationalization initiative: "We feel that there's not an explicit or intentional disconnect between goals of internationalization and learning other languages, but on the ground, those things don't seem to go together without us making that connection for people."[24] Foreign language study felt "glommed on" to other general education requirements, and she would like to see it better integrated. At the same time, she was pleased with this development, as was Candy, who said, "I think the University is moving in a very good direction … because

---

[24] Lucia made a similar observation about Prudens, where foreign language study was not required, nor did there appear to be a push to make it so: "We don't think of it as directly being part of this whole strategy toward global learning, but I think it is part of it." She did not want foreign language study to become mandatory, however. Rather, she preferred that the University promote "the climate for diversity" out of which "the study of foreign language and literatures would come naturally."

… having the students take more than English [provides] skills that will be required for … many jobs in the future."

Teaching and Learning Goals

Study participants' interest in internationalization has led them to dedicate substantial time and effort to revising, developing, and teaching courses that include more international, intercultural, and global perspectives. Participants described how they hope that their students' learning will benefit from their labors, including enhanced understanding of their disciplines and fields, a deeper sense of self and greater global awareness, and stronger critical thinking and communication skills. Before discussing these desired learning outcomes, however, I address a learning outcome that participants repeatedly asserted that they are *not* trying to achieve with their students.

"I'm not trying to convert anybody." When speaking about what they wanted their students to gain from internationalized courses, a number of participants brought up their concern that they not be seen as trying to convert students to their worldview— broadly speaking, one that values diversity, exchange, and travel; acknowledges cultural relativism; rejects ethnocentrism and isolationism and may be perceived as having a liberal bias. Rather, they explained that they hoped to expose their students to diverse perspectives so that they can, as Molly put it, "be critical about what they have at home, not necessarily because it's bad," but because it is important to use a critical eye when looking at one's own country.

Carol also noted that she tries to avoid "evaluative comparison" in her courses. For example, when explaining the differences in how languages work, such as formal vs. informal language, Carol's message to her students is "that there are other ways of doing

and other ways of thinking that are different from ours, and not better and not worse."

Celeste compared herself to colleagues who "take … a very … apparently liberal view"

in their classes. She recognized that such an approach can be "useful," but she also

observed that it can be "contentious." Celeste expressed awareness that a number of her

students are "very conservative," and she asserted, "I don't think I'm there to indoctrinate

them into who they should vote for." Instead, she viewed her role as ensuring that her

students understood the value of diversifying the art education curriculum to include

artists from the countries and cultures from which their students came, not just the

traditional Western canon.

"Obviously, I mean, it is a history course." Among participants there was

consensus that disciplinary content knowledge is a key student learning outcome.

Participants varied in their capacity for and interest in consistently addressing content in

an internationalized fashion, but they did not view the issue as a zero-sum game as they

thought some colleagues did.

Kip discussed how she has to ensure that she covers content mandated by the

social work accrediting body, although there is flexibility in terms of how she presents it.

While starting with the recognition that "it *is* a history course," Marcsi described how she

incorporated different resources and frameworks to help her students to understand the

complexity of diplomatic history. About her introductory foreign language classes Carol

said, "We have … about an hour and change less [of weekly instructional time than do

other institutions]. So we spend a lot of time just on structures, on vocabulary, the things

that they need to continue to move on."

One specific content-oriented learning outcome that participants frequently discussed was their students' ability to connect the theories to the practices of their disciplines or fields. Participants who focused on this learning outcome appeared to have less difficulty conveying course content in an internationalized way. For example, Myles described how international studies majors have to produce a "globally engaged thesis [that] has to incorporate some kind of engagement component where they're both getting some practical, real-world application to what they're studying and then also doing some research." Myles's "favorite example" of this activity was a student who studied abroad in two Latin American countries, during which time she researched youth violence. As a senior, this student did similar research locally, which she incorporated into a comparative case study with her two study-abroad experiences.

Participants in foreign languages also described their efforts to make internationalized connections between theory and practice. Lucia explained, "I want them to perceive the language [as being] alive." In a different way, Carol also described how the study of a foreign language bridges theory and practice: "There's the learning more about the English language part of learning a second language. There's the cultural consciousness raising part. There is a vocational part." Carol's hope was that, by drawing connections between the academic, personal, and professional benefits of foreign language study, students would be "comforted that their language study, which is very demanding…, is not for naught."

"See the mountain to appreciate what it is." Internationalized courses offer spaces in which students can learn more about other cultures, countries, traditions, and worldviews, but they also provide opportunities for students to reflect on their own

culture, country, traditions, and worldview. Candy explained, "The first step is …

understanding [of content], and then perhaps … they can feel … how they … are part of

this whole entire process…, that they shouldn't see themselves outside of it but really

inside." A number of participants spoke of a desire to instill in students both a deeper

sense of self and a greater global awareness, perspectives that students would carry with

them throughout their lives.

In talking about study abroad, both Myles and Leonardo described trying to get

their students out of their "comfort zone." As Myles explained, doing so "allows them to

… examine who they are and what they want to be." From his training in psychology,

Leonardo averred, "Life is not as simple as we tend to hear as we grow up, and as we

internalize it growing up, because we have a limited capacity for complexity growing

up." Therefore, in addition to content knowledge on multicultural counseling, his study

abroad program provides students with opportunities to reflect on their own upbringing

and identity. Leonardo placed particular value on doing so within an overseas context:

"It's … good for students … from a distance to see the mountain to appreciate what it

is—the mountain being … the United States of America."

Students can also learn this perspective on campus. Molly described her attempts

within her courses to "push [students] out of their indigenous comfort zones" with very

receptive responses. In speaking about the study of foreign languages, Lucia observed,

"When one learns a language, it's becoming a very active learner in the sense that [one

is] asked to question [one's] prior beliefs and assumptions about the world."

Myles described how internationalized education helps students understand how

they and their country fit into the wider world. He asserted that, as a form of experiential

education (whether at home or abroad), internationalized education "helps [students] understand the interconnectedness and the interrelatedness of the world and problems, and about really innovative ways to solve them." Stephen also noted how internationalized education could teach students about the complexity of international relations. He explained that interfaith dialogue illustrates to students the difficulty—if not the impossibility—of forgetting past injustices in favor of peaceful coexistence. Evelyn also cited recognition of people's "different histories and understanding of historical events" as an important learning outcome for her students since they will encounter and have to negotiate difference in their teaching careers. This perspective was also important to Molly, who wanted her students, most of whom were U.S. citizens, to grasp their "responsibility [for] making this world a better place, [for] making it peaceful."

"Think in different ways." Beyond a chance to enhance students' self-understanding and understanding of the world, participants viewed internationalization as a way to strengthen students' critical thinking and communication skills. As Lucia asserted, ""Knowing that there are different realities really makes us think in different ways. We're more critical thinkers."

To illustrate how she seeks to develop her students' critical thinking skills, one participant described an assignment in which students had to complete an analysis of the recent financial crisis using a Marxist or feminist perspective. One of the most conservative students in her class "gave a perfect Marxist interpretation of the financial crisis." The participant remarked that she was "so happy" that this student had been able to employ successfully a theory that contrasted drastically to his own worldview, not

because she hoped that he would become a Marxist, but because it meant that he grasped and was able to apply the concepts critically. Marcsi also discussed the importance of developing students' critical writing skills. Her goal is for them to develop "their communication skills so that they can communicate … ideas more effectively, more directly—support their opinions with evidence."

Lucia described how foreign language study can enhance critical thinking skills: "We become... problem solvers in the sense that, well, we're … faced with maybe … a language structure that doesn't really match what we know in our language. How do we go about that?" Carol talked about a different benefit of foreign language study—how it can ameliorate students' native language skills. She explained, "Beyond the content, I'm actually much more concerned with teaching them how to write … because that's what they need to do…. Not only are you learning the content, but you're also learning … critical thinking and critical writing."

Evelyn, in contrast, mentioned a different communication skill that is important for interacting with non-native speakers of English: "How do you make your input comprehensible? How do you speak … more slowly but not insultingly slowly…? How do you paraphrase?" These communication skills would be vital for Evelyn's students as they enter the classroom, but if they do not have much experience interacting with non-native English speakers, they might not be sensitive to these concerns.

Mentoring and Advising Students

Beyond on-campus and overseas teaching activities, study participants described their interactions with students through mentoring and advising activities. In particular, a

number of participants discussed working with students who were already interested in internationalized education.

Myles, for example, explained that in the international studies program, students meet with their advisors each semester to discuss their learning plans. In these meetings, advisors can ask questions such as, "'If you're interested in learning Spanish and thinking about studying abroad…, have you thought about studying in Central or South America rather than in Spain?'" In this way, they can encourage their students to consider less popular study abroad destinations that might provide them with more of an immersion experience.

Kip reported that she was advising two new social work students who were hoping to participate in her exchange program. She said, "I am their advisor precisely because they came in wanting this international program, having read it on our website." As department chair, Marcsi had to meet with all history majors who wanted to study abroad to "help them with course selections, approve courses from overseas that will [count toward the major]—that's the time-consuming part." Molly described working with an advisee who had not studied abroad but was interested in a career in international public health. After graduating, the student traveled to Africa, where she worked on women's health issues in anticipation of applying to graduate school.

Summary and Initial Conclusions

Generally speaking, participants seemed rely on what Morey (2000) called an "additive"—rather than integrated—approach to internationalization, although they aspired to infuse intercultural, international, and global perspectives throughout their work. Participants may have been more internally than externally motivated to engage in

internationalization (as I argued in Chapter 5), but their predominantly additive practices of internationalization may have been influenced by an external source: their institutions' piecemeal approaches to the process. A number of the faculty members in this study called for better integration of internationalization into the teaching, research, and service activities of their universities, while at the same time noting that institutional context— such as institutional, faculty and student cultures and academic leadership and vision— inhibit such efforts.

Although both Prudens and Astutus had made progress in internationalization through hiring, policy changes, and planning documents, their initiatives did not appear to be tied to the Universities' institutional missions. At Prudens, this detachment seemed to be the result of internationalization's challenges to the University's mission and identity, while at Astutus, it seemed to be a consequence of a lack of consistent vision for the University as a whole. It did not seem that either university had fully grasped what it had committed to by adopting an internationalization initiative.

Participants' practices of internationalization were illustrative of these challenging contexts. While the main intention of this dissertation study was to explore faculty involvement in the internationalization of the on-campus curriculum, and some study participants could identify specific examples of such efforts, many others focused on study abroad activities as their or their students' primary means of engagement in internationalized courses. In terms of research, among participants for whom it is a priority, some described agendas that related to their interest in internationalization, while others expressed frustration with their struggle to engage in research that simultaneously met institutional and departmental expectations for academic scholarship and their

interests in internationalization. Participants' on-campus service activities were among their most consistently internationalized pursuits, although like research, they were a much smaller part of their work activities.

Given that the primary professional focus of most faculty members at both institutions was teaching, it was not particularly surprising that participants spoke less of research and service as parts of their internationalization activities. Most participants did express interest, however, in internationalizing more of their teaching, research, and service and expressed hope that their institutions would support them in this process. They also identified ways in which internationalization could be expanded at their universities. I now turn in the next chapter to participants' recommendations.

Chapter 7

Participants' Recommendations for Internationalization

As I discussed in Chapter 5, participants in this study generally reported that their motivations for engagement in internationalization at Prudens and Astutus Universities came from internal sources, or personal experiences that predated their institutions' adoption of internationalization initiatives. Moreover, as I noted in Chapter 6, the adoption of formal internationalization initiatives at Prudens and Astutus has not necessarily facilitated participants' continuing participation in internationalization. Rather, participants pointed to institutional challenges that they felt have impeded their full involvement in internationalization and described ways in which they sought to work around these obstacles.

In light of these findings about participants' experiences of internationalization, I now present their recommendations for the future of internationalization at their institutions. In both individual interviews and focus groups, participants drew on their experiences to offer suggestions for how their universities could improve their internationalization efforts at an institutional level and within their international offices. They also provided feedback on their institutions' faculty grant programs for internationalization of the curriculum, but they ultimately had difficulty delineating how to assess student learning around internationalization. Participants also struggled to identify ways in which more of their colleagues could be encouraged to engage in internationalization of their institutions.

"If You Want Things to Move Slowly, Go to the University"

Despite expressing frustrations with their respective institutions'

internationalization efforts (described in Chapter 6), participants were generally

optimistic about future prospects for internationalization at Prudens and Astutus

Universities. They were not, however, confident about the pace of change. There was a

general consensus among participants that "if you want things to move slowly, go to the

university," and that this belief was especially applicable to internationalization at their

institutions. Most participants predicted that internationalization would progress

"slowly," but some also articulated reservations about how "surely" it would proceed.

Few thought that the process was likely to accelerate, and those who did forecast that the

pace would pick up only if their universities' leaders were to sense that doing so would

enhance their institution's profile or reputation and were, in turn, to decide to put more

resources into it—a prediction that was consistent with participants' explanations of their

institutions' extrinsic motivations to adopt internationalization strategies in the first place

(see Chapter 5).

"Show Them How You Can Open Doors"

The successful implementation of an internationalization initiative requires all

constituencies within a college or university to be engaged in the "the conscious effort to

integrate and infuse international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the ethos and

outcomes of postsecondary education" (NAFSA Board of Directors, 2010). As was

evidenced by the findings presented in Chapter 6, however, internationalization is a form

of innovation that institutions of higher education may find challenging to adopt fully—

despite their best intentions—because of the challenges that it may present to an institution's mission and identity, resources, and other priorities.

Despite such constraints, to be successful in initiatives such as internationalization, academic leaders need to create an atmosphere in which members of their institution can implement change. As one Prudens participant asserted, "Universities have to be careful not to make their administration get in the way of innovations…. The place to start is to show [professors] how you can open doors for them, not to shut them down." In previous chapters, I discussed a number of ways in which participants suggested that academic leaders could open these doors, including more explicit integration of internationalization activities into promotion and tenure considerations (see Chapter 5) and clearer articulation of institutional goals for internationalization (see Chapter 6). Here I present participants' recommendations for how their universities could direct more resources into internationalization activities, opening more doors.

While participants rarely indicated that remuneration was important for their involvement in internationalization, they often expressed concern as to whether institutional resources would be available to sustain internationalization activities at their universities. One Astutus participant observed, "I haven't seen any fundraising to develop … scholarships [for study abroad] or … a base structure [for internationalization]," while also noting that for internationalization to succeed, such efforts will be necessary. Similarly, a Prudens participant called for "targeted fundraising" for scholarships for study abroad. A number of faculty members at both institutions suggested that internationalization should be a component of their

universities' capital campaigns to establish, for example, endowments to maintain such efforts as study abroad and faculty grants for curriculum development. One participant also proposed that part of a university grants officer's responsibility should be to identify and assist faculty members in writing proposals for internationally oriented research and exchange opportunities.

Prudens participants pointed to improvements in institutional policies on housing and financial aid that had previously discouraged students from participating in study abroad (see Chapter 5), but they also argued for more reform to financial aid policies. One Prudens faculty member asserted that "funding formulas for scholarship monies" need to allow students to apply their financial aid to summer study abroad programs—not just programs in which they participated during the academic year. Astutus participants identified this concern as well, although the University's focus on winter intersession (January term) study abroad programs (rather than summer session programs) seemed to have minimized this issue. As one faculty member there explained, tuition for winter intersession courses was rolled into a student's spring semester tuition, which meant that participation did not create an added expense for that student. Participants were perplexed, however, as to why similar arrangements could not be made for summer programs such as Maymester and other summer session courses overseas.

