EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL

CULTURE/CHANGE AND INTERNATIONALIZATION

EFFORTS

by

CYNTHIA GREEN

CLAIRE MAJOR, COMMITTEE CHAIR

NATHANIEL BRAY
KARRI HOLLEY
AARON KUNTZ
WAYNE URBAN

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education in the
Department of Educational Leadership,
Policy and Technology Studies
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2012

ABSTRACT

The rapid growth of globalization and the interconnectedness among nations challenges universities to transform their educational practices and integrate an international perspective through internationalization of their campuses. How an institution advances internationalization efforts to provide all students with the intercultural skills, increased cultural awareness and expanded worldviews necessary to help them succeed in today's global society depends on the support of the organizational culture and its commitment to implement needed change. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between organizational culture/change and internationalization efforts at one research institution through a qualitative, descriptive case study. Tierney's (1988) framework on the *Six Concepts of Culture* and Kezar and Eckel's (2002) framework on *Five Change Strategies* were used to analyze data from senior leadership, administrators, faculty and students to explore how organizational culture and change supported or deterred internationalization efforts at one institution.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I appreciate the valuable input provided to me by the participants in this qualitative research study carried out at Florida State University. I would also like to thank my dissertation chair; Dr. Claire Major, for her guidance and support throughout this process. This dissertation would not have been possible without the ongoing support from my supervisor, colleagues, fellow cohort members, and friends.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I:

INTRODUCTION

The rapid growth of globalization and the interconnectedness among nations challenges

universities to transform their educational practices and integrate an international perspective

through internationalization of their campuses. The demands of globalization require that

institutions of higher education provide students with increased international knowledge and

intercultural skills needed to succeed in today's society (Qiang, 2003). According to Deardorff

(2006), students today need to develop the skills "to communicate effectively and appropriately

in intercultural situations," increase their cultural awareness and understanding, and demonstrate

an understanding of the worldviews of others (p. 247). The development of such intercultural

skills, according to Deardorff (2006), is an outcome of internationalization.

Knight (2003), one of the most frequently cited scholars on internationalization, defines

internationalization as "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global

dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (p. 6). The

majority of all baccalaureate, master's and doctoral universities are engaged in the ongoing

process of internationalizing their curricular and co-curricular programs to ensure that students

develop the skills and competencies needed to successfully collaborate and compete in today's

global society (American Council on Education, 2012). As part of the internationalization

process, some institutions also work to develop a campus culture and climate that values and

supports international and intercultural perspectives and initiatives (Qiang, 2003). For the

purpose of this study, internationalization is defined as the process of developing a culturally rich

campus-learning environment with curricular and co-curricular programs designed to provide all

students with opportunities to develop the intercultural skills, and cultural awareness and

understanding necessary to succeed in the 21st century. A diverse and educationally enriching

campus environment is necessary for institutions to obtain comprehensive internationalization

which is an integrated balance between internationalization on the campus and

internationalization abroad.

Some institutions show commitment to internationalization and to the goal of producing

global ready graduates in their mission statements and strategic plans as a response to the

growing importance of internationalization and globalization. The degree to which the

internationalization process is developed on each campus varies among institutions. There are

multiple factors influencing this process at the institutional level and these include components

such as the mission, vision of senior leadership, funding, resources, and alignment of internal

goals toward local, national or international interests (Knight, 2003). Both the leadership and the

organizational culture of each organization help shape the institution's response to both the

external and the internal influences to internationalize. Tierney (1988) posits that an

"organization's culture is reflected in what is done, how it is done, and who is involved in doing

it. It concerns decisions, actions, and communication both on an instrumental and a symbolic

level" (p. 3).

Institutions differ as to how internationalization is developed and integrated into the

culture. Bartell (2003) posits that internationalization may be viewed as occurring on a

continuum. He explains that on one end of such a continuum the internationalization is limited

to such things as student mobility involving sending students abroad and receiving international

students. On the other end of the continuum, he continues, is comprehensive internationalization

"conceptualized as a synergistic, transformative process, involving the curriculum and the

research programs, that influences the role and activities of all of the campus stakeholders"

(Bartell, 2003, p. 51). Institutions that view student mobility as the primary means of

internationalization promote study abroad and exchange programs to send U.S. students abroad.

Over 260,000 U.S. students studied abroad in 2009 (Open Doors Report, 2010, p.18). Many of

these institutions also receive inbound international students seeking degrees or participating in

non-degree exchange programs. A record high of 690,923 international students studied in U.S.

institutions in 2010 (Open Doors Report, 2010, p. 2). Some of these institutions measure the

success of their internationalization by the numbers of international students on campus and the

number of domestic students who participate in study abroad.

Universities that have implemented comprehensive internationalization systemically

throughout their institutions provide opportunities for all students to be engaged in intercultural

learning on their campuses as well as through international experiences. Over 17 million

students in U.S. institutions of higher education today will need to learn about "other countries,

regions, cultures, or global issues … at home" (Green, Luu & Burris, 2008, p. 82). Commitment

to internationalization on these campuses often results in internationalized curriculum, courses

with a global focus, and a variety of programs to promote interaction among students of diverse

cultures (Olson, Green & Hill, 2006). Establishing and assessing students' global learning

outcomes in these culturally rich learning environments helps measure the success of the

internationalization strategies.

Statement of the Problem

The development of a rich cultural learning environment through campus

internationalization enhances education for all students. Such an environment provides

opportunities for all students to develop increased cultural awareness and intercultural

competencies necessary for successful global engagement in today's world. Many campuses

have the rich resources to help develop a globally engaging learning environment for all students; however, these institutions may not realize their full potential to internationalize their campuses unless they progress through a comprehensive, ongoing internationalization process. According to Knight (1994), institutions need to recognize the value and benefits that internationalization provides for the campus community and make an ongoing commitment to campus internationalization. The success of a commitment to internationalize depends on the support of the organizational culture and necessary organizational change needed to implement internationalization systemically throughout an institution. Therefore, it is important to examine and understand the relationship between campus internationalization and organizational culture and change in order to implement and sustain a successful internationalization process.

Background to the Study

The background to the study provides an overview of the various stages of internationalization defined by the research as they have developed over the last several decades in the U.S. The majority of institutions have responded to the growing need to provide students with more opportunities to be globally engaged and to develop intercultural competencies and increased cultural awareness necessary in today's global society (Green et al., 2008). These institutions have progressed from simply sending students abroad to gain exposure to other cultures to creating a more culturally enriching campus environment for all students. How far an institution moves in the developmental process of internationalization will vary greatly depending on the organizational culture (Knight, 1994). Several key topic areas provide critical background for the study including student mobility, internationalization abroad, internationalization at home, and comprehensive internationalization.

4

Student Mobility

Many institutions focus internationalization efforts on sending U.S. students abroad and enrolling international students, a view that has been part of the U.S. higher education system for decades. Some institutions have not made efforts to expand student mobility to more comprehensive internationalization initiatives on their campuses where all students have opportunities to become globally engaged. Many of these institutions offer international experiences to their students through a variety of study abroad opportunities. Study abroad; however, plays a minor role toward developing a globally aware student population since only 9% of U.S. students participated in study abroad in 2009 (Open Doors Report, 2010, p. 18).

These small percentages of U.S. students who do study abroad sometimes live and study with other Americans. They sometimes participate in American style classes taught by professors from the home institutions. Such programs provide students with limited opportunities to interact with the local culture and to broaden their worldviews by increasing their cultural awareness. Some institutions use study abroad as their primary focus of internationalization, and according to Mestenhauser (2003), "study abroad has become the shorthand of international education that is being embraced by most undergraduate programs as the international education solution" (p. 8). Administrators and educators from institutions viewing study abroad as the primary means of internationalization most likely believe in the adage "send them abroad and they will be internationally educated" (Mestenhauser, 2003, p.8).

These institutions also enroll international students on their home campuses since doing so gives the campuses a more international appearance. The 2010 Open Doors Report shows that international student enrollment reached 690,923 in U.S. institutions of higher education during 2009. Having international students enrolled in institutions of higher education, however,

typically is not an indicator of successful internationalization. Without purposely promoting interaction between U.S. and international students, there will be limited intercultural learning (Volet & Ang, 1988). Institutions may need to provide support for integrating the international students into the campus community or to promote interaction with the U.S. students. Volet and Ang (1988) posited that "It has become clear that unless intercultural contact is engineered as part of formal study, social cohesion will not happen and all students will miss out on critical learning opportunities" (p. 9). Enrollment of international students does not guarantee that friendship, cultural interaction and increased cultural understanding among international and U.S. students will naturally develop.

Efforts to support student mobility that are focused on numbers rather than learning do not require a campus-wide initiative or senior level commitment with funding and vision in order to succeed (Mestenhauser, 2003). Some institutions simply measure their success in internationalization by increasing the number of international students and the number of study abroad students. Olson et al. (2006) question why some institutions remain focused only on study abroad participants and the enrollment of international students and not on creating a campus culture where all students learn to understand, appreciate and collaborate successfully with people of diverse cultures. Olson et al. (2006) have one suggestion about why this might be true stating that "success is most often measured in terms of the level of activity, or the 'outputs' to global learning" (p. x). The Open Doors Report, published annually by the Institute for International Education, ranks institutions by the number of international students they enroll and by the number of U.S students they send out on study abroad programs.

Ranking high among the institutions in the number of study abroad participants and enrollment of international students helps institutions build a strong national and international

reputation (Horn, Hendel, & Fry, 2007). The senior leadership and organizational culture support these types of internationalization efforts that may not be part of any institution-wide plan. However, Knight (2001) points out that "there seems to be a myth accompanying the great leap forward in the internationalization of colleges and universities and a perception that the more international a university is, the better it is and the higher quality its programs are" (p. 233). While sending and receiving students are considered two important parts out of the numerous components needed in comprehensive internationalization, "they do not necessarily ensure that all graduates will be globally aware or competent" (Olson et al., 2006, p. x).

Internationalization Abroad

Institutions may expand their international endeavors in student mobility and establish study centers abroad and numerous programs through linkages and partnerships. This stream of internationalization is referred to as 'internationalization abroad' by Knight (2003) who defines it as "all types of higher education study where the learners are located in a country different from the one where the awarding institution is based" (p. 6). Institutions in this stage of internationalization encourage faculty to be involved in international efforts through consulting and research. They sign agreements with international partner institutions in support of student and faculty exchanges, and international research and development projects (Olson et al., 2006).

Some institutions establish branch campuses abroad in efforts to build their institutions' international reputations. These branch campuses are very different from the study centers established decades ago to provide undergraduates with study abroad opportunities. The branch campuses built in the late 20th and 21st century are set up to enroll students from the countries and geographical regions where the centers are located (Wildavsky, 2010). The demand for branch campuses changes as the global economy changes. Numerous branch campuses built in

Japan in the 1980s and 1990s failed after the economic downturn (Wildavsky, 2010). Today a branch campus of Temple University in Japan is the only U.S. branch campus still in operating in Japan (Wildavsky, 2010). In 2010, a complex of U.S. branch campuses called Education City opened in Qatar. The Qatar Foundation subsidized the building of the campuses and carefully selected institutions with outstanding reputations in areas of engineering, journalism, Foreign Service, and medicine (Wildavsky, 2010).

The senior leadership in such institutions may interpret successful internationalization through the international presence of the university abroad, rather than by the opportunities provided for students enrolled on the home campuses (Edwards, 2007). Indeed, international educator Edwards (2007) cautions that the internationalization of higher education "may be designed to fulfill an idea on the part of trustees or other stakeholders that this is necessary for the institution to be competitive in its efforts to retain its standing and fulfill its mission" (p. 375). Yet providing intercultural learning opportunities for all students enrolled in the home campuses can extend opportunities beyond the elite few who can afford to study abroad to all students who may benefit from increased knowledge and understanding of other cultures. As Knight (1994) suggests, "developing an ethos or culture in the university that values and supports intercultural and international perspectives and initiatives" is key to successful internationalization (p. 4). The extent to which institutions develop and support such a learning environment depends greatly on the organizational culture.

Internationalization at Home

Institutions committed to providing an international education and intercultural learning opportunities for the 91% of the students who do not go abroad work to develop 'Internationalization at Home' (Mestenhauser, 2003). This concept, developed by Bengt Nilssen, refers to providing an integrated and conceptually coordinated approach of international education on the campus. Paige (2003) describes 'Internationalization at Home' more concretely as "the provision by universities of providing international and intercultural learning opportunities for those students who for various reasons do not participate in study-abroad programs" (p. 52). The 'Internationalization at Home' component provides students with curricula and programs with international themes and international content, involves active participation of international students in the teaching and learning process, and provides a variety of extracurricular programs and events with an international and intercultural focus (Olson et al., 2006).

The 'Internationalization at Home' component is also referred to as campus internationalization. Students who are engaged with diverse cultures on campus may learn to interact effectively in different intercultural situations as part of their academic preparation (Volet & Ang, 1998). Campus internationalization helps institutions move away from the mindset of seeing *us* and *them* as two distinct populations living and studying on the same campus and allows for international and intercultural learning among U.S. and international students. Promoting interaction and learning among all students may help them achieve the intellectual growth necessary to comprehend and understand the world around them is a desirable goal (Agnew & VanBalkom, 2009). Yale University President Richard Levin sees the increased presence of international students "as a means of exposing their U.S. counterparts to

diversity, not only in culture but also in worldview. It's the only way that American kids are going to, without going abroad, get real opportunities to learn about how people from different countries think differently than we do" (Wildavsky, 2010, p. 33). Levin's success in increasing both the international student enrollment at Yale, as well as promoting the interaction between U.S. and international students, help demonstrate the important relationship between senior leadership and an organizational culture supportive of internationalization efforts.

Comprehensive Internationalization

Olson et al. (2006) argue that successful internationalization needs to have a balance of both 'Internationalization at Home' and 'Internationalization Abroad'. These scholars posit that "the internationalization abroad activities [need to be] well integrated with and supportive of the internationalization at home initiatives" (p. xi). According to these authors, integration of the two streams is necessary for institutions to achieve comprehensive internationalization. Comprehensive internationalization may provide students with the academic and co-curricular programs necessary to help them develop increased cultural awareness, appreciation of difference and to begin to understand the world views others.

Otten (2003) posits that a "valuing approach to cultural differences should be an integrated dimension in curriculum development, teaching and all other social and organizational activities of educational programs" (p. 19). Students benefit from interacting with people of diverse cultures and from applying what they learn in class to their real life experiences. Ongoing interaction with people from different cultures helps students develop effective and appropriate communication and behavior needed in intercultural situations, and allows them to work and collaborate more effectively in diverse groups. As Otten (2003) suggests, ongoing processing and reflection of those interactions may allow students to maximize their intercultural

learning. Otten (2003), for example, emphasizes that intercultural interaction will only result in substantial intercultural learning if students reflect on these experiences as part of the learning process. He further suggests that comprehensive internationalization efforts should include the important component of processing as part of classroom and co-curricular activities (Otten, 2003).

Establishing learning outcomes to help assess the effectiveness of curricular and co-curricular programs is a critical part of many comprehensive internationalization efforts, with good reason. Deardorff (2006), for example, states that intercultural competence needs to "be identified as a student learning outcome of internationalization and assessed throughout time" (p. 259). She defines intercultural competence as a combination of skills, knowledge, attitudes, and learned behaviors allowing students to adapt to different communication styles and behaviors, adjust to new cultural environments, and possess a deep understanding of culture and others' worldviews (Deardorff, 2006). Involvement in the ongoing process of intercultural development in both curricular and co-curricular programs may help students develop intercultural competence and increased cultural awareness. Intercultural learning and the development of intercultural competence will not result from a onetime experience such as participation in a study abroad program or in an academic class with an intercultural focus (Deardorff, 2006).

Ongoing assessment and monitoring of internationalization efforts may be an integral part of comprehensive internationalization. As Knight (2001) suggests, for example, "We need to assure ourselves and the different stakeholder groups that the process of internationalization is being evaluated on a regular and consistent basis and that improvements are being made to ensure that the international dimension of teaching/learning, research, and service is contributing to the relevance and quality of higher education" (p. 241). Knight further

suggests that a university-wide commitment is necessary for institutions to reach this degree of

comprehensive internationalization involving close collaboration among the various units

involved in international activity including study abroad, enrollment of international students,

international partnerships and overseas study centers. Olson (2004) posits that "comprehensive

internationalization requires a level of intentional, systemic and strategic thinking that is still rare

at most U.S. higher education institutions" (p. 51).