"It Needs to Get a Little Bit of Real Polish"

Participants reported that their universities' new international office staff has been able to advocate for institutional policies that have had positive effects on internationalization, especially in the area of study abroad (see Chapter 6). As I discuss later in this chapter, participants also were generally very pleased with the

internationalization grant programs that their international offices had implemented. Participants, however, identified areas in which the Prudens and Astutus international offices could be enhanced or could augment their services—which one Prudens participant described as getting "a little bit of real polish." Similarly, an Astutus participant described the need to transition from a "small-town grocery store" mentality to an "organized supermarket" approach to international programs.

A number of participants at both Prudens and Astutus suggested that their international offices would benefit from increased staffing, although they did so for different reasons. At both universities student participation in study abroad was reportedly increasing, but as one Prudens participant explained, staff members were limited in their ability to help students to integrate these experiences into their overall undergraduate experiences: "You get students to have international experiences…, but not having enough staff support to really help them think through what they're doing, to be prepared, to develop partnerships, to have a reflective component when they return."

Another Prudens faculty member suggested that the international office director needed more support from the University. She saw this support as potentially "[enhancing] faculty participation in international experiences and also [helping] support faculty who'd like to develop those kind of initiatives in campus." Similarly, another Prudens participant observed that while the international office staff seemed to have a firm grasp on study abroad, additional staff—or even a faculty member with a course release—was needed to advocate for faculty involvement in internationalization. An Astutus participant also proposed that increasing the international office staff (which consisted of two individuals—a director and an assistant) would convey the University's

commitment to internationalization. He also noted that expanding the staff, even by one person, could improve the work of the office by enhancing communication with deans, programs heads, and, most importantly, faculty members because, as he averred, internationalization "really begins at the individual level of faculty."

Several participants proposed that Prudens could do more to encourage faculty members to take their sabbaticals in places that are different from their university. Such exchanges, he asserted, could provide opportunities for linkages with institutions in countries with which the University does not have historic ties (i.e., non-European locations). Beyond promoting institutional connections, faculty travel to nontraditional destinations could encourage students to study abroad in less conventional places as well. For example, another Prudens participant suggested that her travel to North Africa for her internationalization grant had led one of her students to choose to spend a semester abroad in the same country.

Professors at both universities suggested that their international offices could look to their faculties for support in these areas. Specifically, one Prudens participant observed, "There's no … summer stipend for faculty—maybe like a group of … six … from different departments—to come up with some ideas, some kind of plan and strategies" for internationalization or to create internationalized courses. In a similar vein, an Astutus participant noted that if remuneration were not available, "I wish I could get a permanent reduction in course load … to work on these internationalization efforts and get credit for it." At Astutus, however, course reductions are not presently available for development of new classes.

Foreign-born participants noted that their international office could capitalize on their experiences and backgrounds. A professor at Prudens observed that while there had been a recent "influx of international faculty," the University had not encouraged them to offer interculturally, internationally, or globally themed workshops or talks. Another foreign-born faculty member reported disappointment at not having been invited to consult on a project occurring in her home country. Many participants, it appeared, wished to be invited to engage in programs rather than create and execute them on their own, as had often been their practice.

Participants indicated that in the process of initiating and offering such opportunities, international offices should be mindful of the information overloads and time constraints that faculty members perpetually experience. Noting that the international office had held an outreach session for the faculty soon after it opened, a Prudens participant suggested that faculty members would benefit from more regular meetings, such as biannual lunch forums or exchanges fairs (resembling study abroad fairs for students), at which professors could learn about "what programs are available or about ways to develop programs."

While this faculty member suggested that international office staff members' efforts to reach out to professors to create programs have improved the University's internationalization efforts, another professor shared a different impression of the outreach session mentioned above. As this participant suggested, "That office has to be very, very approachable and open … if they're committed to international education." He reported being very disappointed with the meeting because the discussion focused on "all of this stuff relating to the legalities" of leading study abroad. He acknowledged that

such paperwork was part of the process of leading study abroad, but he advised, "Don't

bog down somebody who's trying to think about a new program with this." While this

participant persevered with his program, he reported that approximately two-thirds of the

20 attendees left the meeting early. He said, "I saw some of them in the days the

followed, and they said, 'God, I'm going to forget about that idea. That's just too

much.'" This approach to outreach appeared consistent with Prudens's aversion to risk

and concern about litigation, but it was off-putting to prospective participants in the

University's emerging internationalization enterprise. Moreover, as was discussed in

Chapter 6, the Prudens international office staff and faculty leaders of study abroad

would likely benefit from clearer delineation of responsibilities related to logistical vs.

curricular planning for these activities.

"A Really, Really Wonderful Program"

When Prudens first introduced its internationalization grant program in 2008, it

offered one grant per year. Since 2010, two grants have been awarded each year. At

Astutus, two grants were offered with the program's inception in 2008, and at least three

grants have been offered annually since 2010. Ten of the 15 participants in this study had

received internationalization grants (four at Prudens; six at Astutus), and they

consistently spoke favorably about it. Indeed, one recommendation that many suggested

was that the grant program should be expanded so that more faculty members could

participate—to increase the number of professors engaged in internationalization and

enhance the likelihood that internationalization would persist.

Among the five participants who had not received internationalization grants, two

(one at each university) had not heard of the program. When I explained the opportunity

to one of these individuals, he did not see it as being relevant to him because his area of interest did not coincide with the program's priorities: "They are so prejudiced against the idea of sending somebody [to Europe] to study old things that they would never do it. You only send people to politically correct locations to study new things." The other, who had remarked in our conversation on the deluge of e-mail through which he continuously had to wade, suggested that he was not aware of the program because unless an announcement said "free money," he would be likely to miss it.

Both of these participants had, however, identified other mechanisms, both inside and outside their institutions, to engage in internationalized teaching and research. The same applied to the other three participants who had heard of the program but not received grants. One of the three had applied, but the timing of the CIEE International Faculty Development Seminars—the activity that the grant would have funded (see Chapter 4)—conflicted with her other summer commitments. The other two expressed interest in the program, but again existing obligations precluded them from applying and provided them with other chances for international travel and exchange.

As the internationalization grant program expanded at Prudens, the University seemed amenable to grantees' participating in activities beyond the CIEE seminars (as was evidenced by Franklin's use of his grant to take students to Africa). If this diversification of options were to continue (and Astutus were to adopt it, too), it could expand faculty participation. Grantees did not, however, suggest that allowing recipients to use grant funds for activities beyond CIEE seminars would improve the grant program. Rather, grantees talked about the positive message that their universities were conveying via the internationalization grant program, as well as the benefits of the CIEE seminars.

Most grantees were able to describe how they had integrated their grant experiences into their work, although they did not always report success in this area.

While participants at both Prudens and Astutus spoke of the unclear and inconsistent messages that they had received from their universities' leaders regarding internationalization, among grant recipients there was consensus that the faculty internationalization grant program suggested "that there might be a little shift in attitude that somebody here considers this stuff important." Beyond interpreting the program to mean that internationalization was important to their institutions, grantees also appreciated the idea that the universities were offering funding to faculty members for an activity "without a really clear sort of research purpose." Rather, the program offered a chance for professors to expand their horizons beyond their existing teaching and research agendas. Moreover, grantees generally valued the ease with which they were able to participate in the program: "It's nice to have a faculty development opportunity that you don't have to create on your own out of nothing.... It was just sitting there waiting for you."

The CIEE faculty seminars in which all but one of the grantees participated lasted one to two weeks. Participants reported that they were very intense (not "scholarly tourism," according to one Astutus grantee), and while some expressed frustration with the programs' lecture-based structure, they were very appreciative of the caliber of presenters whom they met, as well as of program organization and facilities. In addition, they were grateful for the materials (e.g., PowerPoint presentations, photo slide shows, other media) that they were able to bring back for use in their courses and for the U.S.-

based and overseas contacts whom they had made for potential teaching and research collaboration in the future.

One participant spoke explicitly about having an obligation to "give back" upon her return from her CIEE seminar, and another observed, "The provost paid a lot of money for me to go. I'm happy to make myself available." Indeed, most study participants who had received grants described ways in which they were using their experiences to the benefit of their universities. Several grantees at both Prudens and Astutus reported participating in outreach sessions to promote the program to colleagues (with a Prudens participant again emphasizing that the CIEE seminars were not "tourism"), and several of them talked at length about how they had managed to incorporate—or envisioned incorporating—their experiences into their teaching and research. For some, however, doing so remained a challenge. A number of grantees suggested that it might be useful for their international offices to coordinate meetings of grant recipients to share ideas about incorporating their experiences more effectively into their work, as well as more outreach activities at which they could promote the program to their colleagues.

At Prudens, two grantees described designing, or planning to design, embedded courses based on their seminar experiences. That is, during the spring semester, they would offer courses that would include a travel component over spring break. They and their students would visit the country or region in which they had participated in a CIEE seminar. Another Prudens grantee described a new course that she had designed following her grant experience.

Among grant recipients at Astutus, success at incorporating grant experiences into their courses was less consistent. One participant described a serendipitous acquisition by the University's library that could supplement the materials that she brought back to campus from her seminar, while another explained how she was using what she had learned about cultural differences between the United States and her seminar location to teach her students about cross-cultural communication in qualitative research data collection. A third grantee noted that her seminar experience had given her new ideas for her research agenda, as well as "how to … integrate it into my coursework … with case studies and examples and slide shows and photos."

Another grantee from Astutus planned to integrate her seminar experience into her teaching, but she had not yet been able to do so because of the sequence in which her courses were offered. In contrast, one Astutus grantee appeared to be very hesitant to incorporate her seminar experience into her teaching:

> I guess one of the things … that's kind of held me back is … a discomfort in not necessarily knowing it in enough depth to really deal with the stereotypes [about the region to which she traveled] I know are going to come out…. I think that is … one of the disadvantages then in not going deeply … into things.

This participant was the only one who expressed this type of concern, but it is a potential issue of which internationalization grantee selection committees should be mindful if their hope is indeed for recipients to use their experiences to advance internationalization of the curriculum. As I already noted, some participants appreciated that the grant program allowed them to explore countries and topics with which they were not already

knowledgeable, but this lack of familiarity could also discourage their integration of their grant experience into their work.

Given the limited availability of funding for internationalization grants and the seemingly limited number of faculty members who were able to participate (or interested in participating) in the program, it did not appear that Prudens and Astutus could depend solely on this grant program for successful internationalization of the curriculum. Indeed, despite the existence of internationalization grants, several participants at Prudens suggested that "more tools for faculty to revise the curriculum" were needed. One specifically remarked that he would benefit from pedagogical training that would help him to internationalize his courses more creatively. An Astutus participant expressed concern about academic leaders' simplistic view of internationalization of the curriculum and how that attitude was inhibiting internationalization:

> I still have yet to … adequately explain to the dean and the administration, and the administration that this … is not just developing some courses and asking people to teach them…. For this to be successful and to … be done well, I probably am going to have to seek some funds, to have some workshops.

Even faculty members who are already engaged in internationalization, these participants were suggesting, require additional training to ensure that they are effectively integrating intercultural, international, and global perspectives and content into their work.

"No Way … to Systematically Know Where this Is Going"

As I presented in Chapter 6, participants readily described the internationalized courses that they taught, what they wanted their students to get out of them, and the methods that they used in pursuit of those outcomes. As the preceding discussion

indicates, they also had little difficulty identifying ways in which their universities could enhance their experiences of internationalization on institutional, administrative, and program levels. They had trouble, however, explaining how they assessed how student learning was being affected by their efforts at internationalization. One Astutus participant identified a potential source of this struggle:

> I could probably see that on individual papers, but there's no way for me to systematically know where this is going…. Unless there's … a full-fledged study … that I could get involved in, but really there's no systematic way…. I'm not going to take these individual papers and make up … a sort of a generalization and say, "Well, this is where it's going, or this is where it's heading." … I would have had to have them … over several semesters to see if there's any growth in that area.

That is, without a formal, longitudinal study of students, this participant felt that it was impossible to gauge the effectiveness of their internationalized courses and discern how the faculty might expand or improve it.

Participants were also challenged to explain how they assessed student learning on an individual basis. They discussed their evaluations of particular types of assignments, such as papers, tests, and presentations, as well as capstone courses for upper-level students, but they did not elaborate on the criteria that they used to assess whether students have achieved stated internationalized learning outcomes. This finding is particularly problematic since both Prudens and Astutus have adopted cross-cultural competency as a desired learning outcome for undergraduates.

"They Just Sort of Look at You a Little Funny"

While participants at Prudens and Astutus agreed that other professors should not be required to engage in internationalization of their teaching, research, and service activities (since such a policy would not benefit the effort), they had difficulty identifying ways in which to encourage greater involvement in internationalization by their colleagues. Some participants suggested that other professors' lack of involvement was a consequence of their worldview. On only one occasion did a participant report experiencing outright hostility against her efforts, but other participants perceived that some colleagues did not take their internationalization work seriously. Others pointed to personal circumstances as inhibiting colleagues' participation.

The worldview to which participants attributed their colleagues' lack of interest in internationalization was an ethnocentric or Americentric perspective that led them to believe that Americans "know it all." Participants reported that this presumption was most pervasive among faculty members in professional fields (e.g., business, social work, nursing), but they recognized it to be a general impediment to internationalization, particularly in terms of students' ability to transfer credits from study abroad experiences.

While this worldview did not result in these professors' direct opposition to participants' involvement in internationalization, participants reported that it generated a sense of apathy among their colleagues. While one participant recounted a faculty colleague's public description of her study abroad program as a "junket," another participant suggested that some colleagues "think that we're totally scamming" their university or "getting away with something" that is not academically or intellectually credible, but most colleagues "just sort of look at you a little funny" because they do not

understand why or how she would be involved in this enterprise. She suggested that these faculty members were those who had not changed their syllabi in decades and did not have the flexibility necessary to engage in this type of work.

One participant identified a number of challenges to participation by his younger peers: "The difficulty is that they have children… they're … raising a family, and so … they've got a lot of balls in the air, and it's very difficult for them to commit to something." Family commitments could particularly affect their ability to take sabbaticals in nontraditional places or lead extended study abroad trips. He also noted that adjunct faculty members are too concerned with securing their next job to commit the time required for this kind of work. About an older colleague who had time to and interest in collaborating with him, he observed, "He'd do it in a … heartbeat …, but … he has bad legs and such." Such health problems would make international travel, particularly to developing countries, very difficult.

Summary and Initial Conclusions

With the adoption of internationalization initiatives, Prudens and Astutus Universities were, in some ways, catching up to work in which a cohort within their faculties was already engaged. These professors were encouraged by their institutions' movements toward internationalization, but they were also frustrated by the pace and the depth of the changes that they felt were necessary for effective internationalization.

At an institutional level, study participants suggested that more resources needed to be allocated for internationalization, but their focus was on resources for international travel opportunities for students and faculty members rather than for specific reform of on-campus curricula. In particular, they recommended that administrators engage in

targeted fundraising to ensure that students could afford to study abroad and faculty

members could continue to participate in such programs as the CIEE development

seminars. They also encouraged administrators to continue to reform institutional

policies in ways that would facilitate student participation in study abroad, particularly

during the summer. The preponderance of such recommendations indicated that

participants assumed travel to be a crucial part of internationalization.

Participants also provided feedback for their international offices. At both

Prudens and Astutus, there was agreement that their international offices would benefit

from additional staff members. They expressed hope that their international offices

would expand outreach to the faculty to enhance professors' ability to internationalize the

curriculum, as well as to draw on professors' prior experiences to benefit their

universities more broadly. Among participants who had received grants for

internationalization of the curriculum, feedback on the program was highly favorable,

and a number of grantees described ways in which they had incorporated their

experiences into their work. Others, however, reported struggling with integrating what

they had learned into their teaching—a finding that suggested that internationalization

grants may not be adequate faculty development opportunities on their own.

Another area in which participants reported a struggle—or implied it through their

limited comments on the subject—was student assessment. Participants at both Prudens

and Astutus had difficulty describing how they assessed the effects of internationalized

courses on student learning. As both universities have instituted a cross-cultural learning

outcome for their undergraduates, developing mechanisms to identify how and whether

students are achieving this outcome appeared to be an important next step for their internationalization initiatives.

Although participants expressed a desire for their universities to make available more resources for internationalization (e.g., scholarships for study abroad, more internationalization grants, released time for curriculum development) to increase participation and encourage sustainability, they were not able to offer many suggestions as to how Prudens and Astutus Universities might encourage broader faculty involvement in their internationalization initiatives. The majority of the reasons that participants proposed for their colleagues' lack of engagement had to do with those professors' worldviews, which were unlikely to be changed simply by providing more extrinsic motivations for engagement in internationalization. Even the personal constraints, such as family and health issues, were not the types of impediments to participation that the universities could overcome by incentivizing involvement.

Chapter 8

Discussion and Implications

In recent decades, trends toward political, economic, and social globalization have intensified "the need for most people, regardless of their vocational, cultural, or geographical contexts, to learn to interact more effectively with others from different cultural backgrounds" (Stone, 2006, p. 335). To advance knowledge in these ways—and to compete with counterparts that are doing so (Biddle, 2002)—U.S. colleges and universities have been adopting policies and practices of internationalization (Green et al., 2008), understood for the purpose of this study to be a "conscious effort to integrate and infuse international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the ethos and outcomes of postsecondary education" (NAFSA Board of Directors, 2010).

Internationalization is typically put into practice through activities consistent with higher education's tripartite mission of teaching, research and service—activities such as curriculum development and reform, study abroad programs, international student recruitment, faculty exchanges, joint research projects, linkages with foreign institutions, and establishment of campuses overseas. A college's or university's faculty is crucial to the success of its institution's internationalization enterprise because of the vital role that professors play in these areas. In particular, the faculty is responsible for teaching and mentoring of students, collaborating on research, and engaging in campus and community outreach (O'Hara, 2009), as well as for designing and reforming curricula (Diamond, 1998; Lattuca & Stark, 2009) and perpetuating institutional culture (Richardson, 1994; see also Antonio et al., 2000).

Despite the significant contributions that faculty members can make to their institutions' internationalization efforts, prior research on the phenomenon of internationalization has tended to approach it from a national or an organizational perspective rather than from an individual perspective (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002; Svensson & Wihlborg, 2010). Indeed, in much extant scholarship on internationalization, if the faculty experience was considered at all, it was usually bundled into larger single and comparative case studies of internationalization programs (e.g., Biddle, 2002; Stromquist, 2007). This limited perspective is problematic to our understanding of internationalization in higher education because it does not provide insights into what motivates professors to engage in internationalization, how they put their interests into practice, and how their experiences relate (or do not relate) to their institutions' broader internationalization efforts.

This study was an effort to explore these issues through the experiences of faculty in two private universities. Below, I provide an overview of the study, a summary of its key findings, and, in light of these findings, a set of propositions on internationalization and faculty work for further study. After discussing these directions for future research, I offer a few preliminary ideas about what these findings might mean for institutional policy and practice.

An Overview of the Study

For internationalization to persist and succeed within U.S. colleges and universities, higher education scholars and practitioners need a fuller understanding of the faculty experience of internationalization. The purpose of this study, therefore, was two-fold. First, it investigated faculty members' engagement in their institutions'

internationalization efforts and the effects that they believed their participation has had on their professional lives. Second, it explored how individual and institutional goals for internationalization may or may not have corresponded and thus been achieved. To these ends, this study posed three interrelated research questions:

1. What motivates faculty to engage in internationalization efforts? Are personal or institutional influences more influential in their decision to participate?

2. Which of faculty members' teaching, research, service, and other professional activities do they connect to their institution's internationalization initiative?

3. What do faculty members identify as the facilitators and/or impediments to their engagement in these internationalization efforts? How do these facilitators and/or impediments influence their decisions about engagement and affect their motivation to engage in internationalization efforts on their campus?

To probe these questions, I engaged in a phenomenological interview study with 15 faculty members at two private higher education institutions that were engaged in internationalization in a number of ways, including via a faculty development program for internationalization of the curriculum. I investigated professors' motivations to engage in internationalization; how they manifested their interests through their teaching, research, service, and other professional activities; and how their institutions' internationalization and other policies affected their interest in and ability to take part and persist in this type of work.

Conceptual Framework

This study was informed by scholarship from the fields of philosophy and higher education, particularly the theoretical underpinnings of the concept of internationalization, prior research on practices of internationalization, and extant literature on faculty life and work. For over a century, commentators have called on educators to prepare their students for lives of global or world citizenship so that they might more effectively navigate a constantly changing world in which technological advances, political upheavals, and economic integration are expanding the personal and professional connections of people throughout the globe. Internationalization is the latest conceptualization of education for world citizenship, and within the literature, scholars have emphasized the need for it to be integrated throughout the life and work of higher education institutions (see, e.g., Ellingboe, 1998; Green et al., 2008; Harari, 1989, 1992; Knight, 2003, 2004; NAFSA Board of Directors, 2010).

Numerous challenges exist, however, to the infusion of internationalized teaching, research, and service practices into colleges and universities. Many U.S. professors, for example, have been socialized into disciplinary traditions that do not emphasize the value of international, intercultural, and global perspectives within their fields (Morey, 2000), which may discourage their participation in internationalization. Moreover, professors are under great pressure to perform as "complete faculty members"—as effective contributors to all three aspects of their institution's mission (Fairweather, 2002), despite diminishing institutional resources (i.e., conflicting guidelines about institutional priorities at a time of declining financial support and increasing expectations for productivity). The challenge for advocates of internationalization, therefore, is to find

ways to encourage faculty members to take on a new and perhaps unfamiliar role when they already are expected to do more with less.

As expectations for faculty work continue to rise, it is taken for granted that professors are resistant (i.e., not motivated) to change and require external incentives to modify their behaviors and fulfill the public's expectation that they lead more evenly distributed work lives. Indeed, that faculty members are resistant to change is treated as "self-evident truth" within higher education (Johnson, 1984, p. 496), but this reputation for inflexibility is not substantiated in the research literature. Rhoades (2000), for example, has shown that academic departments and their faculty members are resistant to monetary incentives from their institutions' central administrations, preferring instead to pursue innovations of their own design in response to perceived needs in the external environment.

Rhoades's (2000) finding was supported by subsequent research on faculty attitudes toward internationalization, which suggested that faculty-led, rather than administratively driven initiatives, "appear to achieve greater concrete effects on faculty behavior" (Finkelstein et al., 2009, p. 140). As an institution-wide initiative, however, an internationalization initiative tends to originate within a college's or university's administration (Biddle, 2002; Rudzki, 1995). This study sought, therefore, to identify what motivated faculty members at two institutions to engage in their university's internationalization initiative, how they put their interest into practice, and how their engagement did (or did not fit) into their institution's efforts. This investigation, I imagined, would advance our thinking about the role of the faculty in internationalization and pave the way for further investigations to build our understanding of

internationalization efforts in colleges and universities and yield actionable

recommendations for institutional policy and practice.

Research Procedures

I investigated these questions through a phenomenological interview study of 15

faculty members at two universities in the northeastern United States. I chose to engage

in a qualitative study because prior survey research findings were limited in their ability

to provide insights into the role and experience of faculty members in internationalization

(see, e.g., Finkelstein et al., 2009; Green et al., 2008). In addition, I opted to concentrate

on the faculty experience because prior research in the field of higher education tended to

focus on the phenomenon from a national or organizational perspective (Marginson &

Rhoades, 2002; Svensson & Wihlborg, 2010). My impression was that focusing on

faculty experiences—rather than those of the institution and/or its administrators—would

provide new insights into how internationalization may be promoted and achieved within

U.S. higher education.

Studies of internationalization and faculty work have primarily focused on these

experiences within large research universities. Therefore, to expand our understanding of

internationalization and the faculty experience, I chose to pursue my study at smaller,

primarily undergraduate, teaching-focused institutions. I also desired to complete this

project at institutions that had been involved with internationalization for a number of

years—and that had adopted formal internationalization strategies, including a faculty

program for curriculum development—to ensure that there had been adequate time and

resources for faculty members to engage in the initiative. Since my goals were to

understand what motivated faculty members to engage in these initiatives, how they did

so, and how institutional policies and practices influenced their interest and involvement, my study focused on those already engaged in internationalization efforts at institutions seeking to internationalize undergraduate education.

Over several months I contacted 11 institutions about completing my study on their campuses. Several declined on the grounds that they were too early in their internationalization processes for an outside researcher to explore their initiatives, while another refused because the institution tended not to entertain research requests from outside researchers. Other universities felt that participating would require too much time, and I removed two institutions from consideration because of other logistical concerns. Ultimately, I secured institutional review board (IRB) approval from two institutions to which I gave the pseudonyms Prudens and Astutus Universities, as well as approval from the Pennsylvania State University Office for Research Protections of modifications to my existing approved research study (IRB #33041, a pilot study that informed the current research).

The research sites. Founded in the early 20th century as a Roman Catholic men's college, today Prudens University is a coeducational institution whose basic Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classification is "Master's L: Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)," meaning that Prudens awarded at least 200 master's degrees in 2008-2009. Located in the northeastern United States, its undergraduate population of 4,000 vastly outnumbers its graduate student enrollment of 500 (70% of which is part-time). The undergraduate population is quite homogeneous, with 75% identifying as White, 93% coming from New England and the Mid-Atlantic, and 80% identifying as Roman Catholic.

Astutus University was chartered in the late 19th century. It is a secular, private institution in the northeast United States with a basic Carnegie classification of "Doctoral/Research University," meaning that Astutus awarded at least 20 doctorates during 2008-2009. In 2009-2010, Astutus enrolled nearly 5,000 undergraduates and almost 3,000 graduate students. A primarily nonresidential institution, 85% of undergraduates were residents of the state in which Astutus is located, and 55% identified themselves as White.

Prudens and Astutus Universities established centralized international programs offices, staffed by international education professionals, in 2008. Previously, international education responsibilities were scattered around each campus. At both universities, the founding of these offices represented a new institutional commitment to international education, including internationalization of the curriculum. Specifically, among these offices' first initiatives was the introduction of faculty development grants for internationalization of the curriculum (e.g., in support of revising existing courses, developing new courses, or creating study abroad programs), which provided funds for professors to participate in Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) International Faculty Development Seminars.

The study participants. Ten of fifteen participants in this study were tenured or tenure-track faculty members who had received a faculty development grant for internationalization of the curriculum. The other five participants were recommended to me by a liaison in their university's international programs office. My contact in each office suggested particular individuals because of their engagement in internationalization in other ways (e.g., leading study abroad programs, developing or

revising courses, participating in exchanges or international research or service). Thus, I

recruited a combination of faculty members who had received institutional resources to

support their efforts to internationalize the curriculum and faculty members who had

pursued such projects without support for professional development. At Prudens, I

recruited seven participants (four female, three male; three foreign-born, four U.S.-born;

five tenured, two tenure-track) in a variety of academic fields. At Astutus, I recruited

eight participants (five female, two male; three foreign-born, four U.S.-born; four

tenured, three tenure-track), also from diverse academic fields.

Data collection. I conducted two interviews with each participant on two

different occasions. Each interview lasted approximately one hour (although interviews

ranged from 30 minutes to two hours). The first interview was designed to elicit

information on the origins of a participant's interest in internationalization and his or her

methods of putting it into practice; the second interview provided an opportunity to

follow up on data collected in the first interview as well as to discuss how the participant

saw internationalization continuing at his or her institution.

In addition to the individual interviews, 13 participants participated in one-hour

focus groups with campus colleagues. I held two focus groups on each campus, with two

to five individuals in each group.[25] During each focus group, I asked participants to talk

about how their institutions might encourage more faculty members to participate in

internationalization, and how they might improve the environment for

internationalization overall. All interviews and focus groups were digitally recorded. All

---

[25] Two participants at Astutus were unavailable during the focus group times that worked for the majority of participants and myself.

individual interviews were transcribed; I relied on field notes of the focus groups as well as the recordings to capture verbatim quotations.

Data Analysis

Data analysis involved a four-phase process of phenomenological data analysis identified by Giorgi (2009). Throughout the data analysis process I was mindful of the phenomenological practice of bracketing or *epoché*, the process of setting aside one's beliefs, knowledge, and/or experiences of a phenomenon during the analysis of another's description of his or her experience of that phenomenon (Giorgi, 2009; Van Manen, 1990).

In the first phase, I read each interview to obtain its general meaning. Second, I returned to the beginning of each transcript to identify "units of meaning" (Giorgi, 2009, p. 129). I used Atlas.ti qualitative data analysis software to capture these units for each transcript using a set of a priori codes developed for the study, according to Giorgi's practice of adopting a disciplinary attitude, which allows the researcher to "set some limits or controls on the analysis and to thematize only a particular aspect of a more complex reality" (pp. 11-12). Third, I revisited the text again to identify the elements of a participant's description of an experience that were essential to it (Giorgi, 2009). Fourth, I wrote the "structure"—the term that Giorgi uses instead of what other phenomenological researchers have called the "essence"—of the faculty experience of internationalization. A structure is not intended to be "a definition of the phenomenon" (Giorgi, 2009, p. 166). Rather, it is to be the naming of the dimensions of the phenomenon and the description of how those dimensions connect to each other (Giorgi, 2009, p. 200). Giorgi (2009) allowed that one or more structures may be developed from

the data. Below, I identify the structures that emerged from this study of the faculty experience of internationalization, specifically related to their motivations for engagement, practices, and facilitators and impediments.

   Trustworthiness procedures. Giorgi (2006) argued against the practice of member checks that are based on the assumption that "the experiencer is also the best judge of the meaning of the experience" (p. 358). In addition, he discouraged against member checks on the basis that the findings of phenomenological studies "are expressed structurally, not isolatedly" (p. 359). That is, through data analysis, individual participants' experiences are combined with the experiences of others to identify the essence(s) of a phenomenon.

   I chose, however, to invite participants to engage in a specific form of member check by asking them to comment on and correct the accuracy of two-page summaries that I wrote after each interview. The purpose of these summaries was to confirm my understanding of the main points of our discussions, not to elicit feedback on my analysis of their experiences. I felt that inviting participants to comment on these summaries would assist me in basing my analysis on the most accurate data possible.

   All documents were password-protected, as was the computer on which I prepared these documents and completed data analysis.

Limitations

   This study represents one of the earliest attempts to explore the experiences of college and university faculty members' engagement in their campus internationalization efforts. As an exploratory study, it does not seek to generalize to other contexts, but rather to inform and advance subsequent research efforts. Moreover, as a qualitative

study, its findings cannot be generalized to a population, but use of these methods "allows for and facilitates the emergence of new themes and issues in the course of data collection and analysis" (Helms, 2010, p. 18). It is a step toward building theory to guide these efforts and, ultimately, a step toward clear recommendations regarding policy and practices that promote internationalization in higher education. As is the case with any study, this investigation has limitations.

As I noted previously, much prior research on internationalization has approached the phenomenon from a case study perspective focused on research universities (e.g., Biddle, 2002; Stromquist, 2007). By designing this inquiry as an interview study focused on faculty members and situated within two undergraduate-focused institutions, this project has begun to expand the perspective of internationalization scholarship. Our understanding of the faculty experience of internationalization remains limited, however, and would benefit from additional investigations at different institution types, including small liberal arts colleges and community colleges. In addition, exploring the phenomenon of internationalization at different types of religiously affiliated institutions (i.e., other Roman Catholic institutions as well as colleges and universities connected to Protestant denominations) could provide useful insights into the influences that these traditions may have on faculty work and the practice of internationalization.