The Internationalization Process

Knight (1994) suggests that the internationalization process is a continuous cycle made

up of six phases shown in Table 1. She suggests that the success of each institution's

internationalization efforts may depend on their ability to recognize internationalization as an

ongoing process and not a static or linear phenomenon. How far institutions progress in this

cycle may depend on the level of commitment of the senior leadership, the available resources

and the organizational culture (Knight, 1994).

Table 1

Knight's Internationalization Process

Phases	
Awareness	Recognition of the need, purpose and benefits of internationalization for students, staff, faculty and society
Commitment	Support is needed by senior level administration, faculty, staff and students
Planning	Identify institutional needs and resources, establish purpose and objectives. Establish priorities and develop strategies
Operationalize	Implement internationalization efforts throughout the institution's teaching, learning and service components
Review	Monitor and assess the ongoing programs and ensure they work together in a complementary and mutually beneficial way.
Reinforcement	Ensure sustainability of internationalization through ongoing involvement of stakeholders and build in incentives and rewards

Some institutions, for example, have the awareness that internationalization is an important component of the educational process and even commit to such efforts in their strategic plans and mission statements yet they do not move into the comprehensive planning stage (Knight, 1994). The comprehensive planning stage, according to Knight (1994) requires campus-wide involvement of key stakeholders, and continued support from the senior administration. Institutions that move into the fourth stage which Knight (1994) calls the operationalize stage implement curricular and co-curricular programs designed to promote cultural awareness and increased intercultural learning for all students (Knight, 1994). Such programs require ongoing collaboration among units across the institution and vary among institutions depending on the funding, resources and needs of each institution (Knight, 1994).

The ongoing challenge to institutions is to sustain internationalization programs on their campuses as vibrant, globally engaging initiatives in both the review and reinforcement stages (Knight, 1994). Knight (1994) posits that ongoing support from senior administration, key stakeholders and drivers of institutional culture, is essential throughout the ongoing internationalization process. She continues that the inclusion of stakeholders in the review process leads to new and innovative ideas necessary for reinforcing the base of commitment. Knight (1994) sees the use of the six stages of the internationalization cycle important "to ensure that the international dimension is integrated and institutionalized into the university/college culture and systems" (p. 14).

An Internationalization Plan

A commitment to comprehensive internationalization, and the movement through Knight's suggested stages of the internationalization process, is a major undertaking for any institution. Childress (2009) posits that institutions can facilitate the process of

13

internationalization by first developing an internationalization plan to serve as a guide for how to implement internationalization on their campuses. Childress (2009) states that plans are institutions' commitments to internationalization and may serve as blueprints for what the institution envisions internationalization will look like on their campuses. In a research study with 31 member institutions of the Association of International Education Administrators, Childress (2009) found that 71% of the institutions had some type of written internationalization plan.

Internationalization plans help senior leadership and administrators clarify who will lead the efforts, how to involve key stakeholders in the process, and what resources will be available to implement an internationalization initiative (Childress, 2009). Institutions develop different types of internationalization plans depending on their vision and commitment level to internationalization. According to Childress (2009), institutions primarily use three different types of internationalization plans. These are institutional strategic plans, distinct documents, and unit plans (Childress, 2009). Sixty one percent of institutions in the study use institutional strategic plans, which include specific references to internationalization in the overall plan, along with other university priorities (Childress, 2009).

Thirty-two percent of institutions in the study use distinct documents, or stand-alone plans, to address university wide implementation of internationalization (Childress, 2009). These plans require vision, campus-wide commitment, resources, and leadership by senior administration, before planning or implementation even begins. They call for actively engaging faculty in the planning process. They require resources and incentives in support of research, internationalization of the curriculum, and other international/intercultural projects (Childress,

2009). Some institutions include criteria on international research and active involvement in international activities in the faculty hiring and tenure processes.

The development of an internationalization plan can help to ensure that all stakeholders in the university understand the importance of internationalization and the value it will add to education for all students on campus (Childress, 2009). Much of the success of institution-wide plans depends on the successful collaborations built across all divisions of the university, including Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. These collaborative efforts bring faculty and staff together to develop an integrated approach to promoting the engagement of U.S. and international students through curricular and co-curricular programs. Including all of these key components in the development of a university-wide plan may help to facilitate the development of campus internationalization and provide students with a dynamic, culturally diverse and engaging learning environment.

Nineteen percent of the 31 institutions in Childress's (2009) study use a unit plan designed to guide internationalization efforts in one or more units across the university. This type of plan is sometimes used in institutions where internationalization efforts have not yet been implemented systemically throughout the institutions (Childress, 2009). Such plans often develop because there is a small group of campus constituents who believe strongly in internationalization but do not have the resources or support of senior leadership to implement internationalization comprehensively. These efforts may not be part of a comprehensive or systemic internationalization effort, but they provide students with opportunities to be globally engaged on campus. Such grassroots efforts to promote internationalization may lead to senior administration making a commitment to support a campus-wide initiative (Childress, 2009).

It is extremely difficult to implement successful, comprehensive internationalization without the commitment and resources from senior leadership and the support of the organizational culture (Knight, 1994). The mission, values and priorities of an institution are part of the organizational culture. How an institution interprets, prioritizes and implements internationalization depends on both the vision of senior leadership and the organizational culture (Knight, 1994).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine and describe the relationship between organizational culture and change and internationalization efforts made at one institution. A descriptive case study research design was used to explore the development of internationalization efforts underway at one campus, Florida State University, as viewed by senior leadership, faculty, administrators, and students. Florida State University had no university-wide initiative to internationalize the campus but numerous efforts and changes leading to the implementation of some internationalization initiatives had taken place. Therefore, data from interviews, focus groups and document analysis was gathered to investigate the overarching question of how the organizational culture and change in this institution supported or deterred the progress of internationalization efforts. The findings from this study will be made available to the senior leadership, administrators and faculty at Florida State University involved in reviewing current internationalization efforts. These findings may be helpful to the internationalization planning committee as it moves toward developing a university-wide plan to implement systemic, comprehensive internationalization at Florida State University.

Significance of the Study

This study added to the limited body of literature on internationalization in higher education and helped fill the existing gap in studies by examining the relationship between organizational culture and change and internationalization efforts at one institution. The study also provided insights into the unique challenges faced by a large, research institution to internationalize. Florida State University has a well-developed internationalization abroad component but there was no university wide initiative to internationalize the campus and provide all students with opportunities to be globally engaged. This study provided the new president and the new provost with information about how the campus community defines and envisions internationalization and why the campus community considers campus internationalization to be an important part of educating students. Data from senior leadership, administrators, faculty and students provided insight on the challenges facing FSU, as well as the strengths supporting FSU, in its internationalization efforts to provide all students with opportunities to develop intercultural and global competencies both on the home campus and abroad. The triangulation of the data from multiple stakeholders across the campus helped show how the organizational culture supported or deterred the changes needed for FSU to move toward comprehensive internationalization.

Tierney's (1988) framework on *Six Concepts of Culture* was used in combination with Kezar and Eckel's (2002) framework on *Five Change Strategies* to explore the unit of analysis of internationalization at FSU. The use of Tierney's (1988) framework to examine the relationship between organizational culture and internationalization helped expand the use of Tierney's model. The combined use of both frameworks provided additional insight into the relationship between organizational culture and change to support or deter internationalization on a campus.

This study also contributed information to demonstrate how institutional commitment; including vision, strategies and resources, are necessary in order to successfully implement comprehensive internationalization systemically throughout the entire campus. In addition, the research findings are sufficiently described so that others will be able to consider whether the findings might be transferrable.

Research Questions

This study including the following research questions:

1. How do Florida State University stakeholders perceive internationalization?

2. How do organizational culture and change support or deter the internationalization efforts at Florida State University?

CHAPTER II:

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The main body of literature reviewed for this study is the internationalization of higher education in the U.S. and some Western countries within the last decade. Empirical articles written by well-known researchers in the area of internationalization within the last 20 years were also included because of their influence in developing the concepts and processes of internationalization. Research on organizational culture and organizational change was also reviewed as they relate to the unit of analysis of internationalization on a university campus.

First, this literature review provides an overview of intercultural competencies as an expected learning outcome of the internationalization process. Comprehensive internationalization helps provide students with opportunities to develop intercultural competencies through curricular and co-curricular programs and to be actively engaged with diverse populations. The literature shows that the development of such competencies is best achieved through ongoing interaction in a culturally enriching, globally engaged learning environment. Second, an overview of *international student engagement*, key to developing a culturally rich learning campus community, is covered. The literature shows that institutions need to provide structured curricular and co-curricular programs to increase interaction among domestic and international students and help them become interculturally competent. The section on International Student Engagement contains the following subthemes: international student enrollment and recruitment, international student challenges, and promoting international and domestic student engagement.

Third, the institutional mission, institutional funding, use of internationalization plans and ranking systems are all key components to the internationalization process. A review of the role

of faculty and academic departments demonstrate that the involvement and support of these key stakeholders is essential. Systemic and comprehensive internationalization cannot take place without the active participation of faculty in curriculum internationalization projects and international research collaborations. All of the research synthesized in this chapter indicates that internationalization is a complex process involving multiple components. The successful implementation of an internationalization initiative takes vision and long-term commitment from the institution as well as support from the organizational culture. Key stakeholders in the institution need to be actively engaged in the planning, implementation and ongoing support of the process. This section of the literature review is divided into the two areas of institutional support and faculty as key stakeholders. The subtopics under institutional support are the following: mission, internationalization plans, financial support, and ranking the international dimension. The subtopics under faculty as key stakeholders are the following: funding and incentives, role of faculty in internationalization efforts, role of department in internationalization efforts, and curriculum internationalization.

Outcomes of Internationalization

Intercultural Competencies

Two studies, one by Deardorff (2006) and one by Hunter, White and Godby (2006), were carried out with similar goals to arrive at definitions of the terms intercultural competence and global competence through input from experts in the field of intercultural communication and international educators and administrators. Hunter et al. (2006) attempted to define the term global competence through input from scholars and administrators. Global competence was defined as "having an open mind while actively seeking to understand cultural norms and expectations of others, leveraging this gained knowledge to interact, communicate and work

effectively outside one's environment" (Hunter et al., 2006, p. 277). Deardorff (2006) carried out a similar study to have administrators and intercultural experts define what constitutes intercultural competence. The top three common elements she found through the study from the administrators were "awareness, valuing, and understanding of cultural differences; experiencing other cultures; and self-awareness of one's own culture" (Deardorff, 2006, p. 247). The intercultural scholars defined intercultural competence as "the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one's intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes" (Deardorff, 2006, p. 247). The one element in Deardorff's (2006) study that received total consensus from both the administrators and intercultural scholars was "the understanding of others' world views" (p. 248).

The Hunter et al. (2006) study also attempted to identify how students in higher education acquire intercultural and global competencies. According to their study, the first step in becoming globally competent is "for a person to develop a keen understanding of his or her own cultural norms and expectations: A person should attempt to understand his or her own cultural box before stepping into someone else's" (Hunter et al., 2006, p. 279). Participating in reflection about one's own culture is important to this step. The second step after developing increased self-awareness is "an exploration of cultural, social, and linguistic diversity, while at the same time developing a nonjudgmental and open attitude toward difference" (Hunter et al., 2006, p. 279). Interacting with people from different cultures and learning about their social and cultural values is helpful in this step. The third step involves an in-depth understanding of the interconnectedness of societies and the concept of globalization. Courses with international content or global learning outcomes are important for this step. Forty-five percent of the

institutions of higher education in the U.S. reported having developed global learning outcomes in 2006 (Green et al., 2008, p. 8).

Developing global competence is a process that involves a variety of different steps or phases combining reflection, experiential interaction and acquisition of knowledge. The Hunter et al. (2006) study noted that global competence is not acquired through just language study or study abroad as was once believed within higher education. Their study also questions whether global competence is achieved through global citizen certificate programs that have been developed in the last few years on many U.S. campuses (Hunter et al., 2006).

Deardorff (2006) concurred that the development of intercultural competence is an ongoing process and not the result of a one-time experience. During this process, there are internal outcomes such as shift in frame of reference, and external outcomes such as interacting effectively in an intercultural situation (Deardorff, 2006). Her study concluded that intercultural competence "needs to be identified as a student outcome of internationalization and assessed throughout time--not just one or two points in time" (Deardorff, 2006, p. 259).

Researchers at one institution in Ohio conducted a semester long study to assess the development of intercultural sensitivity [synonymous with intercultural competence] in students. Students completed the Intercultural Developmental Inventory (IDI), designed to measure intercultural sensitivity, at the beginning of the semester (Klak & Martin, 2003). Eighty-five students in the study completed a variety of readings and assignments designed to increase intercultural awareness and appreciation as requirements for a course they were in enrolled in. They also attended over five culture specific events during the semester and submitted written reflections on the intercultural significance of these events (Klak & Martin, 2003). At the end of the semester, they completed the IDI again. The analysis of the pre and posttest scores showed

that the students moved "in the direction of greater intercultural sensitivity and appreciation" (Klak & Martin, 2003, p. 460).

Jurgens and Robbins-O'Connell (2008) carried out a study involving administrators of International Programs offices in three universities in the U.S. and Ireland to compare the intercultural learning opportunities available to students. References to internationalization efforts appeared in recruiting materials or mission statements at the three institutions. The administrators were asked how they sponsored or supported programming or activities designed to help develop intercultural competency in students. The researchers found that the majority of the seven administrators in the study were unable to comment on the frequency of such programming or activities. The researchers also found that the three campuses did not have a system for "determining the level of such need, nor for determining the success of current programming and activities developed or utilized by their respective departments or the universities in general" (Jurgens & Robbins-O'Connell, 2008, p. 72).

The study by Jurgens and Robbins-O'Connell (2008) showed that the institutions had indicated internationalization as a priority but had not yet involved all of the campus stakeholders in the initiatives. The researchers concluded in their findings that, "Universities may understand and promote…global competence within the university community and among the university's students…but a model of measuring the factuality of such claims does not readily exist" (Jurgens & Robbins-O'Connell, 2008, p. 73). The researchers also concluded that "mission statements that purport universities' support for creating and maintaining a diverse student population and for graduating interculturally competent students are essentially useless if the institution does not provide the means necessary to achieve these goals" (Jurgens & Robbins-O'Connell, 2008, p. 73).

International Student Engagement

Another key component to comprehensive internationalization is the enrollment and integration of international students into the campus community. Enrolling and actively engaging international students on campuses is a key component to helping all students develop intercultural competencies. International students contribute toward the cultural diversity of a campus and are essential partners in helping all students develop intercultural competencies and increased cultural awareness and understanding.

International student enrollment and recruitment. Data collected through a survey of over 1,000 U.S. institutions by Green et al. (2008) for the American Council on Education in 2006 shows that 59% of all international students in the U.S. are enrolled in doctorate-granting universities. Eleven percent of these institutions reported that between 10% and 25% of their undergraduate enrollment was from international students (Green et al., 2008, p. 19). Smaller proportions of international students attend master's level or four-year institutions. Only 15% of master's institutions reported that 5% or more of their undergraduate population was international in 2006, compared to 21% who reported 5% or more in 2001. Thirty percent of four-year institutions reported that international students made up more than 5% of their undergraduate enrollment in 2006, compared to just 24% that reported over 5% in 2001 (Green et al., 2008, p. 47).