By recruiting participants through their institutions' international offices, my prospective participant pool was limited to individuals whose prior work in the area of internationalization had been sanctioned by or completed in conjunction with the international office. Moreover, at Astutus University, the head of the international office asked prospective participants for permission to recommend them for participation in my

study; I did not have the opportunity to contact them first on my own. Although I needed

the assistance of both international offices to identify the recipients of faculty grants for

internationalization of the curriculum, a broader canvassing of the faculty (such as via an

e-mail solicitation) may have generated a more diverse group of prospective participants

from which I could have recruited non-grantees. These individuals, whose relationships

with their institution's international office may not have been so close, may have had a

different perspective on internationalization at their university.

     Although identifying participants through their universities' international offices

may have presented limitations for this study, it was also to the advantage of the study

because using my liaisons' recommendations reduced the amount of time that I needed to

spend researching prospective participants to discern their eligibility. The restricted time

frame of this study presented other limitations as well, however. If I had been able to

design the study as a longitudinal investigation, I could have followed participants more

closely as they developed, executed, and reflected on their internationalization projects. I

could have also gained a more thorough perspective on how participants were interacting

with and responding to their institutional contexts as they sought to internationalize their

work. Such a design could have been useful in that it would have allowed me to identify

changes in motivation, practices, facilitators, and impediments over an extended period

rather than in the almost exclusively retrospective fashion that this study's design

permitted. (I discuss the idea of a longitudinal study in more detail below. See

Recommendations for Future Research Design.)

Summary of Key Findings and Propositions for Future Research

In the course of our interviews and focus groups, study participants were forthcoming with details regarding their motivations to engage in internationalization, the ways in which they put their interests into practice, and the facilitators and impediments that affected their ability to participate effectively in internationalization at their institution. What follows is a summary of key findings in these areas, as well as a set of propositions to guide future research on internationalization and faculty work in higher education. (These propositions are keyed to the three research questions that guided the study.) Just as this dissertation study built on my experience with a pilot study on faculty motivation for engagement in internationalization of the curriculum, my experience with this dissertation study can inform future research on faculty experiences of internationalization and the effects that they believe their engagement in it has on their academic work and professional lives, as well as on how individuals' goals and institutional goals for internationalization may or may not correspond and thus be achieved.

Faculty Motivations for Engagement in Internationalization

As to the origins of faculty motivation for engagement in internationalization, the key finding of this study was that, among this group of 15 participants, most sources were intrinsic in nature. With few exceptions, participants' motivations to internationalize their teaching, research, and service activities emerged from experiences that occurred outside of, and through interests that existed prior to, their institution's adoption of an internationalization initiative. For example, participants felt internally motivated to approach their work from an internationalized perspective because of their personal

background (e.g., as an immigrant or refugee), a transformational experience in their life (e.g., studying or working abroad), and/or a belief in the interconnectivity of the world. Participants suggested that it was their professional obligation to act on these experiences and perspectives not so that their students would live or see the world exactly as they did, but so that their students would carry a sense of compassion and empathy with them into their personal and professional lives after college. Participants also wanted to pursue work that mattered, and they wanted to instill that passion into their students.

While participants most frequently cited intrinsic motivations for engagement in internationalization, they did express interest in more incentives and recognition for their efforts. Participants at all career stages wished for more sources of extrinsic reward. They noted their institutions' faculty development grants for internationalization of the curriculum as a positive step in this direction, and they expressed a desire for other incentives, such as released time or remuneration to create or lead a new course. Such policies would recognize and reward internationalization activities. Participants also wanted clearer delineation of where internationalization activities fit in promotion and tenure criteria and suggested more public acknowledgments of faculty efforts to lead study abroad programs and other activities.

Ultimately, however, it seemed that participants' internal and external motivations were inextricably linked. They spoke readily of the personal experiences that originally motivated them to engage in internationalization and the professional opportunities that they would like to see to encourage their persistence in these activities. With a sense of disappointment or frustration, some participants indicated that intrinsic motivations might not continue to be sufficient for their involvement in internationalization efforts. They

suggested that, at some yet unidentified point, extrinsic sources of motivation—or a lack thereof—would lead them to continue or drop out of the enterprise. This finding suggests that the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is less explicit than we may assume it to be, and that there is ongoing give and take between the two forms.

Participants were able to propose ways in which their institutions could enhance or facilitate their own participation in internationalization, but they had difficulty identifying how their institutions could motivate colleagues to join the internationalization enterprise. They frequently emphasized that their colleagues should not be forced to engage in internationalization because coercion simply would not work, although they did express hope that more faculty members would decide to get involved. To encourage more voluntary participation, a number of participants suggested that reaching out to their colleagues might help to make such activities more accessible to (and feasible for) them. For example, they suggested that they could lead presentations on their experiences with CIEE's International Faculty Development Seminars, participating in overseas research and service, and leading study abroad.

Participants also indicated that their institutions could simplify policies and procedures in ways that would make it easier for faculty members to engage in internationalized teaching, research, and service. They pointed to their institutions' establishment of international offices as a positive development, but they also observed that these offices were understaffed. Specifically, they suggested that these offices would benefit from additional staff members who could help students to integrate their study abroad experiences into their broader undergraduate education, as well as staff members who could collaborate with faculty members (and advocate for them) on such initiatives

as internationalization of the on-campus curriculum, creation of study abroad programs, and participation in international exchanges. Such coordination of effort could help Prudens and Astutus Universities and their faculties to move away from an "additive" (Morey, 2000) approach to internationalization, which seemed to be a challenge at both institutions.

Proposition 1a: Faculty motivations to engage in internationalization efforts related to teaching and learning are primarily intrinsic in nature.

Future research should continue to explore what faculty members identify as sources of motivation for engagement in internationalization. Prior scholarship has indicated that faculty motivation may vary by career age (Colbeck, 2007; Helms, 2010) and perhaps also by institution type (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Clark, 1987) and life experiences. The findings of this study suggest that personal experiences are a particularly important motivator for faculty members who opt to engage in internationalization, and subsequent inquiries could provide additional insight into this issue.

Extant literature also tells us that, when introducing new initiatives, institutional leaders should explore the individual, internal motivations that might encourage faculty members to engage in them, rather than assume that professors will require external incentives to participate (Serow et al., 1999). If future research continues to indicate that life experiences are an important source of motivation for faculty members to engage in internationalization, academic leaders could use this information to draw more professors into the enterprise, which would enhance its overall integration within their college or university.

Proposition 1b: Faculty members engage in internationalization in an effort to contribute to their students' holistic development.

Participants in this study indicated that their view of their teaching role was not limited to the transmission of content knowledge about their field or discipline. Rather, they viewed learning in college as affecting the long-term personal and professional lives of students, and this perspective on undergraduate education has contributed to their engagement in internationalization of the curriculum. While participants (with one exception) did not ground their motivations for engaging in internationalization in philosophical arguments, their perspective harkened back to arguments of the interwar period and years immediately following World War II, when primary and secondary education scholars advocated for students to learn about other countries so as to be better prepared to live and work in an increasingly interconnected world (Kandel & Whipple, 1937; Monroe, 1937; Shotwell, 1937; Tewksbury, 1945; Whipple, 1937), as well as to Nussbaum's (1994/1996, 1997) more recent writings on cosmopolitanism. Future research on motivations for involvement in internationalization should explore more deeply whether philosophical influences play a role in faculty decisions to participate in internationalization, or if they might be a positive influence on uninvolved professors' decisions to become involved.

Proposition 1c: Institutional incentives and rewards for engagement in internationalization influence faculty members differently at different career stages.

Although the findings of this study suggest that intrinsic motivations play a stronger role than extrinsic motivations in faculty decisions to engage in internationalization, these findings are far from conclusive. Thus, the need to study the

effects of external incentives on faculty participation in internationalization efforts should be explored further. Future research should investigate in more detail what types of extrinsic motivation might encourage further participation by professors who are already engaged in internationalization as well as persuade colleagues to become involved. In addition, studies should investigate if, how, and why different types of extrinsic motivation may have greater or lesser influence on faculty members at particular career points and in different positions.

Specifically, future investigations should consider for which types of faculty members (i.e., tenured, pre-tenure, or fixed-term contract professors) such incentives as released time, remuneration, and institutional recognition are important influences on decisions to engage in internationalization. Beyond these forms of extrinsic motivation, subsequent studies could explore how and for whom changes to institutional policies (i.e., lessening red tape and incorporating internationalization into promotion and tenure criteria) would be influential in decisions to engage or persist in the effort. Moreover, as colleges and universities become increasingly dependent on fixed-term and other types of contingent faculty members, if and how these members of the professoriate are motivated to engage in internationalization will become particularly important.

Proposition 1d: Faculty members are more likely to become involved in internationalization if introduced to the work of colleagues who have successfully engaged in these efforts.

Future research on faculty motivation for engagement in internationalization should consider whether interactions between professors who are involved in the enterprise can encourage uninvolved professors to participate. Participants in this study suggested that their engagement in this type of outreach might help to expand

participation in internationalization on their campuses because of the message that they could send about the initiative's feasibility. At the same time, they also related conversations with colleagues who approached them about their efforts to lead study abroad, design new courses, etc., and who subsequently dismissed it as "too much work." In addition, they noted the presence of colleagues who did not acknowledge the value of internationalization and whose minds were unlikely to be changed. Future inquiries could explore in more detail the role that faculty members played in motivating colleagues to engage in internationalization. For example, the faculty could be surveyed to investigate, among other things, whether (and to what extent) their participation in internationalization was influenced by the efforts of their colleagues.

Faculty Practices of Internationalization

In terms of practices of internationalization, a key finding of this study was that participants appeared to have difficulty consistently integrating and infusing international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the ethos and outcomes of their work, despite a desire to do so on the part of the vast majority of participants. A number of participants' outlet for internationalized teaching was leading study abroad, rather than a more integrated approach to their on-campus courses that would include all their students—not just those who were able to travel overseas with them. Acknowledging the challenges of internationalizing the curriculum and implying that the internationalization grant program was not adequate for this purpose, several participants expressed a need for their institutions to provide more professional development opportunities to assist faculty members in internationalizing their courses. Also pointing to a potential shortcoming of the internationalization grant program, one participant suggested that she

has not incorporated that experience into her courses because she did not feel that she had gained sufficient knowledge of the region and culture to address it responsibly.

Beyond these challenges to internationalizing their teaching, participants noted impediments to internationalizing their research agendas. Teaching undergraduates was the primary responsibility of all seven Prudens participants and six of eight Astutus participants, but in some academic departments at both schools, participants reported that faculty members were under increasing pressure to engage in research. For participants, their ability to pursue internationalized scholarship was limited by the absence of released time (at Prudens) or limited opportunities for released time (at Astutus) for research that would have allowed travel abroad. Participants reported that a lack of institutional funding for this purpose was an impediment, although a number of them had secured external grants to support overseas research or had tried to be more efficient by combining overseas teaching and research activities.

Participants appeared to have better success in internationalizing their service activities, whether on or off campus. A number of participants served as chair of their department or academic program, and through this leadership role, they encouraged internationalization of their majors through such initiatives as the introduction of new courses (although they were not always approved), hiring of new faculty members (although securing funds to add to their number was often difficult), and/or development of study abroad programs. Other participants sat on institutional committees that influenced the progress of internationalization at Prudens and Astutus, including the curriculum committee, strategic planning committee, and faculty senate. Still others

engaged in service activities off campus, ranging from volunteering at local schools to sitting on international consultative committees in their fields.

Proposition 2a: Faculty members who aspire to internationalize their teaching, research, and service activities are discouraged from doing so when they perceive a lack of institutional support for their work.

The literature has suggested that professors are challenged to perform as "complete faculty members" (Fairweather, 2002), despite expectations from their institutions and the public that they distribute their attention more equally between their teaching, research, and service responsibilities. Survey data have suggested that this trend has been most pronounced at research universities, but professors at other four-year institutions have also felt pressure to be more productive in all areas of their college or university mission without commensurate institutional support to do so (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Therefore, faculty members have been put in the position of having to do more teaching and research activities with fewer resources to support their work (Colbeck, 1998; Johnsrud, 2002; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Rosser, 2004; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

Future research should explore how faculty members use institutional resources that are available to them for the purpose of internationalizing their teaching, research, and service activities, as well as what resources they would suggest their institutions offer to facilitate further internationalization of their college or university (i.e., professional development programs, research leave, team-teaching opportunities). Within the context of internationalization, the resources that are needed and/or available may vary by such characteristics as institution type, whether a faculty is unionized, and how dependent an institution is on adjunct or fixed-term faculty members.

Proposition 2b: Faculty members who are engaged in their institution's internationalization initiative are more likely to persist in the enterprise if they feel integrated into the life and work of the institution.

Prior scholarship on internationalization has argued that professors "are discouraged by its marginality to what is perceived as 'the real work' of their disciplines" (Johnston, 1993, p. 15). Indeed, U.S. academics have been accused of perpetuating "scholarly ethnocentrism" (Johnston, 1993, p. 15) and "chauvinism" within their fields (Haigh, 2002, p. 55), which may be a result of having been socialized into disciplinary traditions that have not viewed global perspectives as important (Groennings, 1990; Morey, 2000). Consequently, faculty members who do engage in internationalized work may feel marginalized from their college or university, even when it purports to have adopted an institution-wide internationalization strategy.

In this study, a number of participants appeared to persist in their internationalization work even though they were not always convinced of their institution's deep commitment to or appreciation of this work. Very few participants spoke explicitly about the possibility of stopping these activities because of an absence of formal institutional recognition (beyond the support that they had received through curriculum development grants, study abroad programs, etc.), although a number of them wished that such acknowledgments were more forthcoming (e.g., released time, extra pay, public statements by academic leaders). They seemed to continue their efforts primarily because of a belief that an internationalized approach to their teaching, research, and service was the right thing to do for their students and their institution.

Future research on internationalization should explore with faculty members their perceptions of how well integrated their work is within the life of their institution and

should invite them to provide illustrations of such integration (or lack thereof). Positive evidence may include institutional rewards or other forms of recognition, while negative evidence may include active or passive opposition from colleagues or other experiences in which faculty members have felt their work in internationalization was disregarded or undervalued by their institution. Further phenomenological inquiries might focus on how faculty members make meaning of and respond to such interactions with their colleagues and institutions.

Facilitators and Impediments to Faculty Engagement in Internationalization

As participants spoke of their practices of internationalization, they often gave the impression that they were working in isolation or with a very small group of like-minded colleagues. Their work did not appear to be integrated into the broader teaching, research, and service mission of their institutions, despite claims by their institutions to be invested in internationalization. In this way, it did not seem that participants' relationships with their institutions had changed much from before the universities adopted their internationalization initiatives (i.e., when most participants were engaged in this work on their own). Participants gave the impression that they felt that they (and a few colleagues) *were* their universities' internationalization programs and received very little support for being so, despite institutional "lip service" in support of internationalization. Indeed, unfulfilled expectations for the initiative may ultimately be a disincentive to ongoing involvement with internationalization.

Another key finding of this study, therefore, concerned institutional impediments to participants' success in internationalization and their prognosis for the future of internationalization at their universities. At Prudens, a number of participants suggested

that the University's Roman Catholic mission and identity made it resistant to the types

of change necessary to engage fully in internationalization (particularly in terms of

considering different cultural traditions, worldviews, etc.), while at Astutus, several

participants indicated that the University was without a coherent vision, which impeded

the integration of internationalization into the University as a whole.

Proposition 3: An internationalization initiative will be successful when the faculty perceives it to be grounded in their institution's mission, identity, and culture.

Institutional motivations for engaging in internationalization are complex. While

some colleges and universities have explained their involvement as providing a service to

their country and the world and instilling in their graduates a sense of "global

citizenship," they have also cited desires to remain competitive with peer institutions, to

maintain prestige, and to generate new revenues as motivations for internationalization

(Biddle, 2002; see also Altbach, 2006; Groennings, 1990; Johnston, 1993; Mestenhauser,

1998; Stohl, 2007; Stromquist, 2007). These latter explanations were consistent with

faculty perceptions of "the increasing commodification and commercialization of higher

education and the perceived decline of purely academic values within higher education"

(Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006, p. 138).