The presence of international students on campus is important to internationalization efforts because of the various perspectives such students bring to the campus-learning environment. Their backgrounds and experience also contribute toward building a culturally diverse community. Sixty-one percent of doctorate-granting institutions offer some type of scholarships for undergraduate international students, and 73% provide stipends and fellowships

for graduate international students (Green et al., 2008, p. 33). Zhao, Kuh, and Carini (2005) carried out a study on the amount of interaction between U.S. and international students through National Survey of Student Engagement data from over 71,000 freshmen and senior respondents. Based on the amount of interaction they found between U.S and international students, the researchers concluded that a campus should not just recruit a mass of international students but "must also intentionally arrange its resources so that international and American students benefit in desired ways from one another's presence" (Zhao et al., 2005, p. 225). Recruitment efforts, however, are ongoing in over 25% of the institutions in the U.S. Forty percent of doctorate-granting institutions reported having specific recruitment targets in 2006 compared to 39% of the master's universities and 35% of the four-year institutions in a study of over 1,000 institutions across the U.S. (Green et al., 2008, p. 21). Approximately 33% of institutions in this same study make institutional funding available for international recruitment involving the travel of recruitment personnel. Doctorate-granting institution funding for international student recruitment increased from 52% of the institutions in 2001 to 65% in 2006 (Green et al., 2008, p. 21).

Schoorman (1999) found that all 31-faculty members in her study of two departments' responses to internationalization agreed having international students on campus was important in her study. However, the study revealed that there was less agreement on whether the presence of international students had a positive impact on classes. The researcher stated that faculty in the Department of Business "noted the potential for international students to be educational resources within the department. The students' culture was believed to have a positive impact on teaching" (Schoorman, 1999, p. 33). Faculty in the Science Department felt that the culture of students did not contribute anything additional to the teaching and learning experience in classes.

Their perspective was "to pay attention to the culture of students implied a lowering of the standards of excellence" (Schoorman, 1999, p. 37). A faculty member in another study on faculty and internationalization at one institution said, "We need greater understanding of what creates good will. It's all very well to do things to attract students in, but it's what you do when they are here that's important…" (Robson & Turner, 2007, p. 48).

The benefits international students bring to U.S. institutions vary among institutions. Robson and Turner (2007) found in their study on faculty and internationalization at one institution that some of the 35 faculty members in the study had a lack of clarity as to why international student enrollment was important on campus beyond generating income from out of state tuition and fees. The researchers also found that a minority of the faculty in the study had concerns about the additional time and effort that would be required to support international students. A few faculties regarded the "growth in international student numbers as an 'unfortunate necessity' equated with increased staff-student ratios, and teaching, supervisory and pastoral responsibilities" (Robson & Turner, 2007, p. 44).

International student challenges. There are also numerous challenges facing international students enrolled in U.S. institutions. Students face a variety of personal, academic, social and cultural challenges during their adjustment and integration into U.S. campus culture. Gu, Schweisfurth, and Day (2010) found in a study of four institutions in the United Kingdom that most international student respondents thought the challenges of adapting to a different academic culture were much more difficult the adaptations to cultural and social differences. Many of the 250 student respondents were surprised to find that adapting to the academic environment was much more of a concern to them a few months into their programs of study than it had been prior to arriving (Gu et al., 2010). Findings from the study show that only seven

26

per cent of international students had reported pre-arrival concerns about being embarrassed if unable to answers questions in class compared to 44% that had that concern after arriving. Only 18% of the international students in the study had been concerned about speaking up in class before arriving compared to the 36% who had this concern once classes began (Gu et al., 2010).

Twenty-four international students participated in a qualitative study by Lee and Rice (2007) in one university in the Southwest. The international students were interviewed about their feelings of adapting to a new culture. The researchers found that the majority of the students felt "uncomfortable with the give and take of classroom dynamics, and were thus perceived as incompetent" (Lee & Rice, 2007, p. 397). The international students in the study also indicated that they felt uncomfortable in classes. They reported that they were ignored and excluded by other students and were often left out of study groups (Lee & Rice, 2007).

Some students reported difficulties in their interactions with faculty members in this same study. Some respondents reported that they had to change their faculty advisors due to difficulties that they thought were based on "cultural intolerance" related to the students' difficulties in speaking English (Lee & Rice, 2007, p. 398). Other students "felt genuine aversion on the part of professors unwilling to be flexible with accommodation to non-standard speakers of English, and were frustrated that people didn't have empathy for how hard they work" (Lee & Rice, 2007, p. 398). One Chinese female student said the following in the qualitative study.

> I know the first time I can't understand [because] my English is not too good. But if I ask questions the professor will say, 'I don't understand' and so that makes me very embarrassed. I don't ask questions any more. I ask other students—I don't ask the professor—I just talk to other students. (Lee & Rice, 2007, p. 397)

Such experiences in the classroom were not the only difficulties international students experience in their new environment. Gu et al. (2010) found in their study of 250 international students in

four institutions in the United Kingdom that nearly half of the international students indicated that they were unhappy in their social life. This study also "indicated gaps in cultural values and behaviors between home students and international students which posed challenges for academic and social integration" (Gu et al., 2010, p. 17). Lee and Rice (2007) found through their qualitative study with 24 international students from 15 countries at a large public institution in the Southwest that the international students' perceptions of American students were that they really had no desire to learn about another culture.

Lee (2010) found in her study with over 500 international students at a large university in the Southwest that the students from developing countries experienced more difficulties in fitting in socially to the new culture than did those respondents from developed countries. Students from predominantly non-white regions of the world felt that they were less accepted by faculty, staff and fellow students and reported more unfair treatment both inside and outside the classroom than did students from predominantly white regions of the world (Lee, 2010). Lee and Rice (2007) found that students from "Asia, India, Latin America, and the Middle East reported considerable discrimination while students from Europe, Canada, and New Zealand did not report any direct negative experiences related to their race or culture" (p. 393). The researchers also found that "many international students were confronted with discrimination early upon entering the U.S. and it became a difficult reality for those who have never experienced it in their home country" (Lee & Rice, 2007, p. 395).

Despite many of the difficulties international students often experience during their studies, most make significant progress and eventually succeed in their goal of obtaining a degree or degrees from a U.S. institution. Gu et al. (2010) found that 71% of international students were comfortable in small group discussions after their second academic year of study

versus only 29% of international students who had felt comfortable upon beginning their studies. Regardless of the initial obstacles, 82% of the international students in the study felt committed to their course of study by the second academic year (Gu et al., 2010). In addition, the researchers found that 85% of the students agreed that "student discussion in class was helpful for their learning, and within this, 16% strongly agreed" (Gu et al., 2010, p. 18).

International students also make much progress in cultural adjustment and understanding as well as make significant gains in personal achievement over time. Gu et al. (2010) found in their study that 54% of the international students reported that their understanding of the host culture had improved by their second academic year and that they "had become more appreciative of their home cultural values" (p. 18). The researchers found that 67% of international students in the study reported reaching a high level of personal independence, 56% said their life experience and interests had been broadened, and 41% reported having better interpersonal and communication skills (Gu et al., 2010).

Promoting international and domestic student engagement. International student enrollment is an important part of campus internationalization. However, just having international students on campus does not ensure that there will be interaction and engagement between international and domestic students leading to increased cultural awareness and competencies, the expected outcomes of internationalization. Zhao et al. (2005) analyzed data on U.S. and international student interaction on U.S. campuses. The researchers concluded that, "Any effort to increase the numbers of international students on campus must also be accompanied by programs and services that induce these students and their American counterparts to engage with one another as well as in other educationally purposeful activities" (Zhao et al., 2005). Summers and Volet (2008) had similar findings in their study on group work

involving 233 British and international students enrolled in three marketing classes in the United Kingdom. The research showed that it is important to increase students' intercultural experiences since these experiences will lead to future intercultural collaboration (Summers & Volet, 2008).

Some universities attempt to promote interaction between international and domestic students in classes. Schuerholz-Lehr, Caws, Van Gyn and Preece (2007) found in their study of internationalization involving ten faculty members that most of the participants agreed that, "The classroom needs to become a forum for students to understand, respect and hopefully embrace various cultural perspectives" (p. 87). Turner-Essel and Waehler (2009) found similar support from faculty in their study with 47 faculty members in counseling training programs. The majority of the respondents agreed that a program with numerous international students would provide an international perspective only if there were an outlet for students to share and express their viewpoints. Volet and Ang (1998) conducted a qualitative study involving 40 domestic and international students in one business class in a university in Australia. The study showed that the Australian students preferred to work with each other and that international students often felt uncomfortable working in mixed cultural groups. The researchers found that careful planning must go into classroom management to help ensure intercultural contact and communication between international and domestic students. The researchers concluded that, "Without such planning, intercultural contacts are likely to be few and far between if students are left to make their own choices" (Volet & Ang, 1998, p. 17).

Not everyone shares the same perspective about the benefits to having mixed culture groups work together in classes. One faculty participant in the study by Schoorman (1999) with faculty members in two departments at one institution said, "I have spent most of my career

working with a mixture of people whose genders, places of origin, religions, and everything are the most unimportant characteristics about them. Students are the same. So whether a group has more or few international students doesn't seem to make the slightest difference" (p. 29).

In Volet and Ang's (1998) study on mixed group work in a business class, they found that both domestic and international students preferred to work in groups and other assignments with students from their own cultures. Students often resisted working in mixed cultural groups because of their strong cultural ties to their own groups where they shared similar perceptions and communication styles, and understood the dynamics of the group. One Indonesian student said the following about his preference for working in a group with peers from his home country. "I find it easier to work with a group of Indonesians—with people from my own country, we can work with our own language and I am more comfortable telling the others to work if they are not putting in effort. I am also more comfortable advising them" (Volet & Ang, 1998, p. 10).

Other international students shared that they were comfortable with peers from their home countries because conversation after small talk was difficult with people they did not know well. They found that cross-cultural understanding and a certain level of comfort were necessary in order to have meaningful discussions (Volet & Ang, 1998). Robson and Turner (2007) found that homogenous groups tend to "stick together to the detriment of the development of interpersonal skills and cross cultural communication [which] is good preparation for the world of work" (p. 45). Through their study with 35 faculty members about the impact of internationalization on the institution, the researchers found that Chinese students, as one example, maintain much contact with each other. The different styles of approaching group work assignments were sometimes given as a reason for students preferring to work with others from their culture.

Volet and Ang (1998) also found that Asian students tended to work together collectively on group projects, whereas Caucasian students divided the tasks and passed their work to each other on disks. One domestic student commented, "There is not much discussion and interaction is limited" and one Asian student said "collectivity is in the Asian culture" (Volet & Ang, 1998, p. 11). Other international students indicated that they thought domestic students had too many outside commitments, such as family and work, which made it difficult for them to work in groups outside of class time (Volet & Ang, 1998).

Summers and Volet (2008) carried out a study with 233 domestic and international students various sections of a marketing class in one Australian university. Students worked in mixed groups in the classes and completed pre and post surveys on their experiences and attitudes toward mixed culture group work. The researchers found that the negative attitudes of the domestic students toward working in mixed culture groups posed a barrier to international students joining mixed groups. Robson and Turner (2007) found similar results in their study on internationalization with 35 faculty members in Great Britain. The researchers found that faculty working with mixed culture groups in their classes had concerns "that home students may not share the view that being part of a diverse learning community was beneficial, and that difficulties may arise when the expectations of international students collide with those of small groups of home students" (Robson & Turner, 2007, p. 45). The researchers found that once students were placed into culturally mixed groups, however, the results often turned out to be positive. Volet and Ang (1998) found similar results from their study on mixed group work between domestic and international students in a business class. One domestic student in that study said the following after having participated in a mixed culture group:

> I am working with international students. I did not have the choice, I had to work with them and it was very good, so we all stayed together for the next assignment. In the first

semester, the first time I worked with them I had problems understanding what they were saying, and half way through they said they didn't want me in the group to begin with…They told me this after we got close. (Volet & Ang, 1998, p. 16)

Therefore, there are benefits to having professors strategically form culturally mixed groups. "Our findings support the view that universities should take measures to promote culturally mixed group assignment work in order to achieve the educational and social goals of internationalization" (Summers & Volet, 2008, p. 369). Such an approach would need to be part of an ongoing pedagogical process if benefits were to continue. Volet and Ang (1998) found through interviews with six culturally mixed groups that there was "no evidence that any of the students would deliberately form or seek to join culturally mixed groups in the future" (p. 16).

Universities across the U.S. also provide opportunities to promote interaction between international students and domestic students outside the classroom in a variety of extracurricular activities and programs. Focus groups carried out as part of research on extracurricular activities between culturally mixed groups showed that U.S. students felt they learned a great deal from international students outside the classroom (Green et al., 2008). Some of the most common types of programs to promote interaction between diverse cultures are festivals and cultural celebrations, friendship programs that pair a U.S. student with an international student, and international themed residence halls. The percentage of institutions offering these types of programs increased from 2001 to 2006 according to the Green et al. study that involved over 1,000 institutions across the U.S. on internationalization (Green et al., 2008). Ninety-four percent of doctorate granting institutions in the study reported providing celebrations of cultural events and festivals to increase cultural awareness on their campuses in 2006 compared to just 90% that reported these events in 2001. Master's universities showed an even bigger increase in this programming area with 92% of institutions reporting sponsorship of these activities in 2006

compared to just 78% in 2001. Four-year institutions increased from just 59% of institutions supporting these events in 2001 compared to the 87% reported in 2006 (Green et al., 2008).

Only 47% of doctorate-granting institutions reported providing a friendship program to pair international students with domestic students in 2006 according to this same national study. Master's level institutions reported that only 27% of their campuses made this opportunity available in 2006. The four-year institutions reported that 32% of their campuses offered a friendship program in 2006 (Green et al., 2008). This study also shows that international residence halls, designed to promote interaction between international and domestic students, dropped at doctorate-granting institutions from the 34% who reported having them in 2001 to only 32% who reported having them in 2006. International halls, however, increased on Master's university campuses from the 16% who reported having them in 2001 to 25% who reported having them in 2006 (Green et al., 2008). Twenty-five percent of four-year institutions reported having international residence halls on campus in 2006 compared to the 15% who reported having such halls in 2001 in this study (Green et al., 2008).

Nesdale and Todd (2000) carried out a study on the impact of international themed residence halls on promoting interaction between international and domestic students at one institution in Australia. The study involved 76 domestic and international students living in one residence hall and 71 domestic and international students living in the other residence hall. Strategic programming to promote interaction and contact was provided for one academic year in the first residence hall with 76 residents and this was called the international themed hall. No special programming to promote interaction between the students was provided in the other residence hall. Domestic students living in the international themed hall reported more increased

34

intercultural knowledge at the end of one year than did their counterparts in the other hall (Nesdale & Todd, 2000).

The international students showed no significant increase in intercultural knowledge, however, in either hall (Nesdale & Todd, 2000). There was increased contact reported between the international and domestic students in the international themed hall. The results also indicated that "the pattern of contact which occurred in the residence hall [international themed hall] tended to impact directly upon the extent of contact on the wider university campus, as well as on the students' level of intercultural acceptance" (Nesdale & Todd, 2000, p. 355). The researchers concluded that the students brought in closer contact through intentional programs and activities, continued to interact with diverse groups in the campus as a whole.

Many international and domestic students, who have increased contact with each other through classroom activities or extracurricular events and programs, often develop intercultural friendships. Lee (2006) found in a study on intercultural friendships that most participants had the same definition of what constituted a close friend. The most frequent definitions of close friend included such things as someone who helps, supports and understands you; is someone with whom you share interests and a sense of humor; and is someone who you enjoy spending time with (Lee, 2006). Lee found that the shared sense of what made up a close friendship helped the participants "become close intercultural friends, disregarding their different cultural backgrounds" (Lee, 2006, p. 12).

Lee (2006) reported that one of the benefits to such a friendship was the amount of cultural sharing that took place. The study reported that participants said talking about culture was a natural topic in their friendships. Lee (2006) stated in his findings that, "Because the subject of culture naturally flowed in their conversations, respondents often took the chance to

35

educate each other by introducing their cultures or eradicating previous stereotypes" (p. 14). Most participants in this study expressed that the cultural learning was one of the best parts of having an intercultural friendship. One international student said, "I don't know, anytime you learn about other cultures in a sense that you learn about yourself. So you just kind of exploring new things. Coming to new understandings of things" (Lee, 2006, p. 16). The interviews of the participants in this study revealed that intercultural friendships provide opportunities not only to learn about other cultures through discussions and sharing, but also to learn more about one's own culture (Lee, 2006). Intercultural friendships provide both international and domestic students with the enriching opportunities of learning about new cultures, values and worldviews.