Future research into internationalization should explore the coherence of an

institution's initiative with its traditional mission, identity, and culture. Studies could

analyze institutional documents to see if justifications for the initiative are rooted in

previous statements regarding mission, identity, and culture. Moreover, studies could

explore how integrated the initiative has become within faculty members' teaching (e.g.,

whether new internationalized courses have been approved), scholarship (e.g., whether

internationalized faculty research projects have been supported with funding and/or leave), and service (e.g., whether internationalized service activities have been supported with funding and/or leave).

Recommendations for Future Research Design

As I have discussed previously, most research on internationalization has been completed at research universities and from a top-down (i.e., organizational) perspective. This study was a preliminary effort to explore the phenomenon of internationalization within the context of undergraduate-focused institutions and from the perspective of the faculty. Future studies should continue to explore the propositions that I have offered in different institutional settings to see if the experiences of faculty members vary between research universities, comprehensive institutions, small liberal arts colleges, and community colleges. Beyond this overarching recommendation for future research design, I propose a number of specific suggestions for subsequent inquiries on this topic.

Recommendation 1: Recruit faculty participants who (a) are engaged in internationalization, but not so closely with their international office, and (b) who have not engaged in internationalization.

As I noted above, a potential limitation of this study was the fact that all participants were identified through their international offices. While these offices provided exceptional support as I pursued this investigation, canvassing the faculty via e-mail may have enabled me to recruit participants who were more independently engaged in internationalization. Moreover, I could have potentially identified faculty participants who were not involved with internationalization at all but were interested in discussing their institution's initiative. Both groups may have provided different insights into faculty motivation, and the former group may have offered other perspectives on

practices, impediments, and facilitators. Future qualitative studies of the faculty experience of internationalization could seek to incorporate this approach to participant recruitment, although this recruitment strategy might be more effective for quantitative studies, such as surveys, particularly in terms of gaining participation from individuals who are not involved in internationalization but want to express opinions on their institution's efforts.

Recommendation 2: Pursue a longitudinal study of faculty members' and their institutions' engagement in internationalization.

In my original research design, I had intended to complete participant interviews within several weeks of each other, and focus groups within several weeks of the interviews. Due to the timeframes in which I was able to secure research sites, recruit participants, and arrange interviews, I could not adhere to this schedule. At first having to wait to complete data collection appeared to be an inconvenience, but the unanticipated six-month gap between interviews and focus groups turned out to be advantageous. Between the spring 2011 and fall 2011 semesters, participants had led study abroad programs, participated in course development, and had other experiences on their campuses that had changed their perspectives on internationalization at their institutions—and not necessarily for the better. While this study is still only a snapshot of the faculty experience of internationalization at both sites, having to extend the time frame for data collection expanded my understanding of the phenomenon.

Consequently, I would propose that future research in this area be designed as a longitudinal study. Beyond the serendipitous information that I was able to collect, a number of participants said something to the effect of, "If you were to come back in five

years, you could really see the institution's commitment or lack thereof." A longitudinal design could provide more insights into individual faculty members' success and persistence in internationalization. More importantly, perhaps, such an approach could generate greater understanding of a college's or university's success in institutionalizing its internationalization initiative. Ultimately, the findings that emerge from a longitudinal design could enhance our knowledge of how individual and institutional goals for an initiative—internationalization, in this case—merge and diverge.

Recommendation 3: Engage both administrators and faculty members in studies.

In an effort to counterbalance the top-down approach of much prior research on internationalization, in this study I focused exclusively on the experiences of faculty members. Consequently, this study gives a voice to this crucial, yet often overlooked, constituency and makes a positive contribution to higher education scholarship by generating propositions and recommendations for future studies that will aid researchers as they pursue research on how faculty pursue internationalization efforts and its effects on their personal and professional lives. Additional studies of internationalization efforts would benefit from formal inclusion of international office directors and academic leaders such as deans or provosts.

I did speak frequently, but informally, with the heads of the international offices at both Prudens and Astutus Universities, but on-the-record conversations may have provided additional background and information that I could not find, for example, through review of institutional documents. Specifically, including academic leaders in such studies may provide additional insights into the issue of faculty and institutional alignment of goals for a college's or university's internationalization initiative. Research

sites could benefit from such findings as they continue to pursue internationalization of their teaching, research, and service activities.

Recommendation 4: Include in data collection classroom observations, analysis of syllabi, and other ways in which faculty members put internationalization into practice.

Green, Luu, and Burris (2008) observed that survey research "does not provide an adequate vehicle to probe the many qualitative aspects of internationalization, such as … the integration of international perspectives" into the curriculum (pp. 4-5). To address this shortcoming of survey research, this study sought to explore with participants how they put internationalization into practice through such activities as curriculum development, scholarship, and outreach. They spoke at great length, but not in a lot of detail, about their practices.

To understand better how faculty members pursue internationalization in their work, more micro-level studies are needed. For example, engaging in classroom observations may provide with opportunities to see study participants in action, as well as student responses to their attempts to internationalize their courses. Moreover, analyzing course syllabi could offer the chance to learn more about how faculty participants communicate to students their rationales for, approaches to, and criteria for assessing student performance in internationalized courses. Reviewing student work in these internationalized courses and how participants assessed it may be insightful, as assessment was an area about which participants had difficulty speaking. After such micro-level studies have been conducted, researchers may be able to move to more survey-based research to understand whether faculty members use particular strategies widely and rate them as effective.

Recommendation 5: Expand interview and/or survey protocols of both faculty members and administrators to include questions concerning external motivators such as the influence of colleagues, the role of the international office, and the importance of institutional policies on engagement in internationalization.

Faculty participants in this study averred that engaging in more outreach to colleagues who were not involved in internationalization might increase the likelihood of these colleagues' participation in the initiative. Future studies on the faculty experience of internationalization should include interview or survey questions that explore the role of colleagues in faculty decision making around participation in internationalization. Professors could be asked specifically about whether their involvement (or lack thereof) was influenced by the efforts of their colleagues, as well as to what extent peer influence played a role in their decisions. Similarly, administrators could be asked about their impressions of the role of faculty relationships (and the need to nurture them) in the promotion of internationalization.

With few caveats, participants in this study spoke quite favorably of their international offices. Future studies should continue to investigate the role of institutions' international offices in faculty decision making around and experiences of internationalization. In particular, interviews and surveys should explore the role of the international office in faculty work, including how its staff and/or its policies facilitate or impede professors' internationalization efforts. Faculty participants could be invited to rate a list of practices (e.g., curriculum reform, study abroad, faculty exchanges, overseas research, service activities) and policies (e.g., enrollment requirements, budgets, liability, program time frames) to clarify how their international office enables or problematizes their work. Administrators (within the international office and elsewhere within the institution) could be invited to rate the same items to see if there is alignment in their

perceptions of how their institution's international office contributes to internationalization.

Recommendation 6: Explore faculty engagement in internationalization at both the undergraduate and graduate levels of teaching, research, and service.

While this study was designed to investigate motivations for, practices of, and impediments to and facilitators of faculty involvement in internationalization of the undergraduate curriculum, future should explore faculty participation at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The literature has suggested that U.S. faculty members are often trained within cultures of "scholarly ethnocentrism" (Johnston, 1993, p. 15) or "chauvinism" (Haigh, 2002, p. 55; see also Altbach & Lewis, 1998) that do not encourage consideration of international or global perspectives. Such limitations may be exacerbated by the high level of specialization that is also required within graduate-level studies. As graduate students often become faculty members, it is important to consider whether—and if so, how—they are being prepared to internationalize their teaching, research, and scholarship. This responsibility falls not only to the institutions of higher education that train graduate students. It is also the task of the scholarly professional organizations that establish standards for the preparation of aspiring faculty members.

Implications for Institutional Practices and Policy

Although the primary role of this study is to inform future research, my ultimate goal is to encourage research that will positively influence internationalization practices in U.S. colleges and universities. I now present a series of recommendations that may assist Prudens and Astutus Universities as academic leaders seek to work with their faculties to improve or expand their internationalization initiatives. These

recommendations may be somewhat transferrable to other institutions of higher education, although as I have acknowledged previously, findings of qualitative studies are not generalizable to a population.

Recommendation 1: Internationalization should be planned rather than declared.

Given the diversity of U.S. higher education institutions, there is no single way for a college or university to internationalize. At the same time, prior research has indicated that a piecemeal approach to internationalization is unlikely to succeed (see, e.g, Haigh, 2002; Mestenhauser, 1998; Morey, 2000). Rather, scholars have recommended that colleges and universities approach the enterprise holistically so that all constituencies are engaged in discerning how to integrate intercultural, international, and global perspectives into the character and outcomes of an institution (see, e.g., Rudzki, 1995; Sanderson, 2008; Stohl, 2007).

Rudzki (1995) suggested that institutions approach internationalization either through a reactive model, in which administrators take control of existing relationships and programs that faculty members have developed, or a proactive model, in which administrators and faculty members join in a discernment process through which they develop an institutional strategy for internationalization. While Rudzki asserted that most institutions employ a reactive approach, participant reports indicated that neither strategy was used at Prudens or Astutus. Rather, academic leaders appear to have established internationalization initiatives on their campuses without engaging in much consultation with faculty members who were already engaged in this type of work, and those faculty members have subsequently persisted in their activities with minimal amounts of new support (and some new impediments). The consequence of this approach appears to have

become frustration on the part of faculty members who were already invested in internationalization and little growth in participation by other professors. To avoid such circumstances, other similar institutions that are considering adopting or preparing to implement internationalization strategies may wish to revisit the methods through which they are exploring this opportunity.

Recommendation 2: Decisions surrounding internationalization should prioritize student learning.

Participants at both Prudens and Astutus expressed similar suspicions about their universities' motivations for engaging in internationalization and substantiated these doubts with descriptions of different institutional impediments to pursuing their internationalized activities. For example, at Prudens, participants described how outreach to promote study abroad was foregrounded with discussions of liability, while at Astutus, participants talked about how unclear (even arbitrary) budget policies drove decisions about study abroad programs. Although study participants persevered despite these discouragements, they also reported that colleagues who may have been interested in developing study abroad programs opted not to do so because of such obstacles. Participants consistently emphasized the need for their institutions to get faculty members excited about study abroad by emphasizing its benefits to student learning, after which administrators could address their legitimate concerns about liability and budgeting. Reordering the way in which administrators approach planning for study abroad has the potential to generate more faculty involvement and interest in the enterprise, as well as to diminish faculty cynicism that study abroad is no more than a "cash cow" for their institutions. Other colleges and universities may wish to revisit the ways in which they

promote internationalization—and study abroad, in particular—to their faculties to see whether their policies and practices are consistent with their rhetoric, and whether how they communicate with their faculties is affecting professors' motivation to participate in their internationalization initiatives.

Recommendation 3: Internationalization requires multiple forms of faculty development.

Beyond administrative support for activities such as study abroad, faculty members need professional development support to ensure that they are leading study abroad, teaching internationalized on-campus courses, and pursuing internationalized research and service in effective ways. Faculty members who wish to diversify their work need to be provided with resources to help them do so—a need that was recognized and desired by a number of study participants who were already engaged in internationalization at Prudens and Astutus.

Participant reports suggested that faculty grants for internationalization of the curriculum were not an adequate form of professional development to facilitate internationalization at their institutions. With only a handful of internationalization grants available each year, it will take some time for a critical mass of grantees to develop on each campus, which could in turn slow down their ability to foment change within their institutions. Beyond this issue, participants expressed concerns about development of pedagogical skills around internationalization.

Both Prudens and Astutus Universities sponsor centers that promote teaching excellence, which would seem to be logical venues with which their international offices could collaborate on faculty development for internationalization of the curriculum.

These centers could reach out to faculty members who are already engaged in internationalization (and have reported feeling marginalized from their institutions) to promote their collaboration with peers (which might encourage previously uninvolved colleagues to engage in internationalization of their work). In addition, these centers could provide a context to encourage increased collaboration among internationalization program grantees (an opportunity that study participants desired).

Recommendation 4: An institution's internationalization strategy should be both coherent for the entire institution and customizable to the needs of specific academic programs, departments, colleges, etc.

While the main focus of this study was on the faculty experience of internationalization, its findings have potential implications for institutional decision making, particularly in terms of how a college or university goes about developing and implementing an internationalization initiative. Specifically, for internationalization to be successful, it should be grounded in a cohesive plan that different academic units can implement according to their faculty capacities and interests, with institutional resources being made available to promote and reward these efforts.

At both research sites, participants identified institutional mission—or a lack thereof—as hindering internationalization. They also acknowledged that colleges and universities tend to be slow or resistant to change, but they expressed frustration that, as they saw the situation, their institutions were implementing their internationalization initiatives slowly and inconsistently. This perception led participants to question their universities' long-term commitment to the enterprise.

Rudzki (1995) averred that, within an internationalization process, different institutional components maintain different levels of influence according to their

permanence within the institution. Specifically, the institution itself is the most enduring

facet, and the curriculum is the most permanent aspect within the institution. Faculty

members follow, and students are the shortest-term participants. While faculty members

may try to effect change through engagement in their institution's internationalization

initiative—through such efforts as curriculum reform, research projects, and service

activities—if their institution has not articulated formal mechanisms and standards for

internationalization, it is unlikely to persist. Rather, the faculty members and students

who participate in internationalized teaching, scholarship, and outreach will be

marginalized, as has been the trend in U.S. higher education since at least the 1970s

(McCaughey, 1984; see also Antonio et al., 2000). The clearest risk of not addressing

this disconnect by promoting engagement across a broader swath of the faculty is that if

these faculty members leave, and as these students graduate, internationalization, even in

this diluted form, will not persist.

Recommendation 5: Institutions and faculty members should be held accountable for their involvement in internationalization.

Internationalization involves the integration of international, intercultural, and

global perspectives into the ethos of higher education (NAFSA Board of Directors,

2010). The ethos, or character, of a college or university is represented through many

aspects, particularly its curriculum (Lattuca & Stark, 2009). What is important to an

institution is also indicated by its policies. For instance, at undergraduate-focused

institutions such as Prudens and Astutus, in promotion and tenure decisions, more

emphasis is typically placed on teaching performance than on research productivity. It

would stand to reason that if an institution adopted a policy such as internationalization,

faculty participation in the initiative would be integrated into promotion and tenure criteria (perhaps not mandated for all faculty members, but recognized for those who participate). Similarly, released time or remuneration for internationalized course development would suggest that internationalization is indeed a curricular priority for the institution.

Just as institutional policies should be consistent with their professed interest in internationalization, faculty members who engage in and benefit from their institution's internationalization initiative should be held accountable for advancing its cause. For example, recipients of grants to internationalize the curriculum should be able to illustrate how they have integrated their experience into their teaching and other professional activities, or explain why they have not been able to do so. In addition, they should be expected to reach out to colleagues in the hope of further expanding the internationalization effort. Study participants appeared, however, to be inconsistent in their ability to integrate their grant experiences into their everyday work lives, despite having had to describe in their grant applications how they planned and expressing significant motivation to do so. In an era of limited resources, being able to document substantive outcomes of these initiatives would seem particularly crucial.

Conclusion

This dissertation study sought to understand the experiences of faculty members who were participating in their institution's internationalization efforts and the effects that they believed that their engagement had on their academic work and professional lives. In addition, it was designed to examine how individual faculty members' goals and institutional goals may or may not correspond and thus be attained.