Zhao et al. (2005) carried out a study to compare the university activities of international undergraduate students with American students in various areas. The researchers used NSSE data from over 71,000 freshmen and senior students at universities across the U.S. The researchers found that first year international students scored higher than their American counterparts in academic challenge, active and collaborative learning, student-faculty interaction and technology. The first year international students, however, spent less time relaxing and socializing than did their American counterparts and showed less overall satisfaction than the Americans (Zhao et al., 2005). Senior year international students were more engaged in academic work, used more technology, and participated more in multicultural activities than did their American counterparts (Zhao et al., 2005). The senior international students, however, were not as engaged in active and collaborative learning and in volunteer activities compared to their counterparts (Zhao et al., 2005). Senior international students spent about the same time socializing and relaxing as did their American counterparts (Zhao et al., 2005). The researchers

concluded that the amount of time international students spend on socializing is much less than Americans spend on socializing until their senior level (Zhao et al., 2005).

Components of the Internationalization Process

The literature review provided an overview of the importance of institutional support in the internationalization process. The institutional mission, institutional funding, use of internationalization plans and ranking systems are all key components to the internationalization process. A review of the role of faculty and academic departments demonstrated that the involvement and support of these key stakeholders is essential. Systemic and comprehensive internationalization cannot take place without the active participation of faculty in curriculum internationalization projects and international research collaborations. All of the research synthesized in this chapter indicated that internationalization is a complex process involving multiple components. The successful implementation of an internationalization initiative takes vision and long-term commitment from the institution as well as support from the organizational culture. Key stakeholders in the institution need to be actively engaged in the planning, implementation and ongoing support of the process.

This section of the literature review is divided into the two areas of institutional support and faculty as key stakeholders. The subtopics under institutional support are the following: mission, internationalization plans, financial support, and ranking the international dimension. The subtopics under faculty as key stakeholders are the following: funding and incentives, role of faculty in internationalization efforts, role of department in internationalization efforts, and curriculum internationalization.

Institutional Support

Mission. How senior administration and stakeholders perceive the mission of the institution both internally to faculty and students, as well as externally to the community and to the state, has a great influence on how institutions will respond to internationalization. A study by Agnew and VanBalkom in 2009 found that a review of institutional response is necessary at three levels: micro (students and faculty), meso (senior administrators), and macro (external, local community, government, or international community) in order to understand the phenomenon of internationalization. They carried out interviews at two U.S. universities in efforts to understand the two different approaches the institutions had to internationalization.

One institution, with minimal internationalization efforts, served local, first generation college students who most often graduated to work in the community. Through interviews, the researchers found that "university leadership considered it unlikely that these students were interested in embarking on a study abroad program" or had other interests related to internationalization (Agnew & VanBalkom, 2009, p. 455). There was a commitment to serve the local urban community that in turn "jeopardized internationalization as an institutional priority" (Agnew & VanBalkom, 2009, p. 457). The authors also found this university to have a weak and internally oriented culture resulting in continued focus on local urban mission.

The second university, however, was an elite private institution and its students were not first generation college students. One university leader said, "The intention of this institution is to create an international presence on campus for all students and not simply for those students who may engage in study abroad experiences" (Agnew & VanBalkom, 2009, p. 457). The institution responded to student desires to have a variety of international experiences available to

them, both on and off campus and to provide opportunities for students to understand the world from various world views.

Chan and Dimmock conducted a similar study in 2008 at two universities in Great Britain and Hong Kong. The study compared why and how the two universities had internationalized based on their mission and vision as well as cultural and national contexts. Through the case study research, they found that the British university aspired to be "an international university that is committed to the region" (Chan & Dimmock, 2008, p. 190). Even though it is committed to the region, the British university had well developed strategies focusing on internationalization abroad with internationalization at home underway by many of the departments. The institution aspired to international recognition and one senior leader said that "UK universities have always been international in terms of welcoming staff and students from many different countries and in terms of disseminating research and scholarship throughout the world" (Chan & Dimmock, 2008, p. 192).

The strategic plan of the university in Hong Kong says that it "strives to be an outstanding university in China" (Chan & Dimmock, 2008, p.190). Part of its goal of internationalization is to serve as "a gateway between mainland China and the global community" (Chan & Dimmock, 2008, p. 193). The study concluded that each university "was internationalizing according to its respective strengths and position of advantage, its assets and resources and in the way that it could best achieve its goals" (Chan & Dimmock, 2008, p. 189).

Research indicated that the support for internationalization demonstrated through the mission statement varies greatly among institutions. Green et al. (2008), for example, found that only 39% of the 1,070 U.S. institutions of higher education participating in a 2006 quantitative study on institutional support referred to internationalization or to preparing global ready

graduates in their mission statements. Only 34% of these institutions listed it among their top

five strategic priorities in that same study carried out by the researchers for the American

Council on Education (Green et al., 2008).

These numbers, even though surprisingly low, showed a slight increase from the 35% of

institutions referring to internationalization in their mission statements in a similar study

published by the American Council on Education in 2001 (Green et al., 2008). That 2001 study

showed that only 28% of the approximately 1,000 participating institutions listed

internationalization as one of their top five strategic priorities (Green et al., 2008). The

commitment to internationalization efforts appears to vary by institutional type, and doctorate-

granting universities showed the most commitment to internationalization, followed by master's

colleges and universities and then four-year institutions. Green et al. (2008) found that only 59%

of doctorate-degree granting institutions referred to internationalization or to global education in

their mission statements in the 2006 study compared to just 55% of master's colleges and

universities, and 43% of four-year institutions.

Through a survey carried out with administrators at 21 institutions of higher education in

the state of Colorado, Theobald (2009) found that just slightly more than 25% of the institutions

included internationalization in their mission statements, although "several indicated a general

support for diversity when asked to describe their missions" (p. 209). Theobald (2008)

concluded from the survey that "most institutions consider internationalization rather narrowly,

limited to coordinating international admissions, complying with immigration regulations or

designing international studies curricula" (p. 209).

This literature indicated, however, that having internationalization in the mission

statement does not ensure that the institution is actually committed to creating or sustaining an

internationalized campus. Many institutions recognize the importance of internationalization "as a component of institutional quality and attractiveness, but that a gap exists between the image institutions seek to project and the implementation of internationalization" (Green et al., 2008, p. 41). Ayoubi (2007) carried out a mixed methods study with 117 universities in the United Kingdom (UK) and found that 74% of the universities' mission statements include references to internationalization. However, through responses from administrators and document analysis of the institutions' website regarding international activity, the researcher found that only 48% of the institutions were making efforts to internationalize (Ayoubi, 2007). This research used a cluster analysis on two different variables for 117 universities that resulted in placing them in four different categories based on international activity and reference to internationalization in their mission statements. Thirty-seven percent of the universities have a high level of international activity as well as a strong commitment to it in their mission statement. Another 37% of universities had low levels of international activity but with internationalization figuring prominently in the mission statements (Ayoubi, 2007, p. 345). Eleven percent of the universities indicated being active in internationalization activities but did not reflect this in their mission statements (Ayoubi, 2007, p. 344). Fifteen percent of the universities in the fourth group did not have visible signs of internationalization efforts on campus, and do not include it in their mission statements (Ayoubi, 2007, p. 344).

Internationalization plans. The research shows that universities respond to internationalization in a variety of ways depending on their particular circumstances as well as on the vision and leadership provided by senior level administration and other stakeholders. Many institutions develop internationalization plans to serve as blueprints for how internationalization will be implemented. The 2006 study on internationalization by Green et al.

(2008) for the American Council on Education reports that only 23 percent of the institutions have internationalization plans. The researchers found that only 43% of doctorate-granting universities reported having internationalization plans out of the 1,070 U.S. institutions participating in this study (Green et al., 2008). The researchers also found that 32% of Master's level universities and 24% of four-year universities and colleges had internationalization plans (Green et al., 2008).

Childress (2009) found that 71% of the 26 universities participating in a survey sent to all members of the Association of International Education Administrators, an organization for senior level administration, had internationalization plans. The researcher concluded, "leaders at many of the institutions examined in this study perceived a written commitment as an important point of leverage in achieving an institution's goals for internationalization" (2009, p. 295). The internationalization plans institutions in this study use fall into three categories according to Childress (2009). Sixty-one percent of the institutions use institutional strategic plans, which included specific references to internationalization along with other university-wide plans. Thirty-two percent of institutions use distinct documents, or stand-alone plans, written to address university-wide implementation of internationalization. Nineteen percent of institutions use a unit plan designed to guide internationalization efforts in one or more units across the university. Childress concluded that unit plans do not promote comprehensive and systemic internationalization efforts across the campus (2009). Forty-two percent of doctorate-granting universities used Institutional Strategic Plans compared to 15% of master's universities, and 4% of four-year institutions. Distinct documents were used by 18% of doctorate-granting universities, 9% of Master's universities, and 5% of four-year institutions. Only 10% of

doctorate-granting universities used unit plans, compared to 4.5% used in master's universities, and 4.5% used in four-year institutions (Childress, 2009).

Childress (2009) found that "institutions' leadership, organizational structure, funding and priorities affected decisions about whether and how to develop internationalization plans" (p. 295). Senior leadership makes decisions on who takes charge of facilitating the development of an internationalization plan, as well as providing the structure and oversight needed to help with its implementation. Many institutions reported that their presidents, provosts, and chief international education administrators appointed a university-wide task force or planning committee to develop an internationalization plan (Childress, 2009). Institutions planning to implement a comprehensive campus-wide internationalization plan benefitted from appointing a task force or planning committee to allow for involvement from administrators and faculty from across the institution. Forty-nine percent of institutions of higher education reported having a university-wide task force or planning committee in 2001 compared to 44% in 2006 (Green et al., 2008). Seventy-one percent of doctorate-granting universities reported having a task force or a committee to develop internationalization plans in 2006. Only 55% of Master's universities and 50% of four-year institutions reported having a task force or a committee for planning efforts in 2006 (Green et al., 2008). Various factors were necessary for the successful development and implementation of these plans.

Support from the presidential level and other senior administration gave credibility to the idea of developing a plan. Childress (2009) pointed out that "widespread faculty engagement was an overarching enabling factor in implementation" (p. 301). Involving the faculty senate and having this body support internationalization efforts was essential to the success of both the planning and implementation stages of internationalization. One respondent from a doctorate-

granting university said, "In universities with strong faculty governance….the academic senate has complete authority …to implement any curricular initiatives including internationalization" (Childress, 2009, p. 301). The four major factors hindering successful planning and implementation of internationalization are the following: limited funding, lack of campus wide understanding of internationalization, faculty members' desire for autonomy, and lack of top-level support beyond rhetoric (Childress, 2009). A faculty member in a large public university in Colorado commented in a qualitative study, "that without a supportive environment, none of what we do would be viewed as helpful. While we have support in words, we sometimes lack support in deed" (Theobald, 2008, p. 210).

Financial support. The research showed that financial support is a major challenge of internationalization. More than half of the institutions responding to the survey on internationalization completed by Green et al. (2008) for the American Council for Education reported that they did not receive any external funding for internationalization in 2006. The researchers found that this was an increase over the 43% reported in a survey of the same institutions in 2001 (Green et al., 2008). However, the researchers found that 59% of doctorate-granting universities received external funding for internationalization efforts in 2006 (Green et al., 2008). In a study by Childress (2009), she found that institutions with senior level support for internationalization efforts were often able to fundraise in support of these efforts. One administrator at a large public institution in Oregon commented that "As important as internationalization is stated to be, given competing institutional priorities and the reality of limited resources and strained budgets, our resource-intensive proposals and recommendations to support internationalization have remained unfunded" (Dewey & Duff, 2009, p. 501).

Research showed that some institutions have a centralized international center responsible for all international initiatives, programs, activities, and ongoing internationalization efforts while other institutions use decentralized models and with oversight for specific programs and initiatives divided among departments or units (Green et al., 2008). The researchers found that ninety-seven percent of doctorate-granting universities reported having a centralized international office compared to 47% in master's universities, and 40% in four-year institutions out of the 1,070 universities in the study. Seventy-three percent of the 1,070 institutions in the study by Green et al. (2008) reported that they had one or more offices to oversee internationalization.

Ranking the International Dimension. Universities have long undergone annual rankings based on quantifiable indicators of performance. Such rankings result in identifying strong or weak institutions, provide for inter-institutional comparisons and benchmarking, and promote improvement efforts (Horn et al., 2007). A mixed methods study was carried out by Horn et al. (2007) involving 87 U.S. research institutions. The researchers developed a ranking system based on 19 international indicators to establish an empirical approach to evaluate the international dimension of each of the institutions (Horn et al., 2007). Categories such as student characteristics, scholar characteristics, research orientation, curricular content, and organizational support received weightings based on established criteria (Horn et al., 2007). Total outputs for each category, and various subcategories, were quantified to identify the most highly internationalized universities in the U.S. Columbia University, University of California-Berkeley, Georgetown University, University of Chicago, and Harvard University rated as having the highest levels of internationalization (Horn et al., 2007). Such an "explicit ranking of

research universities will allow administrators and researchers to identify strong and weak institutions for benchmarking performance or closer examination" (Horn et al., 2007, p.347).

Hser (2005) carried out similar research on the international ranking of universities with 59 member institutions of the Association of American Universities. The researcher established ranking criteria based on such things as number of foreign language and area centers, number of international students on campus, number of study abroad students, and other international research and related activities (Hser, 2005). The researcher found that the University of Wisconsin-Madison, the University of California Berkeley, the University of Texas at Austin and Columbia University ranked highest in terms of campus internationalization. Hser concluded that the number of international students on campus represents a strong indicator of internationalization. She posits that "U.S. higher education institutions should maintain their leadership role in educating world leaders by welcoming more international students and scholars to their campuses" (Hser, 2005, p. 44).

Burnett and Huisman (2010) carried out an explorative study on the internationalization activities of four Canadian universities. They looked at variables such as international student enrollment, faculty, staff, and student mobility, fostering international research and developing international curriculum as measures of success in internationalization in their study (Burnett & Husiman, 2010). The researchers found that universities with more entrepreneurial cultures and implementing a comprehensive, systematic approach to internationalization were more successful in their internationalization efforts. Universities with less developed entrepreneurial cultures and implementing a less systematic, more ad hoc approach to internationalization had not achieved the same results as had the more successful universities and had lower numbers of outputs (Burnett & Huisman, 2010).

Stromquist (2007) completed a case study of internationalization efforts within three departments at one private U.S. institution. She concluded that "some universities attempt to move up the ranks internationally, compared to other universities, by the hiring of "star" professors who often bring with them large research projects and the likelihood of more research projects in the future (p. 96). Stromquist found that it is still unclear how internationalization will affect the university culture in the end but that currently more importance is given to those areas generating revenue. She concluded that the departments emphasizing internationalization succeeded in increasing the number of faculty members and other resources (Stromquist, 2007). The researcher quotes one faculty member at this institution as saying, "The only way to improve the ranking of our university in the *US News and World Report* is to increase grant money from industry. We live and die by this ranking" (Stromquist, 2007, p. 2007).

Another researcher, Deardorff (2006), posits that the success of internationalization should be measured through student outcomes of intercultural and global competence and not on institutional rankings and outputs. The expected outcome of internationalization is the development of interculturally competent graduates and that is one-step beyond the numbers of outputs or participants (Deardorff, 2006). As one group of researchers concluded, "Despite the concurrence of perception within the higher education community, language learning and travel abroad are not necessarily at the core of what it takes to become globally competent" (Hunter, White, & Godbey, 2006, p. 278).

Faculty as Key Stakeholders

Some institutions often allocated specific resources for faculty research and initiatives, professional development, internationalization of the curriculum, research grants, and other incentives to help ensure that the faculty support internationalization efforts. Research showed

that faculty involvement in both the planning and implementation stages of the internationalization process are crucial to the success of internationalization efforts. The level of involvement faculty members have in the internationalization process varies among institutions.

Funding and incentives. Childress (2009) carried out a qualitative research study on incentives for faculty participation in internationalization at Duke University and the University of Richmond. The researcher concluded that these two institutions are examples of demonstrated success in involving the faculty in internationalization through incentives and other rewards. Both institutions provide large amounts of funds from different resources to help ensure that their faculty is actively involved with implementing and sustaining internationalization efforts on their campuses (Childress, 2009). Childress found that Duke's institutional strategic plan included faculty incentives provided by schools and centers, international scholar endowments, curriculum internationalization grants, and matching grants for international initiatives (Childress, 2009). Childress points out that a popular faculty incentive at Duke is support for international travel and research. Faculty may apply for up to $5,000 in travel awards from Duke's Center for International Studies and Global Health Institute to research global health issues around the world (Childress, 2009).

According to the study's findings, Duke carried out extensive fundraising efforts with alumni who had been international or study abroad students, or graduates of international degree programs in order to establish the Distinguished International Scholar Endowments (Childress, 2009). These endowments allow faculty members to benefit from collaborating with distinguished international scholars brought to Duke through these endowments as well as help faculty establish international networks. Duke also supported the development of international

48

and area studies centers through soliciting funds from the U.S Department of Education Title VI grants (Childress, 2009).

Childress also found that the University of Richmond received funds from multiple sources to support faculty involvement in their active internationalization plan. The senior administration "make targeted investments in internationalization plans and to offer faculty a variety of programs through which to connect their scholarly agendas with their institution's internationalization agenda" (Childress, 2009, p. 40). Faculty engagement in internationalization is reinforced throughout the institution when funds allocated from a variety of different resources support faculty initiatives (Childress, 2009).

Ray and Solem (2009) carried out a survey of 423 department chairs in geography to assess faculty incentives in internationalization efforts. The researchers found that opportunities to provide incentives for faculty varied among institutions. The study cites one faculty member as saying, "opportunities and support for faculty advancement are often limited or unavailable, particularly in the area of instructional development and especially for graduate students and early career faculty" (Ray & Solem, 2009, p. 114.) The researchers concluded that "professional development can play a significant role in the success of internationalization by providing faculty with the resources and support they need to collaborate internationally and incorporate global learning outcomes into geography curricula" (Ray & Solem, 2009, p. 116).

 Bogotch and Maslin-Ostrowski (2010) carried out a qualitative research study at a public research institution in the U.S. to examine how a department has internationalized from the perspective of the faculty. The researchers found that there were repeated comments from faculty about lack of travel monies to support grant research. The study cites one faculty member as saying, "Grant seeking is an arduous, time-consuming, and inefficient means by

which to conduct research or work with others internationally, but basically it is the only one path available to those of us who believe in the work of collectively moving public education forward globally" (Bogotch & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2010, p. 233). At this same institution, another faculty member commented on how recent budget cuts put great strains on their work toward internationalizing their department (Bogotch & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2010). The researchers concluded that the role of the chair is essential to promote and support faculty activity in internationalization.

Dewey and Duff (2009) found that many university policies concerning leave served as financial disincentives for faculty to take advantage of international research grants and even Fulbright fellowships in their study of one department at a comprehensive public research institution. The researchers also found that the application process for international research and engagement in international activities was extensive and considered too time consuming by many faculty (Dewey & Duff, 2009). One faculty member in this study stated, "It became quickly evident through our committee's work that an incentive system and support infrastructure for faculty involvement in international activity still needed to be created" (Dewey & Duff, 2009, p. 501). Senior administration and faculty at another institution arrived at the following conclusion:

> The relatively straightforward and uncontroversial steps that departments and institutions can enact to encourage international collaboration are offering compensation and rewards to faculty through existing academicmechanisms such as tenure and promotion policy, providing faculty withtraining and time to learn collaborative practices including the use of information and communication technology,…..to meet shared educational goals across national borders. (Ray & Solem, 2009, p. 114)

However, some institutions found it difficult to establish a recognition or rewards system. There are controversies about how to evaluate and reward the various international initiatives faculty are involved in. In a study by Arthur, Patton, and Giancarlo (2007) on internationalization and

50

faculty incentives, the researchers concluded, "It appears that there is a lag between mandates for internationalization, and how those mandates translate into the domains of academic scholarship in domains of teaching, research, and service" (p. 343).

However, statistics on institutional support for faculty participation in internationalization efforts at doctorate-granting universities in 2006 showed an increase over 2001 according to the study completed by Green, et al. (2008). Ninety-one percent of the 1,070 institutions in this study reported some support for faculty travel to international meetings and conferences in 2006 compared to just 71% of the institutions that reported this type of support in 2001 (Green et al., 2008). Eighty-six percent of institutions reported providing support for faculty studying or conducting research abroad in 2006 compared to only 71% in 2001 (Green et al., 2008).

Another way in which institutions encouraged and supported faculty involvement in internationalization efforts was to include some international criteria into their processes for hiring, promotion and tenure. Stromquist (2007) carried out a study on several academic departments in a private institution a few years after internationalization efforts had been implemented. The researcher found that the three departments which were involved in internationalization had a higher proportion of tenured or tenure-track faculty than those departments that were not as involved in internationalization (Stromquist, 2007). The study showed that the Department of Business had 62% tenure or tenure track faculty, the Department of Communication had 66%, and the Department of Engineering had 81% (Stromquist, 2007). In 2008, Green et al. found that 92% of 1,070 institutions in a study in the U.S. on internationalization lacked guidelines that made international work or experience part of the criteria for promotion and tenure decisions. According to the researchers, only 9% of institutions in the research study "frequently gave preference to candidates with international backgrounds,

experiences, or interests when hiring faculty in fields that are not explicitly international/global in nature" (Green et al., 2008, p. 19). Approximately 21% of all higher education institutions participating in this study acknowledged international activity of faculty with special recognition awards in 2006 compared to 12% of institutions who reported such awards in 2001 in a similar survey (Green et al., 2008).

Role of faculty in internationalization efforts. Faculty members played a key role in integrating internationalization throughout the teaching, research and service of an institution according to Schoorman (1999). Schoorman (1999) studied the impact of faculty on internationalization at one research institution. The researcher found that the successful implementation of internationalization is strongly linked to organizational members' conceptualizations of the process (Schoorman, 1999, p. 28). Ray and Solem (2009) concluded in their study on faculty participation in internationalization that the challenge to institutions is to ensure that faculty involvement in internationalization complements, rather than distracts from, their work in all other areas such as research, teaching, and service.

Cummings and Bain (2009) surveyed over 800 faculty members in 20 countries about the involvement of faculty in internationalization. The researchers found that the role of the U.S. academy in internationalization efforts is "surprisingly insular in its approach to academic work compared to the academics in societies with similar economic levels" (Cummings & Bain, 2009, p. 112). Faculty involvement in internationalization is important and "we as faculty may wholeheartedly support a commitment to internationalization, but there needs to be solid coordination between institutional goals and faculty initiatives," stated Dewey and Duff (2009) in their study on internationalization and faculty (p. 502). Faculty need to help ensure that their faculty initiatives support those of the institution, but they are not the ones responsible for

52

implementing comprehensive internationalization at an institution. The researchers also found that faculty members are often willing to participate in discussions about their understanding of internationalization and to share practices about teaching and learning issues. Dewey and Duff (2009) concluded that, "University administrators cannot implement internationalization without coordination, support and participation by the faculty" (p. 502).

Robson and Turner (2007) found in their study on internationalization with 35 faculty members at one institution in the United Kingdom that many faculty members had the perception that internationalization involved increasing the diversity of the student body just to generate additional income from tuition. The study also showed, however, that the faculty appreciated the opportunity to reflect on teaching practices and to participate in professional development opportunities related to internationalization. The researchers concluded that the faculty appreciated the opportunities to "facilitate the development of inclusive learning environments" (Robson & Turner, 2007, p. 51).

Institutional support of faculty teaching and research is an investment in professional development that helps create "an academic climate that provides faculty with a sense of security and freedom to explore unfamiliar practices such as international collaboration" (Ray & Solem, 2009, p. 114). Support for faculty to teach and do research abroad also benefits institutions' internationalization through the increased skills and competencies faculty acquire during such experiences. Hamza (2010) found that "educators' scholarly activities overseas confirmed that they gained a multicultural outlook from their experiences that added strength to their research credentials" in a study on international professional development opportunities for nine female faculty members from various U.S. institutions who had previously taught for one year or more in various countries in the Gulf Region (p. 65). The researcher concluded that the international

professional development experience of the faculty added "an international flavor to their course content and programs and helped their colleagues in American institutions prepare for such an international experience" (Hamza, 2010, p. 65).

In the study by Arthur et al. (2007), the researchers found that faculty members who have international teaching experiences also reported increased credibility and recognition from academic peers. International teaching experiences provided faculty with the skills and increased awareness needed to help them work more effectively with different learning styles and in diverse classrooms. The researchers stated in their study that, "The institutional benefits of faculty members participating in international projects appeared to be consistent with the overriding mandates for campus internationalization" (Arthur et al., 2007, p. 340). Bogotch and Maslin-Ostrowski (2010) also found similar findings in their study with 18 faculty members and internationalization at one public institution. The researchers reported that one faculty member described how her international experience "made me think differently; how these experiences have opened my eyes to work with others around the world. I am much more able to understand issues from multiple perspectives" (Bogotch & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2010, p. 227).

Other faculty members reported that the international work they had participated in extended beyond their academic roles and helped enhance their sense of personal and professional accomplishments. Fifty faculty members at one university in the Northeast completed a survey by Olson and Kroeger (2001) on internationalization and faculty professional development. The researchers found that faculty felt professional development "should be ongoing and inclusive of work in another language and culture" (Olson & Kroeger, 2001, p. 133). The participants in the study stated that such professional development opportunities on

campus might include such things as "globally oriented theme seminars… and cross-discipline team teaching" (Olson & Kroeger, 2001, p. 133).

Role of department in internationalization efforts. Even though senior administration of an institution decides to implement comprehensive and university-wide internationalization does not guarantee that every department within the institution will respond the same way to this decision. Schoorman (1999) carried out a study on the responses of two different academic departments to a university-wide mandate to internationalize. The researcher found in her study that faculty in the Department of Business responded positively to the idea of internationalization. However, the researcher found that faculty in the Department of Science resisted the mandate to internationalize since they considered the department already internationalized because of the content in the field of science (Schoorman, 1999). When the Department of Science members were interviewed about the mission to internationalize, their responses were not positive. The researcher quoted one faculty member in the study from the Department of Science as saying, "I have very little sympathy for this cultural engineering. I think what the university should do is concentrate on raising standards, not artificial enhancements of certain concepts" (Schoorman, 1999, p. 28). The researcher reported that the respondents in the Department of Business acknowledged the value of including a cross-cultural perspective into the curriculum and the pedagogy (Schoorman, 1999).

Bogotch & Maslin-Ostrowski (2010) carried out a study of one's department response to the university-wide decision to internationalize at a small regional state university. The mission of this regional state university was to serve the local community with no prior emphasis on internationalization. The researchers reported that the departmental mission included no mention of internationalization, however, changes made under a new chair put internationalization "at the

core of individual faculty agendas" (Bogotch & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2010, p. 222). The new

department chair organized international initiatives to provide faculty members with

opportunities to become involved with internationalization. The chair began recruitment efforts

to attract international to diversity the department. The increased enrollment of international

students helped "break down the isolation and led to dissertation studies with an international

theme and collaboration with faculty on international research" (Bogotch and Maslin-Ostrowski,

2010, p. 225). The researchers concluded that the role of the department in internationalization

depends greatly on the leadership of the chair and on the involvement in key stakeholders

(Maslin-Ostrowski, 2010).

      Curriculum internationalization. Internationalization efforts at institutions often

involve campus-wide initiatives to internationalize the curriculum and provide support for such

initiatives. Schoorman (1999) carried out a study on faculty support to internationalize the

curriculum after a university wide mandate to internationalize the campus. Schoorman (1999)

found that faculty support for internationalization of the curriculum in the Department of English

and the Department of Business was often based on "students' need to know about international

issues pertinent to their academic field and that content should move beyond the traditional

Western orientation of subject matter" (p. 40). Clark (2004) posits that an internationalized

curriculum "should also include knowledge about the major international constructs such as

international economics, marketing, management, law, politics, religions, and the environments"

(p. 68). Bogotch and Maslin-Ostrowski (2010) had a similar conclusion in their study on

departmental response to internationalization. The researchers concluded that curriculum could

be infused with an international perspective in a variety of ways including reading assignments

and class discussions, guest speakers, and experiential learning opportunities (Bogotch &

Maslin-Ostrowski, 2010). The survey of over 1,000 institutions on internationalization by Green

et al. (2008) showed that 47% of doctoral universities provided support for curriculum

internationalization efforts in 2006, down slightly from the 50% who reported providing support

in 2001. The percentage of doctoral universities providing workshops for faculty on how to

internationalize the curriculum, however, increased from 30% in 2001 to 59% in 2006 (Green et

al., 2008).

Ten faculty participants in a workshop on curriculum internationalization reported that

they "were better able to anticipate and address problems or issues associated with

internationalization" in a qualitative study completed by Schuerholz-Lehr et al., (2007) in one

Canadian university (p. 86). Others "acknowledged that the workshop had helped them change

their perspective and understanding of the concept of internationalization" (Schuerholz-Lehr et

al., 2007, p. 83). One participant commented, "I no longer immediately think of a place on the

globe when I hear 'international' or 'internationalization'—I now think of a place within the

mind's eye" (Schuerholz-Lehr et al., 2007, p. 83).

Childress (2009) found in her study of internationalization efforts at Duke University and

the University of Richmond that both institutions relied on both internal and external sources of

funding to help support faculty in their curriculum internationalization efforts. The researcher

stated in her study that Duke's Title VI Centers provided grants of up to $3,000 for faculty to

develop courses that have at least 35% East Asian (i.e. Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and

Taiwanese) content and will be taught at least twice in the next five years courses in their

Asian/Pacific Studies Institute (Childress, 2009). The Duke Study Abroad office also offers

funding to faculty to integrate study abroad experiences in to their courses through the

"Curriculum Integration Initiative" (Childress, 2009). The president at the University of

Richmond launched "The Richmond Quest" program in 2000 that provides significant funding

for faculty to internationalize their courses and carry out research (Childress, 2009). Faculty also

has the opportunity to apply for curriculum internationalization grants funded by the office of

international education at the University of Richmond. Awards of $3,000 to $3,500 are provided

for the development of new courses with international content, and awards of $1,500 to $2,000

are provided to "infuse international perspectives into existing courses" (Childress, 2009, p. 39).

Theories on Organizational Culture and Change

Organizational Culture

The organizational culture of an institution relates to the internationalization process and

plays a key role in how internationalization develops within an institution. Peterson and Spencer

(1990) define organizational culture as "the deeply embedded patterns of organizational behavior

and the shared values, assumptions, beliefs, or ideologies that members have about their

organization or its work" (p. 5). Birnbaum (1988) defines it as a "range of possible behaviors

within which the organization usually functions" (p. 73). Tierney (1988) explains that

organizational culture "derives its force from the values, processes, and goals held by those most

intimately involved in the organization's workings" (p. 3). Hatch and Schultz (1997) posit that

"we perceive organizational culture as a symbolic context within which interpretations of

organizational identity are formed and intentions to influence organizational image are

formulated" (p. 360).

The study of organizational culture comes from multiple disciplines with most of the

work in sociology, anthropology and psychology. Ouchi and Wilkins (1985) offer the view that

"the contemporary study of organizational culture may be best understood as a continuation of

the main line of organizational sociology" (p. 458). They see the study of organizational culture

58

as growing out of a conflict in organizational sociology between those that study what is explicit versus what is implicit in organizations (Ouchi & Wilkins, 1985). They view the contemporary study of organizational culture as "bringing to life the richness and the vitality of people working and living together" (p. 459). They acknowledge that the study of organizational culture is not dominated by any single discipline but rather comes from a variety of viewpoints, ideas and approaches. They credit anthropologists for adding much to the study of organizational culture through their methods and points of view (Ouchi & Wilkins, 1985). Schein (1990) posits that organizational culture is rooted in organizational psychology but that the concept has grown to where "there is little agreement on what the concept does and should mean, how it should be observed and measured, how it relates to more traditional industrial and organizational psychology theories, and how it should be used in our efforts to help organizations" (p. 109) Schein (1990) credits the growing interest in organizational culture to the need for business and management schools to better understand organizations and organizational relationships.