Faculty participants at this study's two research sites tended to take their motivation for participating in their institution's internationalization initiative from internal sources, most of which originated from experiences that predated their arrival on their respective campuses. While they expressed a desire for more external recognition of their efforts, they did not require extrinsic motivations for engagement in internationalization. That being said, several participants expressed concern that if external rewards were not forthcoming in the future, they might discontinue their involvement in internationalization. This finding suggested that intrinsic motivations might not be sufficient for long-term participation in an institutional initiative such as internationalization.

In terms of practices, faculty participants identified a variety of ways in which they engaged in internationalization, such as developing new courses, revising existing courses, leading study abroad programs, pursuing internationalized research projects, and participating in internationalized service activities. Participant reports suggested, however, that their efforts were not well integrated into their institution's curricular offerings. Indeed, they indicated that at times they received pushback from administrators and faculty colleagues as they tried to diversify their professional activities in ways that they thought were consistent with and supportive of their institutions' internationalization agendas. These experiences led them to question their institutions' long-term commitment to internationalization and its likelihood of success.

Future research on this topic should continue to explore the faculty experience of internationalization, including their motivations for engagement, practices, and facilitators and impediments for participation. Subsequent studies (both qualitative and

quantitative) could benefit from the involvement of more members of campus communities, including faculty members who have not engaged in internationalization and administrators, who could provide different perspectives on such matters as faculty motivation for engagement and the compatibility of individual and institutional goals. Investigations could also benefit from longitudinal designs that could capture more than a snapshot of internationalization on campuses, as well as from engaging in this research at different types of institutions.

Prudens and Astutus Universities have embarked on ambitious internationalization initiatives to diversify their faculties' teaching, research, and service activities—and, therefore, their students' learning. Both institutions have dedicated significant funds to this enterprise at a time when higher education resources are scarce. Participant reports suggest, however, that academic leaders continue to rely mainly on professors whose motivations to participate in internationalization predated the universities' efforts, and whose interest in and dedication to internationalization is so deep that they are willing to persist despite administrative impediments and mixed messages. Overcoming these challenges will require clear articulation of vision and policies by academic leaders, increased engagement by faculty members, and further involvement by students.

References

About the AAUP. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/about/

Altbach, P. G. (2006). Globalization and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *NEA 2005 Almanac of Higher Education*, 53-74. Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/assets/img/PubAlmanac/ALM_05_06.pdf

Altbach, P. G., & Lewis, L. S. (1998). Internationalism and insularity: American faculty and the world. *Change*, *30*(1), 54-55.

Antonio, A. L., Astin, H. S., & Cress, C. M. (2000). Community service in higher education: A look at the nation's faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, *23*(4), 373-397. doi: 10.1353/rhe.2000.0015

Appiah, K. A. (1996). Cosmopolitan patriots. In M. C. Nussbaum (Ed.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism* (pp. 2-17). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Arum, S., & Van de Water, J. (1992). The need for a definition of international education in U.S. universities. In C. B. Klasek (Ed.), *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education* (pp. 191-203). Washington, DC: Association of International Education Administrators.

Banks, J. A. (1993). The canon debate, knowledge construction, and multicultural education. *Educational Researcher*, *22*(5), 4-14.

Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher*, *37*(3), 129-139. doi: 10.3102/0013189X08317501

Bastedo, M. N. (2005). Curriculum in higher education: The historical roots of contemporary issues. In P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social*, *political*, *and economic challenges* (pp. 462-485). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Berman, J., & Skeff, K. M. (1988). Developing the motivation for improving university teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, *12*(2), 114-125. doi: 10.1007/BF00889607

Biddle, S. (2002). *Internationalization: Rhetoric or reality?* New York, NY: American Council of Learned Societies.

Blackburn, R. T., & Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation*, *expectation*, *satisfaction*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bloom, A. (1987). *The closing of the American mind*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

A brief history of IIE. (n.d.). Retrieved from
http://www.iie.org/Content/NavigationMenu/About_IIE1/Mission_and_Profile/History/History.htm

Boli, J., & Elliott, M. A. (2008). Facade diversity: The individualization of cultural difference. *International Sociology, 23*(4), 540-560. doi: 10.1177/0268580908090727

Brown, S. G. (1948). From provincialism to the great community: The social philosophy of Josiah Royce. *Ethics*, *59*(1), 14-34.

Butts, R. F. (1963). *American education in international development*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

A call to leadership: The presidential role in internationalizing the university. (2004). Retrieved from http://www.aplu.org/NetCommunity/Document.Doc?id=340

Clark, B. R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds*, *different worlds*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Colbeck, C. L. (1998). Merging in a seamless blend: How faculty integrate teaching and research. *Journal of Higher Education*, *69*(6), 647-671.

Colbeck, C. L. (2007). *How does a national research/education funding policy influence academics' professional identities and careers?* Paper presented at the Colloquium on International Policies and Practices for Academic Enquiry, Marwell Conference Centre, Winchester, UK.

Colbeck, C. L., & Wharton-Michael, P. (2006). Individual and organizational influences on faculty members' engagement in public scholarship. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2006*(105), 17-26. doi: 10.1002/tl.220

Committee of the Corporation and the Academical Faculty. (1828). *Reports on the course of instruction in Yale College*. New Haven, CT: Hezekiah Howe.

Cummings, W. K., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2009). Global trends in academic governance. *Academe*, *96*(6). Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2009/ND/Feat/Cumm.htm

D'Souza, D. (1991). *Illiberal education: The politics of race and sex on campus*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Dallmayr, F. (2003). Cosmopolitanism: Moral and political. *Political Theory*, *31*(3), 421-442. doi: 10.1177/0090591703031003004

Dewey, J. (1938/1997). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Diamond, R. M. (1998). Systematic design: Model and benefits. In R. M. Diamond (Ed.), *Designing and assessing courses and curricula: A practical guide* (pp. 13-29). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147-160.

Dodds, A. (2008). How does globalisation interact with higher education? The continuing lack of consensus. *Comparative Education*, *44*(4), 505-517. doi: 10.1080/03050060802481538

Dolby, N., & Rahman, A. (2008). Research in international education. *Review of Educational Research*, *78*(3), 676-726. doi: 10.3102/0034654308320291

Donald, J. (2007). Internationalisation, diversity and the humanities curriculum: Cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism revisited. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *41*(3), 289-308.

Eimers, M. T. (1999). The role of intrinsic enjoyment in motivating faculty. *Thought & Action*, *13*(2), 125-142.

Ellingboe, B. J. (1998). Divisional strategies to internationalize a campus portrait: Results, resistance, and recommendations from a case study at a U.S. university. In J. A. Mestenhauser & B. J. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus* (pp. 198-228). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Fairweather, J. S. (2002). The mythologies of faculty productivity: Implications for institutional policy and decision making. *Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(1), 26-48.

Farmer, D. W. (1990). Strategies for change. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *1990*, 7-18. doi: 10.1002/he.36919907103

Finkelstein, M. J., Walker, E., & Chen, R. (2009). The internationalization of the American faculty: Where are we, what drives or deters us? *The changing academic profession over 1992-2007: International*, *comparative*, *and quantitative perspectives* (Vol. 13, pp. 113-142). Higashi-Hiroshima, Japan: Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University.

Fischer, M. (2007). A pragmatist cosmopolitan moment: Reconfiguring Nussbaum's cosmopolitan concentric circles. *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, *21*(3), 151-165.

Friedman, M. (2000). Educating for world citizenship. *Ethics*, *110*, 586-601.

Geiger, R. L. (2005). The ten generations of American higher education. In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 38-70). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Giorgi, A. (1985a). Introduction. In A. Giorgi (Ed.), *Phenomenology and psychological research* (pp. 1-7). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Giorgi, A. (1985b). *Phenomenology and psychological research.* Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Giorgi, A. (1985c). Sketch of a psychological phenomenological method. In A. Giorgi (Ed.), *Phenomenology and psychological research* (pp. 8-22). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Giorgi, A. (2006). Difficulties encountered in the application of the phenomenological method in the social sciences. *Análise Psicológica, 24*(3), 353-361.

Giorgi, A. (2009). *The descriptive phenomenological method in psychology: A modified Husserlian approach.* Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Green, M. F., Luu, D., & Burris, B. (2008). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: 2008 edition.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Groennings, S. O. (1990). Higher education, international education, and the academic disciplines. In S. Groennings & D. S. Wiley (Eds.), *Group portrait: Internationalizing the disciplines* (pp. 11-31). New York, NY: American Forum.

Guenther, K. M. (2009). The politics of names: Rethinking the methodological and ethical significance of naming people, organizations, and places. *Qualitative Research, 9*(4), 411-421. doi: 10.1177/1468794109337872

Haigh, M. J. (2002). Internationalisation of the curriculum: Designing inclusive education for a small world. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 26*(1), 49-66. doi: 10.1080/03098260120110368

Haigh, M. J. (2003). Internationalising the university curriculum: Response to M. G. Jackson. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 27*(3), 331-340. doi: 10.1080/0309826032000145089

Harari, M. (1989). *Internationalization of higher education: Effecting institutional change in the curriculum and campus ethos.* Long Beach: Center for International Education, California State University, Long Beach.

Harari, M. (1992). The internationalization of the curriculum. In C. B. Klasek (Ed.), *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education* (pp. 52-79). Carbondale, IL: Association of Higher Education Administrators.

Harris, S. (2008). Internationalising the university. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *40*(2), 346-357. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2007.00336.x

Harvard Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society. (1945). *Theory of general education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Harvey, D. (2000). Cosmopolitanism and the banality of geographical evils. *Public Culture*, *12*(2), 529-564.

Haywood, T. (2007). A simple typology of international-mindedness and its implications for education. In M. Hayden, J. Levy, & J. Thompson (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of research in international education* (pp. 79-89). London, UK: SAGE.

Helms, R. M. (2010). *New challenges, new priorities: The experience of Generation X faculty*. Cambridge, MA: Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education, Harvard University Graduate School of Education.

Hendrickson, R. M., Lane, J. E., Harris, J. T., & Dorman, R. H. (2012). *Academic leadership and governance of higher education: A Guide for trustees, leaders, and aspiring leaders of two- and four-year institutions*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Hill, I. (2000). Internationally-minded schools. *International Schools Journal*, *20*(1), 24-37.

Hollinger, D. A. (2001). Not universalists, not pluralists: The new cosmopolitans find their own way. *Constellations*, *8*(2), 236-248.

Honan, J. P., & Teferra, D. (2000). The US academic profession: Key policy challenges. In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *The changing academic workplace: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 234-259). Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College Center for International Higher Education.

Hutchins, R. M. (1936). *The higher learning in America*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Internationalizing the campus 2007: Profiles of success at colleges and universities. (2007). Retrieved from http://www.nafsa.org/_/File/_/itc2007.pdf

Johnson, L. G. (1984). Faculty receptivity to an innovation: A study of attitudes toward external degree programs. *Journal of Higher Education*, *55*(4), 481-499.

Johnsrud, L. K. (2002). Measuring the quality of faculty and administrative worklife: Implications for college and university campuses. *Research in Higher Education*, *43*(3), 379-395. doi: 10.1023/A:1014845218989

Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave. *Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(4), 518-542.

Johnston, J. S., Jr. (1993). Beyond borders. In J. S. Johnston, Jr., & R. J. Edelstein (Eds.), *Beyond borders: Profiles in international education* (pp. 1-23). Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business.

Kandel, I. L., & Whipple, G. M. (Eds.). (1937). *The thirty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: International understanding through the public-school curriculum.* Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.

Klitgaard, R. E. (1981). On reviewing international studies. *Journal of Higher Education*, *52*(2), 124-142.

Knight, J. (2003). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, *33*, 2-3. Retrieved from http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News33/text001.htm

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *8*(1), 5-31. doi: 10.1177/1028315303260832

Lambert, R. D. (1973). Language and area studies review. Philadelphia, PA: American Academy of Political and Social Science.

Lattuca, L. R., & Stark, J. S. (2009). *Shaping the college curriculum: Academic plans in context* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lawrence, J. H. (2010). *At odds or in concert: Faculty-administrators relations and decision making.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers, Oslo, Norway.

Marginson, S., & Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education*, *43*, 281–309.

Maringe, F. (2009). Strategies and challenges of internationalisation in HE: An exploratory study of UK universities. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *23*(7), 553-563. doi: 10.1108/09513540910990799

Mayhew, L. B. (1977). *Legacy of the Seventies: Experiment, economy, equality, and expediency in American higher education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

McCaughey, R. A. (1984). *International studies and academic enterprise: A chapter in the enclosure of American learning*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Mestenhauser, J. A. (1998). Portraits of an international curriculum: An uncommon multidimensional perspective. In J. A. Mestenhauser & B. J. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus* (pp. 3-39). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Michie, A. A. (1968). *Higher education and world affairs*. New York, NY: Education and World Affairs.

Mohrman, K., Ma, W., & Baker, D. (2008). The research university in transition: The emerging global model. *Higher Education Policy, 21*, 5-27. doi: 10.1057/palgrave.hep.8300175

Monroe, P. (1937). Nationalism, patriotism, informed citizenship, and international understanding. In I. L. Kandel & G. M. Whipple (Eds.), *The thirty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: International understanding through the public-school curriculum* (pp. 13-24). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.

Morey, A. I. (2000). Changing higher education curricula for a global and multicultural world. *Higher Education in Europe*, *25*(1), 25-39.

NAFSA Board of Directors. (2010). NAFSA & campus internationalization. Retrieved from http://www.nafsa.org/about/default.aspx?id=8579

Neumann, A. (2009). *Professing to learn: Creating tenured lives and careers in the American research university*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1994/1996). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In M. C. Nussbaum (Ed.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism* (pp. 2-17). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2008, April). *Education for profit, education for freedom.* Paper presented at the College of Wooster, Wooster, OH.

Ogden, A. (2010). *Education abroad and the making of global citizens: assessing learning outcomes of course-embedded, faculty-led international programming.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA.

O'Hara, S. (2009). Vital and overlooked: The role of faculty in internationalizing U.S. campuses. In P. Blumenthal & R. Gutierrez (Eds.), *Meeting America's global education challenge: Expanding study abroad capacity at U.S. colleges and universities* (pp. 38-45). New York, NY: Institute of International Education.

O'Meara, K. A. (2005). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Does it make a difference? *Research in Higher Education*, *46*(5), 479-510. doi: 10.1007/s11162-005-3362-6

O'Meara, K. A., Terosky, A. L., & Neumann, A. (2008). *Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Palat, R. A. (2000). Fragmented visions: Excavating the future of area studies in a post-American world. In N. L. Waters (Ed.), *Beyond the area studies wars: Toward a new international studies* (pp. 64-106). Hanover, NH: Middlebury College Press.

Papastephanou, M. (2002). Arrows not yet fired: Cultivating cosmopolitanism through education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *36*(1), 69-86.

Rhoades, G. (2000). Who's doing it right? Strategic activity in public research universities. *Review of Higher Education*, *24*(1), 41-66.

Richardson, F. C. (1994). The president's role in shaping the culture of academic institutions. In J. D. Davis (Ed.), *Coloring the halls of ivy: Leadership and diversity in the academy* (pp. 13-24). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Rosser, V. J. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, *45*(3), 285-309. doi: 10.1023/B:RIHE.0000019591.74425.f1

Royce, J. (1908/1988). Provincialism. In R. H. Fossum & J. K. Roth (Eds.), *American ground: Vistas*, *visions and revisions* (pp. 190-201). St. Paul, MN: Paragon House.

Rudzki, R. E. J. (1995). The application of a strategic management model to the internationalization of higher education institutions. *Higher Education*, *29*(4), 421-441.

Sanderson, G. (2008). A foundation for the internationalization of the academic self. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *12*(3), 276-307. doi: 10.1177/1028315307299420

Schofer, E., & Meyer, J. W. (2005). The worldwide expansion of higher education in the twentieth century. *American Sociological Review, 70*(6), 898-920.

Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Serow, R. C., Brawner, C. E., & Demery, J. (1999). Instructional reform at research universities: Studying faculty motivation. *Review of Higher Education*, *22*(4), 411-423.

Shotwell, J. T. (1937). International understanding and international interdependence. In I. L. Kandel & G. M. Whipple (Eds.), *The thirty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: International understanding through the public-school curriculum* (pp. 3-12). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.

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

Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L., & Beach, A. L. (2006). *Creating the future of faculty development: Learning from the past*, *understanding the present*. Boston, MA: Anker.

Stark, J. S., Lowther, M. A., Bentley, R. J., Ryan, M. P., Martens, G. G., Genthon, M. L., et al. (1990). *Planning introductory college courses: Influences on faculty*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning.

Stohl, M. (2007). We have met the enemy and he is us: The role of the faculty in the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *11*(3/4), 359-372. doi: 10.1177/1028315307303923

Stone, N. (2006). Conceptualising intercultural effectiveness for university teaching. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *10*(4), 334-356. doi: 10.1177/1028315306287634

Stromquist, N. P. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education*, *53*(1), 81-105. doi: 10.1007/s10734-005-1975-5

Svensson, L., & Wihlborg, M. (2010). Internationalising the content of higher education: The need for a curriculum perspective. *Higher Education*, *60*(6), 595-613. doi: 10.1007/s10734-010-9318-6

Sylvester, R. (2007). Historical resources for research in international education (1851-1950). In M. Hayden, J. Levy & J. Thompson (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of research in international education* (pp. 11-24). London, UK: SAGE.

Tewksbury, D. G. (1945). New directions in international education. *Teachers College Record*, *46*(5), 293-301.

Todd, S. (2007). Teachers judging without scripts, or thinking cosmopolitan. *Ethics and Education*, *2*(1), 25-38.

Tolich, M. (2004). Internal confidentiality: When confidentiality assurances fail relational informants. *Qualitative Sociology*, *27*(1), 101-106. doi: 10.1023/B:QUAS.0000015546.20441.4a

Umbach, P. D., & Wawrzynski, M. R. (2005). Faculty do matter: The role of college faculty in student learning and engagement. *Research in Higher Education*, *46*(2), 153-184. doi: 10.1007/s11162-004-1598-1

Van der Wende, M. (1997). Missing links: The relationship between national policies for internationalisation and those for higher education in general. In T. Kalvermark & M. Van der Wende (Eds.), *National policies for the internationalisation of higher education in Europe* (pp. 10-31). Stockholm, Sweden: Hogskoleverket Studies, National Agency for Higher Education.

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Veblen, T. (1918/1957). *The higher learning in America: A memorandum on the conduct of universities by business men*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Whipple, G. M. (1937). Editor's Preface. In I. L. Kandel & G. M. Whipple (Eds.), *The thirty-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: International understanding through the public-school curriculum* (pp. ix-xii). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.

Appendix A

Letter of Introduction to Provosts

Title of Study: Internationalization of Undergraduate Curricula: Faculty
                              Motivations for, Practices of, and Means for Engagement

Principal Investigator: Sarah G. F. Klyberg
                              Higher Education Program
                              400 Rackley Building
                              University Park, PA 16802
                              [Phone #] | sgf119@psu.edu

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Lisa R. Lattuca, Associate Professor & Senior Research
                              Associate
                              Center for the Study of Higher Education
                              400 Rackley Building
                              University Park, PA 16802
                              814.865.9754 | lattuca@psu.edu

Dear Dr. [Provost's Name],

I am writing to ask your assistance with a study of internationalization efforts in higher
education entitled "Internationalization of Undergraduate Curricula: Faculty Motivations
for, Practices of, and Means for Engagement." My name is Sarah Klyberg, and I am a
doctoral candidate in the Higher Education Program at The Pennsylvania State
University. For my dissertation research, I hope to recruit tenure-line faculty participants
who are active in [University's] efforts to internationalize the curriculum, including (but
not limited to) recipients of [University's internationalization of the curriculum grant
program name]. The purpose of this study is to gain a fuller understanding of why
faculty members engage in internationalization; how they put it into practice; and the
effects, if any, that engagement has on their professional lives. In addition, I hope to
learn about how individuals' goals and institutional goals merge and diverge within the
context of an internationalization initiative, and how that affects achievement of those
goals.

I am requesting from you permission to use [University] as a site for this research.
Participation in the study would entail providing me with names and contact information
of faculty members who are known to be involved in internationalization of the
curriculum at [University]. For those who have received funding to internationalize the
curriculum, I would also ask you to provide the titles, dates, and destinations of their
awards. From this pool of potential participants I would select and recruit a sample of
faculty members to participate in my study, with the goal of ensuring disciplinary,
gender, and other forms of diversity among participants. I plan to contact potential
faculty participants via e-mail and telephone.

Invited faculty participants would be asked to participate in two 60-minute interviews and one 60-minute focus group with me during the 2010-2011 academic year. All information gathered from faculty during the study will be confidential, and I will protect the identity of all study participants and [University] in all written and oral reports on the research.

My application for research exemption determination from the Institutional Review Board of The Pennsylvania State University is now pending (institutional recruitment is permitted before exemption determination). Once I have obtained this research permission, I will provide to you a copy of the approved application for your information or records, and I will request from you recommendations of faculty members whom I described above.

I will call your office in the next few days to arrange a time to discuss the study and answer any questions you may have.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact me by phone (###-###-####) or e-mail (sgf119@psu.edu) for additional information before that time.

Sincerely,
Sarah G. F. Klyberg
Ph.D. Candidate, Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

Appendix B

Participant Recommendation E-Mail to Provosts

Title of Study: Internationalization of Undergraduate Curricula: Faculty Motivations for, Practices of, and Means for Engagement

Principal Investigator: Sarah G. F. Klyberg
Higher Education Program
400 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802
[Phone #] | sgf119@psu.edu

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Lisa R. Lattuca, Associate Professor & Senior Research Associate
Center for the Study of Higher Education
400 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802
814.865.9754 | lattuca@psu.edu

Dear Dr. [Provost's Name],

I am writing to let you know that I have received research exemption determination from Penn State's Institutional Review Board for my dissertation study, "Internationalization of Undergraduate Curricula: Faculty Motivations for, Practices of, and Means for Engagement." Attached to this message is a copy of the approved application.

As we discussed earlier, the next step is to recruit tenure-line faculty participants who are active in [University's] efforts to internationalize the curriculum, including (but not limited to) recipients of [University's internationalization of the curriculum grant program name]. To do so, I am asking for a list of names and contact information of faculty members who are known to be involved in curricular internationalization efforts. The following information will be very helpful to me as I select potential participants from this list.

- Full name
- Rank
- Departmental affiliation
- Office address
- Office phone
- E-mail address

For those faculty members who have received funding from [University's internationalization of the curriculum grant program name], I would also ask you to provide the titles, dates, and destinations of their awards.

From this pool of potential participants I will select and recruit a sample of faculty members, with the goal of ensuring disciplinary, gender, and other forms of diversity among participants, to participate in interviews and a focus group on campus.

I will call your office by [date--about 10 days after sending this message]. If there is an individual with whom you would like me to work from here on, please let me know. I realize you have enough on you plate!

Sincerely,
Sarah G. F. Klyberg
Ph.D. Candidate, Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

Appendix C

Faculty Recruitment Letter (Internationalization Grant Recipients)

Dear Dr. [Faculty Member's Name],

My name is Sarah Klyberg, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Higher Education Program at The Pennsylvania State University. I am recruiting faculty participants for my dissertation study, "Internationalization of Undergraduate Curricula: Faculty Motivations for, Practices of, and Means for Engagement," and [University] has agreed to serve as a site for this research effort. I am writing to you to invite you to participate in my study.

The goal of my study is to gain a fuller understanding of why and how tenure-line faculty members choose to be involved in internationalization and the effects, if any, that engagement has on their professional lives. In addition, I hope to learn about how individuals' goals and institutional goals merge and diverge within the context of an internationalization initiative, and how that affects achievement of those goals.

You have been identified as a potential participant because you were a recipient of a grant to internationalize the curriculum in [insert year]. Participation in my study involves two 60-minute interviews and one 60-minute focus group with a small group of your colleagues during the 2010-2011 academic year. All information gathered from faculty participants during the study will be confidential and I will protect the identity of all study participants and [University] in all written and oral reports on the research. Please note that I am asking for information independently of the [international office], and participation is voluntary.

I hope you will agree to participate in this study as I believe I can learn much from you about this topic. I will follow up my invitation with a phone call in the next few days, but please do not hesitate to contact me by phone (###-###-####) or e-mail (sgf119@psu.edu) in the meantime should you have questions or want to discuss further your interest in participating in my research.

All the best,
Sarah

Title of Study: Internationalization of Undergraduate Curricula: Faculty Motivations for, Practices of, and Means for Engagement

Principal Investigator: Sarah G. F. Klyberg
Higher Education Program
400 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802
[Phone #] | sgf119@psu.edu

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Lisa R. Lattuca, Associate Professor & Senior Research
       Associate
       Center for the Study of Higher Education
       400 Rackley Building
       University Park, PA 16802
       814.865.9754 | lattuca@psu.edu

Appendix D

Faculty Recruitment Letter (Internationalization Grant Non-Recipients)

Dear Dr. [Faculty Member's Name],

My name is Sarah Klyberg, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Higher Education Program at The Pennsylvania State University. I am recruiting faculty participants for my dissertation study, "Internationalization of Undergraduate Curricula: Faculty Motivations for, Practices of, and Means for Engagement," and [University] has agreed to serve as a site for this research effort. I am writing to you to invite you to participate in my study.

The goal of my study is to gain a fuller understanding of why and how tenure-line faculty members choose to be involved in internationalization of the undergraduate curriculum and the effects, if any, that engagement has on their professional lives. In addition, I hope to learn about how individuals' goals and institutional goals merge and diverge within the context of an internationalization initiative, and how that affects achievement of those goals.

Participation in my study involves two 60-minute interviews and one 60-minute focus group with a small group of your colleagues during the 2010-2011 academic year. All information gathered from faculty participants during the study will be confidential and I will protect the identity of all study participants and [University] in all written and oral reports on the research. Please note that I am asking for information independently of the [international office], and participation is voluntary.

I hope you will agree to participate in this study as I believe I can learn much from you about this topic. I will follow up my invitation with a phone call in the next few days, but please do not hesitate to contact me by phone (###-###-####) or e-mail (sgf119@psu.edu) in the meantime should you have questions or want to discuss further your interest in participating in my research.

All the best,
Sarah

Title of Study: Internationalization of Undergraduate Curricula: Faculty
                        Motivations for, Practices of, and Means for Engagement

Principal Investigator: Sarah G. F. Klyberg
                        Higher Education Program
                        400 Rackley Building
                        University Park, PA 16802
                        [Phone #] | sgf119@psu.edu

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Lisa R. Lattuca, Associate Professor & Senior Research
Associate
Center for the Study of Higher Education
400 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802
814.865.9754 | lattuca@psu.edu

Appendix E

Faculty Follow-up Recruitment Phone Script (Internationalization Grant Recipients)

Title of Study: Internationalization of Undergraduate Curricula: Faculty Motivations for, Practices of, and Means for Engagement

Hello, Dr. [Faculty Member's Name].

I am following up an e-mail that I hope you received last week. I wrote to request your participation in my research study on faculty involvement in internationalization, which I am doing to complete my doctoral studies at Penn State University. I identified you as a potential participant because you received a grant in support of internationalization of the curriculum in [year].

Would it be helpful if I briefly described the goals of my study again?

IF YES [then continue with the next two paragraphs]: My goal is to interview faculty members who are involved in [University's] curriculum internationalization initiative to gain a fuller understanding of why and how faculty members get involved in internationalization and the effects that engagement may have on their professional lives. I also hope to learn about how individuals' goals and institutional goals merge and diverge within the context of an internationalization initiative, and how that affects achievement of those goals.

If you agree to participate, I'll ask you to participate in two 60-minute individual interviews and one hour-long focus group with some of your colleagues during the 2010-2011 academic year. I would of course arrange these interviews at your convenience and all the information you provided would be confidential. Your and [University's] identity would be disguised in any oral or written reports on the project.

If NO: Do you have any questions about my study? [If "yes," answer questions; if "no," move on.] Then may I count on you as a participant?

IF NO: Thank you very much for considering my request. If you change your mind, please feel free to contact me by phone ###-###-#### or e-mail (sgf119@psu.edu). I wonder if there is anyone else who is doing this work at [University] that might be willing to participate.

IF YES: Great! Thank you. I plan to be at [University] on [range of dates] and will e-mail you to arrange a time for our first interview. I have a copy of your CV from the [University] Web site. Is it current? (If not, "Would you please e-mail it to me at sgf119@psu.edu?")

Thank you so much for agreeing to participate. I'll be in touch shortly.

Appendix F

Faculty Follow-up Recruitment Phone Script (Internationalization Grant Non-Recipients)

Title of Study:	Internationalization of Undergraduate Curricula: Faculty Motivations for, Practices of, and Means for Engagement

Hello, Dr. [Faculty Member's Name].

I am following up an e-mail that I hope you received last week. I wrote to request your participation in my research study on faculty involvement in internationalization, which I am doing to complete my doctoral studies at Penn State University. I identified you as a potential participant because of your involvement with internationalization of the undergraduate curriculum at [University].

Would it be helpful if I briefly described the goals of my study again?

IF YES [then continue to next paragraph]: My goal is to interview faculty members who are involved in internationalization of the curriculum to gain a fuller understanding of why and how faculty members get involved in internationalization and the effects that engagement may have on their professional lives. I also hope to learn about how individuals' goals and institutional goals merge and diverge within the context of an internationalization initiative, and how that affects achievement of those goals.

If you agree to participate, I'll ask you to participate in two 60-minute individual interviews and one hour-long focus group with some of your colleagues during the 2010-2011 academic year. I would of course arrange these interviews at your convenience and all the information you provided would be confidential. Your and [University's] identity would be disguised in any oral or written reports on the project.

If NO: Do you have any questions about my study? [If "yes," answer questions; if "no" move on.] May I count on you as a participant?

IF NO: Thank you very much for considering my request. If you change your mind, please feel free to contact me by phone ###-###-#### or e-mail (sgf119@psu.edu). I wonder if there is anyone else you think would be willing to participate.

IF YES: Great! Thank you. I plan to be at [University] on [range of dates] and will e-mail you to arrange a time for our first interview. I have a copy of your CV from the [University] Web site. Is it current? (If not, "Would you please e-mail it to me at sgf119@psu.edu?")

Thank you so much for agreeing to participate. I'll be in touch shortly.

Appendix G

Faculty Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research

Title of Study: Internationalization of Undergraduate Curricula: Faculty Motivations for, Practices of, and Means for Engagement

Principal Investigator: Sarah G. F. Klyberg
Higher Education Program
400 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802
[Phone #] | sgf119@psu.edu

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Lisa R. Lattuca, Associate Professor & Senior Research Associate
Center for the Study of Higher Education
400 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802
814.865.9754 | lattuca@psu.edu

1. **Purposes of the Study:** The purposes of this research study are (a) to explore why and how faculty members engage in internationalization of undergraduate courses and programs at their institution, (b) to identify the effects that faculty members believe that their engagement has on their academic work and professional lives, and (c) to examine how individuals' goals and institutional goals may or may not align and thus be realized.

2. **Procedures to be followed:** Participation in this study involves two one-hour personal interviews and one one-hour focus group with other faculty who are internationalizing courses and programs. Interviews and focus groups will be digitally recorded for the purposes of data analysis. You will be asked interview questions about your academic and professional background and responsibilities, your interest in internationalization, how you are internationalizing your courses or program, and your plans for future involvement with internationalization. You will also be asked to provide the researcher with a current copy of your CV.

3. **Benefits:** This research may enhance our understanding of what motivates faculty members to engage in internationalization of undergraduate curricula as individuals and as part of broader institutional initiatives, as well as what facilitates and hinders their participation in personal and institutional efforts. These findings will inform the development of specific measures to enhance faculty engagement in institutional internationalization efforts. On an individual level, participation in this study may result in increased reflection on your engagement in internationalization on personal and institutional levels.

4. **Duration/Time:** Each of the two individual interviews and the focus group will last approximately 60 minutes and will be digitally audio-recorded. The total amount of time that the study will take to participate is approximately three (3) hours.

5. **Statement of Confidentiality:** Your participation in this research is confidential, as is the participation of your university. A pseudonym will be used to protect your real identity. All transcripts and subsequent coding, written description, analysis, and publications will use this assigned pseudonym.

   All recordings will be stored in the principal investigator's password-protected computer in password-protected files.   Only the principal investigator, Sarah G. F. Klyberg, and her Dissertation Chair, Dr. Lisa R. Lattuca, will have access to the recordings. Recordings will be transcribed by the principal investigator or a professional transcriptionist. Recordings will be destroyed by 2016.

   In all publications and presentations resulting from the research, personally identifiable information will not be shared unless you provide specific permission below. You will be invited to review the principal investigator's summaries of your interviews as well as excerpts of her dissertation in which you are personally depicted; you may make changes to the authorizations below after reviewing these materials, as well as at any other time during your participation in this study.

   Please choose among the following sets of options.

   ___ I authorize the researcher to quote verbatim (but without using my name) portions of my interviews in publications/ presentations.
   ___ I do not authorize the researcher to quote verbatim portions of my interviews in publications/presentations.

   ___ I authorize the researcher to identify my academic discipline or field in her writing.
   ___ I do not authorize the researcher to identify my academic discipline or field in her writing.

   If you speak about the contents of the focus group outside the group, it is expected that you will not tell others what individual participants said.

6. **Right to Ask Questions:** Please contact Sarah G. F. Klyberg at (###-###-####) with questions, complaints, or concerns about this research.

7. **Voluntary Participation:** Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. You may stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. Refusal to take part in or withdrawing from this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits you would receive otherwise.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to take part in this research study. If you agree to take part in this research study and the information outlined above, please sign your name and indicate the date below. Signing this form below acknowledges that you read and understand the information in this form and consent to take part in this research project. You will receive a copy of this form for your records and future reference.

Many thanks for your time and participation!

Participant Signature: _____ Date: _____

Researcher Signature: _____ Date: _____

Appendix H

Faculty Interview Guide (Internationalization Grant Recipients)

[Interview 1: Life History, Motivations to Engage in Internationalization, and Practices of Internationalization]

Content: Influential experiences that led to engagement in internationalization; concrete details of work with internationalization

Preliminary Interview Questions

As you know, I am interested in exploring what motivates faculty members to get involved with internationalization of the curriculum, as well as in how faculty members put that interest into practice.

Before we talk about the "why" and "how" of your involvement with internationalization, though, let me get a full picture of your work at [University]. How many classes do you teach each term? Are they all undergraduate courses? Do you have any administrative responsibilities? Can you describe those to me?

Influential Experiences that Led to Engagement in Internationalization

How and why did you become interested in internationalization?

Probes:
- Did you have any childhood/young adult/adult experiences that inspired an interest in people from other parts of the world, other cultures, other geographic regions? What were they? How did they affect you?
- Were there individuals in your life (teachers, friends, relatives) who sparked this interest in you? Who were they? What did they do?
- Why have you acted on these experiences in your professional life? Why do you think they had such an impact on you?

Why did you decide to participate in [University's] curriculum internationalization initiative?

Probes:
- How did you find out about [University's] opportunities for faculty involvement in internationalization?
- What aspects of these opportunities were attractive to you?
- Did anything discourage you from getting involved? Why did you persist despite that/these impediments?

I understand that you visited [country] with your funding. Could you briefly describe what you did while you were there? How important was this opportunity to your curriculum development efforts?

Are you seeking to internationalize all the courses that you teach or a selection of them? If a selection, what motivated you to focus on internationalizing these specific courses?

    Probes:
- Why do students enroll in these courses? Are they required? Electives?

Could you give me a one or two examples of what you have done to internationalize undergraduate courses or programs?

    Probes:
- What instructional techniques do you find most effective for teaching internationalized courses?
- What are your goals and objectives for this course? What do you expect students will learn in the courses?
- How do you assess student learning in this course?
- Do you collaborate with any of your colleagues in these efforts? If YES, how? If NO, why not?

How do these activities fit in with your work life more broadly? Can you talk about how these efforts fit in with your other responsibilities at [University]? Are there synergies or complementarities?

Finally, I like to give participants the option of choosing the pseudonym that I will use in reports on this study. Could you suggest a pseudonym that you think would be appropriate for me to use when referring to you—that would reflect who you are without revealing your identity?

Appendix I

Faculty Interview Guide (Internationalization Grant Non-Recipients)

[Interview 1: Life History, Motivations to Engage in Internationalization, and Practices of Internationalization]

Content: Influential experiences that led to engagement in internationalization; concrete details of work with internationalization

Preliminary Interview Questions

As you know, I am interested in exploring what motivates faculty members to get involved with internationalization of the curriculum, as well as in how faculty members put that interest into practice.

Before we talk about the "why" and "how" of your involvement with internationalization, though, let me get a full picture of your work at [University]. How many classes do you teach each term? Are they all undergraduate courses? Do you have any administrative responsibilities? Can you describe those to me?

Influential Experiences that Led to Engagement in Internationalization

How and why did you become interested in internationalization?

    Probes:
    • Did you have any childhood/young adult/adult experiences that inspired an interest in people from other parts of the world, other cultures, other geographic regions? What were they? How did they affect you?
    • Were there individuals in your life (teachers, friends, relatives) who sparked this interest in you? Who were they? What did they do?
    • Why have you acted on these experiences in your professional life? Why do you think they had such an impact on you?

It is my understanding that [University] has programs in place to support faculty work on internationalization of the curriculum such as [University's internationalization of the curriculum grant program name]. Have you thought about participating in these opportunities? If YES, why haven't you? If NO, why not?

Are you seeking to internationalize all the courses that you teach or a selection of them? If a selection, what motivated you to focus on internationalizing these specific courses?

    Probes:
    • Why do students enroll in these courses? Are they required? Electives?

Could you give me a one or two examples of what you have done to internationalize undergraduate courses or programs?

Probes:
- What instructional techniques do you find most effective for teaching internationalized courses?
- What are your goals and objectives for this course? What do you expect students will learn in the courses?
- How do you assess student learning in this course?
- Do you collaborate with any of your colleagues in these efforts? If YES, how? If NO, why not?

How do these activities fit in with your work life more broadly? Can you talk about how these efforts fit in with your other responsibilities at [University]? Are there synergies or complementarities?

Finally, I like to give participants the option of choosing the pseudonym that I will use in reports on this study. Could you suggest a pseudonym that you think would be appropriate for me to use when referring to you—that would reflect who you are without revealing your identity?

Appendix J

Faculty Interview Guide

[Interview 2: Reflection]

Content: Reflection on relationship of internationalization to other academic work;
meaning of work in internationalization; plans for the future

Preliminary Interview Questions

During our last conversation we talked about what influenced you to get involved in
internationalization of the curriculum and how you practice internationalization in your
work.

Are there any other influential experiences or internationalization activities about which
you would like to talk today? If YES, what are they? If NO, let's move on.

Today I'd like you to reflect on what you said in our prior meeting and look to the future.

What challenges have you encountered in doing this work as a member of this
institution? As a member of your academic discipline?

How do your internationalization efforts fit into [University] more generally?

   Probes:
   - Is [University's] support of faculty work in internationalization sufficient? If
     so, what do you most value about it? If not, what is missing from current
     efforts?
   - How has your involvement with internationalization affected your overall
     experience at [University]?

How has your involvement with internationalization affected your professional life? Your
personal life?

How will your experience with internationalization to date affect your future teaching,
research, and service activities at [University] or elsewhere?

Do you envision continuing to participate in internationalization of the curriculum? If so,
how? If not, why not?

How do you see internationalization progressing at [University] in the future?

Are there other aspects of your work in internationalization that you we haven't discussed
but that you think are important to talk about?

I would like to ask the final set of questions for this study in the focus group to learn from you and your colleagues how colleges and universities might engage the overall faculty more effectively in internationalization efforts. My assumption is that having you all think together might produce some very fruitful directions and ideas.

Do you have any questions about how this focus group will work? If YES, provide clarification. If NO, may I count you in?

Great. I will be in touch with you shortly about scheduling the focus group.

Appendix K

Focus Group Discussion Guide

[Broader Engagement of the Faculty in Internationalization]

Content: How colleges and universities might engage the overall faculty more effectively in efforts to internationalize the curriculum

Preliminary Discussion Questions

Thanks to all of you for joining me for today's focus group. I have already learned a great deal from each of you regarding your individual involvement in internationalization, and I hope that today's conversation will provide the opportunity for you to discuss how [University] might engage the overall faculty more effectively in internationalization of the undergraduate curriculum.

First, to ensure that we all know each other, would you please introduce yourself and your departmental affiliation? [Go around the group.]

Thank you. Did any of you know each other previously? How? Through your internationalization work or otherwise?

Each of you is engaged in or has participated in internationalization of the undergraduate curriculum at [University], either through [University's] formal internationalization program or on your own initiative (or both). And I've talked with each of you about how and why you got involved. Are you aware of colleagues who are interested in internationalization but are not involved? What is your impression of why these colleagues are not active in internationalization?

      Probes/examples:
- Promotion
- Tenure
- Merit salary
- Disciplinary norms
- Departmental relationships
- Inadequate resources
- Inadequate time
- Lack of knowledge on how to do it
- Others?

Do the rest of you agree or disagree with what he or she said?
Are you aware of colleagues who do not support or see the value of internationalization? What is your impression of why these colleagues have this view?

      Probes/examples:

- Promotion
- Tenure
- Merit salary
- Disciplinary norms
- Departmental relationships
- Inadequate resources
- Inadequate time
- Lack of knowledge on how to do it
- Others?

Do the rest of you agree or disagree with what he or she said?

How do you think that [University] could encourage more members of the tenure-line faculty to participate in internationalization of the curriculum?

Probes:
- What about at the institutional level?
- College level?
- Departmental level?
- Within specific majors?

Is there anything else you would like to add to this conversation that we haven't yet discussed?

Appendix L

Faculty Summary Check E-Mail

[Following Interviews 1 and 2]

Dear Dr. [Participant's Name],

Thank you for meeting with me on [date] to discuss your experience with internationalization. As promised, I am sharing with you a summary of our conversation (attached to this e-mail in Microsoft Word). I invite you to review the text and to modify and correct the content that you feel needs to be amended or clarified.

I look forward to speaking with you further about your experience with internationalization. I hope that we can arrange our [second meeting or focus group] on [range of date and time options]. Please respond to this Doodle scheduling request by [date] with several blocks of time during which you can be available: [URL for Doodle event]. If we need to make different arrangements, please let me know as soon as possible.

If I do not hear from you by **[date]** I will assume you have approved the summary, and I will call you to confirm our next meeting time.

Best,
Sarah

Title of Study:	Internationalization of Undergraduate Curricula: Faculty Motivations for, Practices of, and Means for Engagement
Principal Investigator:	Sarah G. F. Klyberg Higher Education Program 400 Rackley Building University Park, PA 16802 [Phone #] | sgf119@psu.edu
Dissertation Chair:	Dr. Lisa R. Lattuca, Associate Professor & Senior Research Associate Center for the Study of Higher Education 400 Rackley Building University Park, PA 16802 814.865.9754 | lattuca@psu.edu

Appendix M

Faculty Follow-up E-Mail

[Following Focus Group]

Dear Dr. [Participant's Name],

Thank you for participating in the faculty focus group on [date] to discuss your experience with internationalization.

I will be in touch with you again in a few weeks/months to provide you with a review copy of the sections of my dissertation in which you are in which you are quoted, paraphrased, or otherwise depicted. At that time, I will ask you to confirm that I have accurately represented you and your experiences, as well as whether you are comfortable with the degree to which I have masked your identity.

It has been a pleasure getting to know you over the past several months. I sincerely appreciate the time that you have taken to meet with me, as well as your willingness to share your experiences with me. My study will certainly benefit from your participation.

Best,
Sarah

Title of Study:	Internationalization of Undergraduate Curricula: Faculty Motivations for, Practices of, and Means for Engagement
Principal Investigator:	Sarah G. F. Klyberg Higher Education Program 400 Rackley Building University Park, PA 16802 [Phone #] | sgf119@psu.edu
Dissertation Chair:	Dr. Lisa R. Lattuca, Associate Professor & Senior Research Associate Center for the Study of Higher Education 400 Rackley Building University Park, PA 16802 814.865.9754 | lattuca@psu.edu

Appendix N

Faculty Member Check E-Mail

Dear Dr. [Participant's Name],

I hope that you will recall that I interviewed you for a study on the faculty experience of internationalization during the 2010-2011 academic year. As promised, I have attached a draft of [chapter] for you to review the sections in which you are quoted, paraphrased, or otherwise depicted.

To facilitate your review, I have assigned you the number [INSERT #] and marked those sections of the chapter in which you are quoted or depicted by highlighting this number in parentheses (this number will not be included in the final draft of the dissertation). You are not identified by your given name in the text; I have used your pseudonym or a salient characteristic when writing about you in this chapter.

Please let me know if I have accurately represented you and your experiences, as well as whether you are comfortable with the degree to which I have masked your identity.

You may provide any comments in a reply e-mail or as comments (e.g., via Microsoft Word's "Track Changes" feature) in the document itself. I can also be reached on my cell phone at [###-###-####] if you would like to discuss the text.

If I do not hear from you by **[date]** I will assume you have approved the draft.

Thank you again for your participation and assistance. I am very excited to have reached this point in the research and I am very grateful to individuals like you who made this work possible.

Best,
Sarah

Title of Study: Internationalization of Undergraduate Curricula: Faculty
                            Motivations for, Practices of, and Means for Engagement

Principal Investigator: Sarah G. F. Klyberg
                            Higher Education Program
                            400 Rackley Building
                            University Park, PA 16802
                            [Phone #] | sgf119@psu.edu

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Lisa R. Lattuca, Associate Professor & Senior Research
                            Associate
                            Center for the Study of Higher Education

400 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802
814.865.9754 | lattuca@psu.edu

Vita

Sarah G. F. Klyberg

Education

Doctor of Philosophy, Higher Education	August 2012
The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA	

Master of Arts, Middle Eastern Studies	August 1997
The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX	

Bachelor of Arts, Political Science, with honors	May 1995
The College of Wooster, Wooster, OH	

Professional Experience

Managing Editor, *Comparative Education Review (CER)*	2008 –2011
Department of Education Policy Studies	
The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA	

Graduate Assistant	2007 –2008
Center for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE)	
The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA	

Country Director	2005 –2007
AMIDEAST	
Muscat, Sultanate of Oman	

Assistant Country Director	2004 –2005
AMIDEAST	
Cairo, Egypt	

Program Officer, Fulbright Senior Specialists Program	2003-2004
Institute of International Education	
Washington, DC	

Coordinator, Fulbright Foreign Students Program	2001-2003
AMIDEAST	
Washington, DC	

Honors

Louise M. Berman Curriculum Award	2010
The University of Maryland	

President's Superior Performance Award	2006
AMIDEAST	

Professional Service

Comparative and International Education Society (CIES)	2010 – 2011
Member, New Scholars Review Committee (NSRC)	

Higher Education in Review (*HER*), University Park, PA

Associate Editor for Production	2009 – 2010
Technical Editor	2008 – 2009
Technical Co-Editor	2007 – 2008