Tierney (1988) views organizational culture from a more anthropological perspective. He sees organizational culture as "the study of particular webs of significance within an organizational setting. That is we look at an organization as a traditional anthropologist would study a particular village or clan" (Tierney, 1988, p. 4). He claims that organizational culture exists through the "shared assumptions of individuals participating in the organization" (Tierney, 1988, p. 4).

Organizational culture can be complex and exist at various levels within organizations. There may be multiple subcultures within any organization. Ouchi and Wilkins (1985) see the current theory on organizational culture focusing on either macro analytic or micro analytic levels within an institution. They define the macro analytic theory as focusing on the culture of

59

the group, "or the conditions under which the group and its culture and subcultures develop" (p. 471). Ouchi and Wilkins (1985) define the micro analytic theory as focusing on what "resides within each individual and can be understood through the cognitive processes of sense-making, learning, and causal attribution" (p. 471).

Schein (1990) defines three fundamental levels of culture within a group or organization as "artifacts, values and basic underlying assumptions" (p. 111). He says that,

> new members of an organization are influenced by all three levels of culture. They adjust to and accept the "layout, the dress code, the manner in which people address each other, the smell and feel of the place, its emotional intensity, and other phenomena, to the more permanent archival manifestations such as company records, products, statements of philosophy, and annual reports. (p. 111)

Schein (1990) posits that there will be an overall shared culture in an organization resulting from common history and experiences of the members. He acknowledges that there will be integration within any unit and that "it is perfectly possible for coexisting units of a larger system to have cultures that are independent and even in conflict with each other" (Schein, 1990, p. 111). Tierney (1988) takes a similar stance and concurs that conflict is possible due to the difference in the cultures that exist on many different levels within an institution as well as within a larger system. He says that a central goal of "understanding organizational culture is to minimize the occurrence and consequences of cultural conflict and help foster the development of shared goals" (Tierney, 1988, p. 5). Tierney posits that administrators will benefit from understanding the cultural dynamics within their institutions and thus be better prepared to reduce "adversarial relationships" and make the decisions that best fit within the culture of a particular institution.

Organizational Change

Organizational change is described by Zaltman and Duncan (1977) as "an alteration in the structures, processes and/or behaviors in a system" (p. 15). Bess and Dee (2008) posit that "change is elusive and difficult to initiate and manage, and change is always occurring at all levels of the organization" (p. 819). Such organizational change, according to Bess and Dee (2008), can fall into two categories of either planned change or emergent change. Planned change involves top management decision making in which "leaders and decision makers emerge to focus energy in structures and activities charged expressly with the function or responsibility for managing change" (Bess & Dee, 2008, p. 799). Internal and external feedback is used by senior leadership to make decisions and guide the organization through the change process necessary to reach established goals.

The second category of change is emergent change resulting from local level changes initiated by faculty, administrators or front line staff in efforts to improve practices or services (Bess & Dee, 2008). These emergent changes often involve creative and innovative ideas that are recognized and supported by senior level administrators. One example of this, according to Bess and Dee (2008), is that service learning which combines classroom content with community engagement "emerged through local faculty initiative and have since been incorporated on a large scale at many institutions" (p. 808). Kezar, Gallant, and Lester (2011) define emergent change as a result of grassroots leadership. The researchers state that grassroots leadership involves "the actions of those who wish to create change or challenge the status quo, but are not in positions or roles that have the power to easily and directly create change" (Kezar et al., 2011, p. 132). Kezar et al. (2011) found that some faculty and staff used grassroots leadership to bring about change by beginning discussions about the importance of an initiative, raising the

61

consciousness of counterparts, and networking throughout units in a university. The researchers also found that faculty and staff used shared governance and the opportunities to form or join committees to help facilitate organizational change (Kezar et al., 2011).

There are different levels of organizational change ranging from incremental or structural (first-order) change to radical or transformational (second-order) change," according to Boyce (2003, p. 125). First-order changes are made to add, eliminate or revise courses or programs, and to modify practices and procedures without changing the overall framework for how the entire institution operates (Boyce, 2003). These changes may be temporary and may be reversed or modified over time. Levy (1986) characterizes first-order change as "change that does not alter the world view, the paradigm and as change within the old state of being (thinking and acting)" (p. 11). These types of first-order changes are often the result of single-loop learning defined "as the learning that occurs from feedback generated by monitoring the effects of ongoing organizational processes and behaviors" (Bess & Dee, 2008, p. 674). Single-loop learning is used to correct mistakes and enhance procedures "but does not explore why the mistakes were made in the first place" (Bess & Dee, 2008, p. 675).

Second-order change, according to Boyce (2003) is transformational and irreversible and may involve changes to the "mission, vision, culture, structures, processes, performance, and behavior" of the institution (p. 127). Second-order change requires "rigorous organizational inquiry, continuous practice of examining assumptions, surfacing and challenging mental models, and acting on what is learned" (Boyce, 2003, p. 128). Levy (1986) characterizes second-order change as change that results in a new world view, new paradigm and change that results in a new state of being (thinking and acting)" (p. 11). Second-order changes are often the result of double-loop learning in which leaders question and analyze the organization's core

beliefs and "may identify inadequacies in existing goals, policies, and behavioral routines" (Bess & Dee, 2008, p. 676).

According to Kezar and Eckel (2002), the organizational culture of an institution affects change strategies at an institution. Change is often brought about within institutions as the organizational culture shifts in response to phenomenon and to better meet the needs of both internal and external stakeholders. The researchers concluded from a study of six institutions on organizational culture and organizational change that that there is a relationship between institutional culture and change. The researchers also concluded that the various layers of culture within an organization should be considered to best identify the most effective change strategies for a particular institution (Kezar & Eckel, 2002). The organizational change in their research was comprehensive and defined as transformational change which "alters the culture of the institution by changing select underlying assumptions and institutional behaviors, processes, and products; is deep and pervasive, affecting the whole institution; is intentional; and occurs over time" (Eckel, Hill & Green, 1998, p. 3).

Kezar and Eckel (2002) identified five core change strategies in their study on how culture affects change at six institutions. The change strategies are senior administrative support, collaborative leadership, robust design, staff development, and visible actions. The researchers found that the distinct institutional cultures of the universities in the study shaped "the application of each change strategy" (Kezar and Eckel, 2002, p. 446). The researchers concluded that change strategies used by institutions need to be aligned with their institutional culture in order to be most effective. Kezar and Eckel (2002) stated that "leaders might be more successful in facilitating change if they understood the cultures in which they were working" (p. 457).

Summary

The review of the literature documented several key components for developing systemic and comprehensive internationalization, "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (Knight, 2003, p. 2). The goal to internationalization is to provide students with the intercultural competencies and skills they need to succeed in today's global society and to develop global ready graduates.

The first key component necessary for internationalization is university support. Burnett (2010) and Ayoubi (2007) both presented studies showing the importance of institutional support in bringing about the organizational change necessary to implement internationalization systemically throughout the institution. Agnew and VanBalkom (2009) posited that the vision of an institution needs to be in alignment with internationalization efforts. Childress (2009) presented a comprehensive study of the various types of internationalization plans institutions are using as a blueprint to implement change. Jurgens and Robbins-O'Connell (2008) cautioned that unless institutions provide comprehensive support for internationalization, such efforts will not progress beyond rhetoric. Therefore, institutional support for internationalization efforts provided through funding, vision, leadership, and internationalization plans is essential to initiate such efforts.

Faculty involvement as part of the planning and implementation of internationalization efforts makes up another key component to the process. Schoorman (1999) made a strong case for the importance of including faculty in the planning and implementation stages of internationalization efforts. Engaging faculty members in the process helps "ensure that the mission of internationalization will be viewed as a permanent part of the education process"

64

(Schoorman, 1999, p. 38). Incentives to encourage faculty to infuse an international perspective into current courses or to develop new courses is also crucial. Childress's (2009) research on several universities made a strong case for the importance of institutional funding to support faculty involvement in international activity, research and collaborative projects.

Another component of internationalization is the presence of international students on campus to provide a diverse and culturally rich learning environment. A culturally rich campus environment is necessary to help develop global ready graduates with an understanding of cultural differences as well as the ability to interact and collaborate with people of various cultures. Research by Volet and Ang (1998) showed how students in culturally mixed groups benefit from interacting with each other in group projects and activities. The study clearly demonstrated that strategic planning on the part of the professor brought about this interaction by placing students in mixed groups rather than allowing them to self-select into groups with similar cultures. Lee's (2006) research on the benefits of intercultural friendships, showed how friendships provide students with opportunities to learn about and experience different cultures.

Knight's (1994) research on the six phases of internationalization showed that internationalization is an ongoing process. Knight's internationalization phases of "awareness, commitment, planning, operationalize, review and reinforcement" demonstrated that it is a complex process and one requiring support of the senior level administration as well as campus stakeholders (p. 12). Knight (1994) posited that the way in which senior administrators and campus stakeholders interpret the importance of internationalization and support those efforts will determine the extent to which internationalization develops on a campus.

The review of organizational culture and change theories showed that the successful implementation of any phenomenon, such as internationalization, needs to be carried out with

strategies that align with the culture of that particular institution. The research of Kezar and

Eckel (2002) showed that culture and change are closely related and senior leadership and

administrators need to understand the culture of their institution in order to more effectively

bring about any organizational changes. This is of particular relevance to this research project

since the internationalization process is supported or deterred by organizational culture and

change.

Theoretical Frameworks

I used Tierney's (1988) framework on the *Six Concepts of Culture*, in combination with

Kezar and Eckel's (2002) framework on *Five Change Strategies*, to examine why the FSU

stakeholders consider internationalization important and how they view the progress of

internationalization efforts at FSU. The unit of analysis for this study was internationalization.

The use of these two frameworks provided more depth to the study and allowed me to examine

how the organizational culture and organizational change at FSU supported or deterred

internationalization efforts. Table 2 shows the two frameworks for this study.

Table 2

Tierney's Framework of Organizational Culture and Kezar and Eckel's Framework on Organizational Change Strategies

	Tierney's Six Concepts of Culture		Kezar and Eckel's Five Change Strategies
Environment	• How does the organization define its environment? • What is the attitude toward the environment?	Senior Administrative Support	• Who are the leaders providing support for change? • What resources or administrative structures are provided in support of change?
Mission	• How is it defined? • How is it articulated? • Is it used as a basis for decisions? • How much agreement is there?	Collaborative Leadership	• How are faculty and staff involved in the change initiative from conception to implementation?
Socialization	• How do new members become socialized? • How is it articulated?	Robust Design	• How is the desired outcome of the change presented to stakeholders? • What are the goals and objectives to get there?
Information	• What constitutes information? • Who has it? • How is it disseminated?	Staff Development	• What programming efforts are provided for staff to gain skills and knowledge about the change effort?
Strategy	• How are decisions arrived at? • Which strategy is used? • Who makes decisions?	Visible Actions	• What activities are in process in support of change? • How do these reflect the importance of the change initiative?
Leadership	• What does the organization expect from its leaders? • Who are the leaders? • Are there formal and informal leaders?		

These frameworks combined to provide an ideal lens through which to analyze how the organizational culture and organizational change related to internationalization efforts at one institution where there was no university wide mandate to internationalize. Tierney (1988) stated that "an analysis of organizational culture of a college or university occurs as if the institution were an interconnected web that cannot be understood unless one looks not only at the structure and natural laws of that web, but also at the actors' interpretations of the web itself" (p. 4). Exploring the six cultural concepts in depth with the institutional stakeholders provided insight into how aspects of the organizational culture supported or deterred the changes made to advance some internationalization efforts within the institution. The use of Kezar and Eckel's (2002) *Five Change Strategies*, in addition to Tierney's (1988) *Six Concepts of Culture*, provided me with an additional lens to examine how the changes that took place within the institution related to the institutional culture. The combined use of these two frameworks allowed for the exploration of multiple stakeholders' perspectives on internationalization at an institution without a university wide initiative to internationalize.

This analysis provided insight and an understanding of how participants define and view the importance of internationalization and the progress toward internationalization the campus as one institution. Questions to elicit stakeholders' perspectives on the definition of internationalization, how they envision an internationalized campus and the expected benefits of internationalization provided insight into the importance internationalization has for FSU stakeholders. The analysis of how senior leadership, administrators, faculty, and students view internationalization efforts at FSU provided insight into the challenges deterring FSU from advancing internationalization and helped explain why FSU is not considered an internationalized campus. This data also provided clear examples of the progress made to

implement some internationalization initiatives at FSU even though no university wide mandate exists to internationalization the campus and helped explain the strengths supporting such initiatives. The data analysis from this research study showed how organizational culture and change at one institution related to the internationalization efforts.

Successful implementation of internationalization efforts within a campus without a university wide mandate to internationalize depends on the cultural components of that organization that support or deter the changes needed to develop such efforts. Therefore, a comprehensive analysis of the institution using Tierney's (1988) framework on *Six Concepts of Culture*, and Kezar and Eckel's (2002) framework on *Five Change Strategies* provided critical insight into the relationship between organizational culture and change and the development of internationalization efforts at one institution. Such an in-depth analysis of the institutional culture and change regarding internationalization with multiple stakeholders throughout campus provided insight concerning the importance of internationalization and the progress made toward internationalizing the campus at one institution. This study generated rich, descriptive data on the relationship between organizational culture and change and internationalization efforts at one institution, and allowed me to answer the research questions.

CHAPTER III:

METHODS AND DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter describes the research design, and data collection and data analysis methods used for this qualitative, descriptive case study. It also provides background information on the site selected for this study and an overview of my positionality as it relates to this study and the research site. The steps for data collection and data analysis are presented, along with the measures taken to help ensure trustworthiness of the study.

Methods

I used a qualitative, descriptive case study design for this research. Qualitative was the most appropriate approach for many reasons. Merriam (2009), for example, posits that qualitative research provides the means for "understanding the meaning people have constructed, that is, how people make sense of their world and the experiences they have in the world" (p. 13), which is a goal of this study. Through the use of a qualitative research design, I was able to explore, understand and interpret the phenomenon of internationalization within the context of organizational culture on one university campus through in-depth discussions and focus groups with campus stakeholders. A qualitative research design provided the opportunity to engage the stakeholders in dialogue and use follow up questions to explore their experiences in the internationalization process and analyze how these related to the organizational culture and organizational changes in support of internationalization. This inquiry resulted in rich, descriptive data showing the relationship between organizational culture and change and internationalization efforts at one institution.

A bounded, single case descriptive case study was used for this qualitative study. The use of a case study design allowed me to describe and develop themes from the data and "form

an in-depth understanding of the central phenomenon through description and thematic development" (Creswell, 2008, p. 254). An exploration of the relationship between organizational culture and change and internationalization efforts was carried out through interviews and focus groups with multiple stakeholders as well as through document analysis. According to Yin (2009), a case study is "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context…" (p. 18). The use of a case study design provided opportunities to engage with campus participants and better understand their perceptions, knowledge, opinions, support and concerns about campus internationalization. The use of a case study facilitated the in-depth exploration of the description, analysis and interpretation of the relationship between organizational culture and change and internationalization efforts (Creswell, 2008). The use of a descriptive case study also allowed me to answer the research question using a rich, "thick" description of the phenomenon under study" and provide readers with a description of the relationship between campus internationalization and organizational culture (Merriam, 2009, p. 43).

Research Questions

This study addressed the following questions:

1. How do Florida State University stakeholders perceive internationalization?

2. How do organizational culture and change support or deter internationalization efforts at Florida State University?

Site Selection

I selected Florida State University (FSU) as the site for this study because progress has been made toward internationalizing the campus in the last few years without a university-wide mandate to internationalize. Much of the progress in internationalization resulted from efforts of multiple stakeholders across the university who collaborated to develop and implement various internationalization initiatives. Although the institution had not yet formally adopted internationalization as part of its strategic plan, much of the notable growth in internationalization was due to the grassroots efforts of a variety of stakeholders with support and involvement from some of the senior leadership. The growth of campus internationalization resulted in increased intercultural learning opportunities for students through new programs, courses, and co-curricular activities. FSU provided an ideal site to explore the relationship between organizational culture and change and internationalization efforts because of the recent growth of campus internationalization and the senior leadership support and collaborative efforts of some stakeholders throughout the institution. Moreover, I work at this institution and had access to the multiple data sources needed for this case study.

Background of the Site

FSU is one of 11 institutions in the Florida state university system, and is a research university with very high research activity (RU/VH) according to the Carnegie Classification. Acceptance into this institution is highly competitive, and only 25% of applicants are accepted into the freshman class each year. Enrollment of approximately 40,000 students makes it the third largest institution in the state.

FSU prides itself on the diversity of the student body. The breakdown of the overall student body by race and ethnicity is the following: 3.5% Asian Pacific Islander, 10.2% African

American, 12.3% Hispanic/Latino, 3.5% international, and 68% white. FSU is a national leader in the number of doctoral degrees awarded to African Americans and has one of the highest graduation rates for African Americans in the nation. The FSU College of Law and College of Medicine rank among the top ten in the nation for Hispanic students.

FSU enrolls approximately 1,250 international students per year. Eighty percent of the international students are at the graduate level and the other 20% are undergraduates. International student enrollment at FSU ranks seventh among the universities in the state. Other institutions in the state, however, have had international recruitment plans in place for many years and are actively working to increase the number of international students both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. FSU has never had a strategic plan for actively recruiting international students. The majority of the freshman class entering FSU each year is made up of Florida residents. The state cap on freshman enrollment at FSU, together with the high number of Florida residents who apply each year, severely limits the number of spaces available for freshmen international students. For this reason, the majority of international students at FSU are at the graduate level. Many of the international graduate students apply for graduate assistantships to help fund their education. Assistantships for international students, however, cost academic departments much more than those for Florida residents because of the cost of out of state tuition waivers. For this reason, some departments at FSU have limited the number of international graduate students they will accept on assistantships.

FSU has been involved in internationalization abroad for many years. There has been a very large and well-developed study abroad program with four FSU centers located in England, Spain, Italy, and Panama for several decades. There are also numerous, short-term faculty led programs available to students to study in various countries around the world every summer.

Prior to internationalization efforts beginning in 2006/2007, there were no courses specifically designed to help prepare students for international experiences or to provide them with courses to help them reflect and process their international experiences upon their return home. There were several bilateral exchange agreements with international partners, but there was no structure set up at FSU to help ensure that FSU students learned about and participated in these exchanges. Even though there were various departments in the institution involved in international activity, there was not a central website with all information about international and intercultural activity and opportunities at FSU.

In 2006, stakeholders across the institution organized to collaborate on establishing a plan to help internationalize the campus. This followed a visit by interculturalist Dr. Milton Bennett, who gave several days of presentations and workshops on strategies for how to develop campus internationalization efforts. Many administrators, faculty, staff, and students attended the presentations and workshops and this led to many discussions and shared interest about how to develop campus internationalization. Following are some of the accomplishments in campus internationalization efforts achieved since 2006.

Global Pathways Certificate. The Global Pathways Certificate was developed in 2007 to help students maximize their experiences on campus, in the community and abroad. Students need to complete four courses with an international focus and participate in an international experience or an extended intercultural experience in the U.S. as some of the requirements for the certificate. They must also participate in eight social and cultural, educational, service and experiential activities or programs with an international or intercultural focus.

Global website. The FSU Global website was designed and added to the main FSU page in 2007. This page highlights all of the different international opportunities for students to go

abroad through service, internships, exchanges, and study abroad. It also publicizes all events on campus with an international focus and has increased the visibility of internationalization efforts on the campus.

Exchange and cooperative agreements. A formal process was established for the development and management of all bilateral and cooperative agreements at FSU. Prior to the internationalization initiative, there were only several international agreements with a few FSU students participating in any one year. A fulltime exchange coordinator was hired to manage the exchange process, increase the number of exchange and cooperative agreements, and ensure that the exchanges remain balanced between incoming and outbound students. FSU now has over 45 signed bilateral agreements and students are participating in exchange programs in over 20 countries. These exchange agreements offer students the option of studying on international campuses and being immersed in the local culture.

Development of international policy. An official policy was established in 2009 to ensure the safety and security of all students participating in international experiences. In addition, the policy attempts to ensure that all international programs are academically and culturally enriching experiences and that students follow the correct procedures before participating in an international experience.

Global engagement courses. A three-credit course was designed in 2010 to help provide students with the knowledge, skills and competencies needed prior to engaging in international experiences abroad. This course, *Theory and Practice for Global Engagement*, is now a required course for the international component of the FSU president's new Garnet and Gold Honor Society. It also qualifies as a course requirement for students enrolled in the Global Pathways Certificate Program. A one-credit course, *Applying Your Global Experience*, was

designed to provide returning students with the opportunity to reflect on and process their international experience. A new 3-credit general studies course, *Global Perspectives*, was developed by different academic and Student Affairs members involved in internationalization efforts. This proposed course is being reviewed by the university curriculum committee with the expectation that this course will be available for fall 2012.

Workshops offered to faculty on how to internationalize specific courses and integrate intercultural and international perspectives into the course content, however, did not meet with much success. Even though these workshops were offered to faculty as free professional development, no faculty members elected to participate. There are no incentives for faculty to internationalize their courses or to develop new courses. Faculty involvement in internationalization efforts is not part of the current tenure and promotion policy at FSU.

In addition to the above accomplishments of the working group and stakeholders across the campus, a major university-wide accomplishment in support of campus internationalization was the building of a new, state of the art Center for Global and Multicultural Engagement in 2009. The new building is located in a prime location on campus, and increases the visibility of the intercultural and international opportunities available to students.

Center for Global Engagement

The new Center for Global and Multicultural Engagement, home to the Center for Global Engagement, has an auditorium, art gallery, licensed kitchen, dining room, lounge and six program rooms to support internationalization efforts on campus. The Center for Global Engagement (CGE), formerly the International Center, occupies four office suites in the new building. The mission of the CGE was expanded in 2007 from providing immigration and support services to international students to promoting internationalization efforts at FSU. The

CGE has the primary responsibility of ensuring FSU compliance with federal immigration regulations as a requirement for enrolling international students. The CGE issues immigration documents for newly accepted international students to apply for student visas in their home countries, and provides ongoing immigration services and advising for enrolled international students. The CGE also provides immigration support for up to 400 international visiting scholars to come to FSU each year to participate in various research projects at the invitation of faculty. The CGE also manages a short-term, cultural exchange program with three countries. This program provides opportunities for up to 30 FSU students per year to participate in short-term, rich cultural learning experiences through immersion in the host cultures. Students also benefit from hosting and interacting with incoming students from the exchange institutions as part of the program.

The CGE is involved in international recruitment efforts in collaboration with the Graduate School and the assistant vice president for enrollment management. The CGE provides courses for credit to prepare outbound students for global engagement and offers courses for returning students to reflect on their experiences. The CGE also is home to the office for the FSU Exchanges and for multiple intercultural programs.

FSU Big Ideas

In 2011 the FSU deans were charged by the president to generate "Big Ideas" to use both in strategic planning and in fundraising efforts in 2011. All of the deans identified internationalization as one of these "Big Ideas" and this received support from the president. The deans are working to identify how to continue to move FSU ahead in the internationalization process.

Sample Selection

Multiple FSU stakeholders were invited to participate in this study based on a stratified and purposeful selection process. Purposeful sampling was used in order to obtain a range of different perceptions about the internationalization at FSU from senior leadership, administrators, and faculty, and students who have rich information to share about the topic (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Creswell, 1998). Data from the research participants provided a comprehensive overview of the awareness, appreciation, and value the stakeholders have for internationalization, as well as insight into the organizational culture and change deterring or supporting internationalization efforts on campus. Input from these participants provided me with the necessary data to analyze the relationship between organizational culture and change and internationalization efforts at the institution. The following groups comprised the participants: senior leadership, administrators, faculty, domestic students, and international students.

Senior Leadership

Five members of the senior leadership team at FSU participated in the study. The senior leadership participants included the President, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Planning and Programs, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Management. The interviews with these members contributed extremely meaningful information to add to the richness and depth of the qualitative study.

Administrators

Five deans and two associate deans participated in the study. The deans were from the College of Education, College of Business, College of Social Sciences and Public Policy, the

Graduate School, and Undergraduate Studies. Associate deans from the Graduate School and Undergraduate Studies also participated in the study. Two directors and an associate director of departments whose primary role involves international activity also participated in the study.

Ten interviews took place with individuals from this group to provide multiple perspectives on internationalization. Some of the administrators in this group had been involved in various committees and projects to promote internationalization efforts and others had not been directly involved in the internationalization efforts taking place in the last few years. Interviews with the participants in this group provided much rich data from the perspectives of multiple stakeholders on the value of internationalization, the need to internationalize, and the challenges and strengths FSU has to support or deter to internationalization.

Faculty

This study also included eight interviews with faculty members from multiple academic departments throughout the campus. Faculty members were selected to ensure representation of the academic colleges not represented in the administrator group. The study included faculty members who were actively involved in internationalization efforts at FSU through committee work, as well as through international research and teaching. The study also included faculty who have not been directly involved in any international efforts at FSU. Representatives from the Colleges of Medicine, Law and Nursing were not included because they do not enroll international students.

Students

Three student focus groups made up of five students each were held. The groups were formed to ensure a range of representation of different majors, years in college, and gender. Two focus groups were held with domestic students. One of the two focus groups for domestic

students included students who had been involved in classes designed to increase global awareness and/or had been involved in intercultural and international activities and programs on campus. The second focus group included domestic students who had not been involved in intercultural or international activities or programs on campus and who had not participated in classes designed to increase global awareness. The third focus group was made up of international students from five different countries representing five different majors.

I asked instructors of the intercultural classes and the coordinators of the exchanges and other intercultural programs to provide me with names of students so that I could invite them to participate in the focus group for involved students. A professor of a required Communication course at FSU posted an announcement about the research study and asked students with no prior international or intercultural experience to contact me to volunteer for the study. I communicated with potential volunteers via email to confirm that they had not been involved in any international study experiences or intercultural experiences on campus before finalizing the focus group. The international students were selected for the focus group through recommendations from the international advisors. This ensured a balance in gender, program of study, degree levels, and majors.

Data Collection

As an interpretivist researcher, it is my belief that the perspectives of the campus stakeholders in the internationalization efforts at FSU could best be understood through dialogue. Merriam (2009) posits that interpretive research assumes that there are "multiple realities, or interpretations, of a single event" (p. 8). Therefore, the interviews and focus groups with multiple stakeholders provided me the opportunity to hear about the various interpretations and

experiences these stakeholders have had with internationalization. The study used three different

types of data gathering methods; individual interviews, focus groups and document analysis.

Individual, Semi-structured Interviews

Individual, semi-structured interviews were the primary source for data gathering. Yin

describes the interview as "one of the most important sources of case study information" (2009,

p. 106). Protocol for these interviews ensured that the interviewee engaged in purposeful

conversation, and shared experiences and opinions openly. The lines of inquiry used multiple

how questions and follow-up questions were asked when clarification was needed or to gain

more insight. The questions elicited the participants' perspectives on internationalization and

explored whether they perceived any changes in internationalization efforts in the last few years.

There were 23 one-hour interviews with the participants outlined above.

Focus Groups

There were three, ninety-minute focus groups with students with five students per group.

I selected focus groups as the forum to collect data from students since I believed the questions

would stimulate much discussion. Students not only listened to each other but also contributed

to what others said. The focus group discussions provided me with input from multiple

perspectives of both domestic and international students.

During the focus groups I asked questions to encourage discussion and sharing of

participant opinions concerning their experience, or lack of experience, with internationalization

at FSU. The focus group for the international students provided students with an opportunity to

share how they perceive the environment at FSU and to discuss how much interaction they have

with domestic students. Such an environment allowed participants to listen to each other's

experiences and opinions and prompt or encourage them to share their own. According to

Marshall (2006), the focus group format "allows the facilitator the flexibility to explore unanticipated issues as they arise in the discussion" (p. 114). Good facilitation skills were required in this setting. I needed to guide the discussion to provide the participants with opportunities to share freely their points of views and experiences in order to get rich, quality data from the focus group. It was also necessary to guide the discussion to ensure that the student participants stayed on track and that multiple students answered each of the questions.

Document Analysis

Document analysis also provided important data for this research. I performed document analysis on the FSU vision and mission statement and the Global FSU, Division of Student Affairs and Center for Global Engagement websites. The documents selected related to the research questions and to the theoretical frameworks of Tierney (1988) on organization culture, and to Kezar and Eckel's (2002) framework on organizational change.

Table 3

Data Collection Schedule

Participants	Number of Interviews	Method	Time involved	Projected timeline
Senior Leadership	**5**	Individual, semi-structured interviews	Approximately one hour each	February - March, 2012
Administrators	**10**	Individual, semi-structured interviews	Approximately one hour each	March, 2012
Faculty Members	**8**	Individual, semi-structured interviews	Approximately one hour each	April, 2012
Student Focus Groups	**3**	3 Focus Groups (5-6 students per group)	Approximately 90 minutes each	April, 2012
FSU mission and vision statement, and Global FSU, Division of Student Affairs, and Center for Global Engagement websites	**3**	Document Analysis	Approximately three hours Total hours data collection (approximately 30.5 hours)	March & April, 2012

Invitations to Participate and Informed Consent

FSU stakeholders were invited to participate in this research project via email. The email

explained the purpose of the study, and asked them to participate in a one-hour semi-structured

interview, or in a focus group. Dates and times for the interviews and focus groups were

confirmed by email. In addition, all participants received information about the scope of the

study, the Institutional Review Board approval, and an overview of the methods of data

collection and range of types of participants prior to their participation in the interviews or focus

groups. All participants received a written consent form to read and sign prior to beginning the

interviews or focus groups. Participants received written notice that their anonymity would be

protected and that no names or specific information to help others identify them would be included in the findings of the study. In efforts to ensure anonymity of the participating deans, all of the data from both the deans and the administrators is referenced as originating from administrators. I asked the participants' permission to record interviews or focus groups. Approximately 30 hours of data collection was carried out for this qualitative study.

Case Study Database

Information about data collection from each source went into a database. Merriam (2009) writes "the case study database (or record) then, is the data of the study organized so the researcher can locate specific data during intensive analysis" (p. 203). The names and titles of participants and dates of interviews went into the database with transcripts attached. The names of students in the focus groups went into the database, along with information about the level of involvement each student had with internationalization efforts. I wrote notes after each interview or focus group to summarize briefly the data collected and to help facilitate future coding. The documents analyzed as sources of data for the study, along with the analysis and my notes, were also included in the database. The recordings of the interviews and focus groups were transcribed by a transcription service. I reviewed each transcript for accuracy as soon as I received the document.

<div align="center">

Data Analysis

</div>

I began the data analysis by reading through all of the transcripts as I received them and making initial notes about possible codes. Saldaña (2009) described codes as "a word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language-based or visual data" (p. 3). I read all of the transcripts a second time once I had all of the interviews transcribed. This second reading allowed me to

redefine, combine, or drop some of the initial codes I had made during the first reading. I read all of the transcripts a third time to ensure that all of the rich data pertaining to the established codes was highlighted in each transcript. When I reached the saturation point in which "no new information, insights, or understandings are forthcoming," I became more deductive (Merriam, 2009, p. 183). I looked at the multiple categories of codes to identify the prominent themes that would be used to organize the data. I will use thematic analysis in the next step of data analysis after coding in order to identify the themes.

Van Manen (1990) described the use of thematic analysis as a "bringing into nearness that which tends to be obscured and illusive to the first-hand superficial reflection of an experience" (p. 31). This required me to use reflective inquiry and identify phrases or sentences used by the participants that could be thematic to their experiences. I needed to make a distinction between the initial impressions I may have had about the participants' experiences and the true essence of what they were really saying. Merriam (2009) posited that, "The challenge is to construct categories or themes that capture some recurring pattern that cuts across your data. It should be clear that categories are abstractions derived from the data, not the data themselves" (p. 181). The themes emerged from the most recurring topic discussed by the participants throughout the interviews and the focus groups.

The goal in thematic analysis and was to identify themes that provided the rich data necessary to answer the research questions and support the purpose of the study. I worked to ensure that the themes met the five criteria established by Merriam (2009): 1) they are responsive to the purpose of the research; 2) they should be exhaustive; 3) they should be mutually exclusive; 4) they should be sensitizing; and 5) they should be conceptually congruent (p. 186).

Trustworthiness

I took several steps to help ensure trustworthiness of the data analysis. I ensured that my data collection methods, such as the protocol for the interviews and the focus groups, facilitated collection of data within the framework and answered the research questions. I followed the four principles of data collection to ensure construct validity and reliability of the data gathered through this case study. I used multiple sources of evidence, created a case study database, and maintained a chain of evidence to help ensure reliability of the study (Yin, 2009). I also discussed this research project and the findings with several faculty members familiar with the internationalization process. I also asked a counterpart with expertise in the field of internationalization from another institution outside the state of Florida to review this research and provide feedback. I collected data from multiple sources, which allows for triangulation. Yin (2009) posited "with data triangulation, the potential problems of construct validity also can be addressed because the multiple sources of evidence essentially provide multiple measures of the same phenomenon" (p. 117).

I wrote the findings of the study in such a way that the reader can easily follow the case study from the initial research questions to the conclusion. I used rich, thick description to present my data and to make the case study easy to read and understand. Yin (2009) stated, "the external observer should be able to trace the steps in either direction (from conclusions back to initial research questions or from questions to conclusions)" (p. 122). I established a chain of evidence to ensure that all of the data presented in the final report can be traced back to the raw data collected during the interviews and focus groups. This chain of evidence helps address the issue of construct validity necessary to increase the quality of the case study.

Limitations of the Study

This study had several limitations, including the following:

1. Participants may not comprehend the concept of internationalization;

2. Participants from senior administration who worked at the institution prior to internationalization efforts may be reluctant to share why campus internationalization was not a previous priority;

3. The number of student participants who experienced campus life before and after internationalization efforts began will be limited;

4. The role of the researcher, as Director of the Center for Global Engagement, may impact how participants' responses to questions in the study; and

5. The data collected from the participants is specific to this institution and cannot be generalized.

Researcher Positionality

In order to ensure the integrity of qualitative research it is necessary for the role of the researcher to be clearly defined as it relates to the site of the study and to the participants in the study. Merriam (2009) said, "investigators need to explain their biases, dispositions and assumptions regarding the research to be undertaken" (p. 219). My years of experience in international centers and with internationalization initiatives in higher education during the last 20 years were extremely helpful during this study. A thorough understanding of the complex process of internationalization was necessary to undertake a study about this phenomenon. Furthermore, my years of experience in higher education provided me with knowledge on the organizational structure of an institution and an understanding of the cultural components making up organizational culture and the types of change strategies used within institutions.

My career in higher education in the U.S. began in 1989 as director of a large-scale study abroad program in Washington State for Japanese students coming to the U.S. This program gave me experience in working with faculty, administrators, and students to help ensure that the Japanese students were welcomed and integrated into the campus community. These efforts grew into helping internationalize the campus through the development of strategies and programs. I began my current position as Director of the Center for Global Engagement (formerly the International Center) at FSU in 2004. In this position I expanded the mission of the Center for Global Engagement (CGE) from focusing on international student and scholar services to campus wide promotion of intercultural understanding and awareness through global engagement. I had the full support of my supervisor, the Vice President of Student Affairs, to expand the role of the center and to start internationalization efforts on this campus. The CGE is actively involved in providing the campus community with opportunities to be globally engaged through classes and intercultural workshops as well as a variety of social, cultural, educational and experiential programs with an intercultural and international focus.

I invited Dr. Milton Bennett to speak on this campus with the intention of starting discussions on how to internationalize. I co-chaired the first working group of the International Advisory Committee which was a grassroots, self-appointed committee to address campus internationalization. I continue to serve on the committee that is now co-chaired by a vice president and an associate vice president. I also served on the exchange committee and provided ongoing input to the Office of the Provost on international issues concerning international students, scholars, and agreements.

I continue to work with the Dean of the Graduate School and the Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Management to increase international student enrollment on campus. I also

88

designed and set up special programs bringing international students to FSU as non-degree seeking students. These programs generate funds that are used to expand the programs and international efforts of the CGE as well as help support campus internationalization.

However, I am not a senior level administrator and am not involved in providing any direction to the deans on internationalization. I have a role as Director of the CGE but am not charged with implementing a systemic internationalization initiative on campus. There has been no such charge given at FSU and there are multiple administrators involved in international efforts.

Because of the decentralization of international efforts at FSU, I feel that it is possible to carry out this study and collect data on the different perspectives of the stakeholders. I acknowledge that I have personal values and biases concerning the value of internationalization. I took care to ensure that input from stakeholders whose beliefs may be contrary to my own was recorded accurately and used as part of the data for this study. My efforts at trustworthiness regarding this study helped me be aware of my bias and allowed me to present the opinions expressed by the participants. My professional work and experience in the field of international education helped me understand the nuances of the data.

CHAPTER IV:

FINDINGS

Internationalization of a campus is an ongoing process that involves the development of intercultural and international opportunities and experiences to provide a rich cultural learning environment for campus stakeholders. Universities are challenged to integrate such opportunities and experiences into the learning experiences of students in order to prepare graduates for an increasingly globalized society. This study examined how the organizational culture and change at one institution supported or deterred the development of internationalization efforts. This single site case study examined the perspectives of multiple FSU stakeholders, ranging from students to senior leaders, in the ongoing internationalization efforts.

Tierney's (1988) framework on the *Six Concepts of Culture*, and Kezar and Eckel's (2002) framework on *Five Change Strategies* provided the lenses through which to examine the relationship between internationalization at FSU and organizational culture and change. Three overarching themes emerged from the data in the study: stakeholder perspectives on internationalization, deterrents of internationalization at FSU, and support for internationalization at FSU.

Stakeholder Perspectives on Internationalization

The research participants in this study ranged from having peripheral involvement in some of the internationalization efforts taking place over the last few years at FSU to primary organizers and promoters of such efforts. The interviewees articulated clear definitions of internationalization and cited multiple reasons why a campus should strive to be internationalized. Many of these same participants shared a vision of an internationalized

90

campus that would provide students with a variety of opportunities to develop skills and

awareness through both curricular and co-curricular opportunities. The research participants also

shared their views on whether they considered FSU to be an internationalized campus and

articulated many reasons in support of their views. The research participants also reflected on

their experiences in the internationalization efforts to date and the expectations they hold for

continued progress. An analysis of the data on stakeholders' perspectives on internationalization

resulted in the following three subthemes.

Defining Internationalization

Almost every senior leader, faculty member and administrator who participated in the

research study articulated a clear definition of internationalization. The definitions of

internationalization ranged from providing a culturally rich campus environment for students to

learn about cultural differences to the student development of specific student learning outcomes

on global and intercultural competencies. The majority of the research respondents described the

two key components of internationalization as having "international students on campus to

increase the amount of contact students have with the rest of the world" and as sending domestic

students abroad "to gain exposure to other cultures." One administrator stated, "Every effort that

aims to help students develop the global competencies needed to effectively manage intercultural

relations, to me, is what internationalization is." Another faculty member gave a much broader

perspective on the definition of internationalization by stating, "I see the internationalization

process as a way to develop students as individuals who possess the global competencies that

enhance not only their personal lives but also enhance their ability to work in a culturally diverse

environment." One senior leader emphasized how both student mobility and student learning are

key components to internationalization.

91

I would define internationalization as a broad, philosophical base that we hold as part of our mission as an institution to have comprehensive programs where we not only recruit and educate international students, provide opportunities for our domestic students to have international experiences, but also have a campus where the two groups interact and learn more about cultural difference and the issues and ideas that each side brings to the table. All of this is necessary in order to provide all of our students with the skills and awareness they need to succeed in today's world.

A faculty member supported the need to have both the academic and non-academic units involved in internationalization by stating, "I think internationalization includes both academic and non-academic levels of developing a university with a global mission." Another faculty member shared a similar view of internationalization as "incorporating international issues and opportunities to learn about cultural difference in both our curricular and co-curricular programs."

Several research participants defined internationalization in terms of the role of the institution. One faculty member explained how he sees the role of the institution in internationalization by stating, "Internationalization is the university community becoming aware of international issues, world cultures, becoming accepting of others who have a different cultural background." A senior administrator shared a similar view on the importance of the role of the institution in providing a rich cultural learning environment to promote student learning by stating, "I see internationalization as a broad, global awareness of where we, as an institution of higher learning, fit into the global picture. The ways in which we connect to the world need to be explored through both our curriculum and whatever programming we provide for students beyond the classroom experiences." The data confirmed that the FSU stakeholders see internationalization as an important part of educating students by providing them with opportunities to become more interculturally and globally competent.

Envisioning Campus Internationalization

The majority of the senior leaders, faculty and administrators participating in the study articulated clear visions of what an internationalized campus should look like and what it should provide to community members. One faculty member captured the complexity of campus internationalization by stating, "I think an internationalized campus has an intercultural and international orientation that permeates things at all levels – like a thread running through everything it does." This same vision was shared by an administrator who talked about the importance of "getting more international students on campus" since he saw increased international student enrollment as essential to helping domestic students "change their view of the world by having all these international experiences on campus." One senior leader expressed the importance of having an internationalized institution "because we have all of these undergraduates living in their own little worlds and they need to interact with international students in class as well as outside of class. There should be interaction because of genuine interest and not just because of a requirement."

Another administrator supported that same view by stating, "I think this can be a very enriching campus when kids from small towns can broaden their whole view of the world just by having all of these international interactions on campus." A faculty member shared his view on the importance of providing an internationalized campus since it provides a way for "students to be exposed to international issues by not going anywhere…just taking advantage of the presence of international students and scholars on campus." An administrator supported this same view by stating, "An internationalized campus provides a real robust culture with a lot of international activities where students from different cultures meet and interact." One administrator shared a different point of view on the importance of widespread student

93

involvement in international and intercultural opportunities on campus. The administrator

reflected that "widespread participation seems to me to be window dressing" and explained that

a true internationalized campus would provide programming to those people who "have a

commitment and interest in the real depth of activities."

A faculty member pointed out the importance of developing an internationalized campus

"as part of an institutional culture and not something that is carried out by a few departments."

One senior administrator said the following about the importance of an internationalized

campus:

> The one impact of truly having an internationalized campus would be to help students develop a greater understanding of cultures other than their own and a comfort with being outside of what are their usual experiences. I think that they will have a broader education, regardless of their discipline, and an understanding of whatever that is from something other than a regional perspective or a national perspective. I think the ultimate outcome is that it enriches everybody's learning experience.

Several research participants stated that having an internationalized campus was essential for an

institution since not all students would have the opportunity to study abroad or have

international experiences outside the U.S.

One administrator commented on the fact that FSU's enrollment of 41,000 students

"makes it mind numbing to think about how to give students an international experience."

Another administrator pointed out that international experiences were expensive and that "we

keep trying to figure out how to do it cheaply but we can't figure out how to make that happen."

This was summed up by one senior leader who said, "Even though every one of us here might

like to see our domestic students have an overseas experience as part of their education, we all

know that is not possible. So, by exposing them to cultural difference here on campus is

powerful, it's transformative, and it's really important if you're going to be a citizen of the 21st

century." The data confirmed that all of the research participants recognized the importance of

providing a culturally rich campus environment to provide all students with opportunities to interact with people from diverse cultures.

Benefits of Internationalization

All of the interviewees in this study acknowledged that there are many benefits to internationalization and to providing an internationalized campus to enhance the learning environment on a university campus. The research respondents clearly articulated the benefits of having international students on campus and the ways in which they contribute toward a culturally rich learning environment. One administrator commented that international students are a key component of internationalization because they "bring the world to FSU" and provide cultural diversity both 'academically and socially.'

All of the interviewees addressed the importance of internationalization in contributing to student development and as an essential part of educating students for today's world. Several research participants pointed out that one of the benefits of an internationalized campus was to help students expand their worldviews. One administrator said, "For students to be truly global citizens they need to be informed about the world as broadly as possible, and they need to be able to look beyond their own narrow circle." Another administrator shared the importance of getting students to "think beyond the borders of our state, think beyond the borders of our country, and get exposed to international issues." A faculty member agreed that a benefit of internationalization is the need to get students to think differently and expand their worldviews. The faculty member talked about the importance of students "becoming broader minded individuals and to learn that the world does not revolve around this country." The four main themes which emerged from the analysis of the data on benefits of internationalization were

international student contributions, student learning outcomes, preparation for a global workforce, and institutional recognition.

International student contributions. Many of the interviewees commented on the importance of having international students on campus to provide a more culturally diverse environment. One faculty member commented, "I think about the wealth of cultural information and cultural experiences that they [international students] bring with them…and how students, our domestic students benefit from this in so many ways by interacting with them [international students]." Another faculty member agreed with the importance of campus interaction between international and domestic students by stating, "So it's in a sense creating an environment that welcomes that exchange of cultural information here on campus." The faculty member continued by saying that the presence of international students and their interaction with domestic students "really helps all students expand their world perspective and challenges them to think more globally."

One administrator pointed out that international students have different values and ways of doing things that challenges the domestic students to question their attitudes, beliefs and ways of doing things. The administrator added, "I think that the true value of their [international student] presence on campus is the difference that they bring to the table." A faculty member commented on the benefit of having international students on campus to present "American students or Americans in general with a sense of what other cultures think of the United States, and it's usually a very complex notion." One faculty member articulated that one of the best benefits of having international students on campus was what they added to the classroom.

> Well, I think international students enrich the campus environment because within the
> classroom, they typically bring a different perspective to the issues. They certainly help

our students gain an understanding of other cultures, other ways of perceiving things, thinking about things, other approaches to problem solving, and I think it helps the US student, perhaps, move a little bit out of their comfort zone and become comfortable with others that have different backgrounds and maybe become more open and accepting to other cultures.

Another faculty member expanded on the important contributions international students make to a university campus by stating, "Well I think they [international students] bring, if people talk to them and engage with them, they bring a lot of what education is about-- that is understanding what's going on in the world, understanding different ways of seeing social, political, economic problems, understanding different cultures."

Several other research interviewees reflected on the importance of having international students on campus to provide exposure to other cultures to the vast majority of domestic students who will not have an international experience. One faculty member commented on the high cost of study abroad and other international experiences and saw international students on campus as providing opportunities for domestic students, "regardless of their economic ability, to have an international experience right on campus." Another faculty member supported this same view and commented that having international students on campus provided "a very cost effective way to learn a lot because even if you travel to a country you're not necessarily going to have the opportunity to talk to people." The data confirmed that the majority of the stakeholders recognize that international student enrollment helps create a culturally rich campus-learning environment.

Student learning outcomes. The majority of the interviewees all discussed the crucial role of internationalization in helping all students expand their worldviews and gain the intercultural skills, knowledge, and cultural awareness necessary for today's world. One faculty member expressed that the "most important thing that students can learn from

internationalization is recognition and acceptance of difference." The faculty member

continued by saying that "students need to learn that no culture is better than somebody else's

culture and that people have different ways of doing things." A similar view was shared by

another faculty member who stated that he would like to see students "develop awareness, and

more than that, an openness towards people from different cultures… and a willingness to

embrace other cultures, countries and religions." A senior leader shared a similar perspective

on internationalization as key to helping students understand how they fit into the world and to

help them develop a more "sophisticated mindset to understand and appreciate cultural

difference rather than just tolerate difference."

The majority of the research participants also talked about the importance of students

developing the intercultural competence and the skills necessary to communicate and interact

effectively with people from diverse cultures. One faculty member said that the most important

outcomes of internationalization for students are "not only the skill-based sets of competencies

which help students interact with people of diverse cultures, but also such things as attitudes,

beliefs and values to help them better understand and appreciate the world." Another faculty

member showed similar expectations of internationalization by stating, "We need to help

students to develop and expand their value systems, their attitudes, and expand their global

awareness in order to promote the successful interaction between people from different

cultures."

Preparation for a global workforce. Several interviewees discussed how cultural

awareness and understanding, intercultural skills, and expanded worldview are valuable and

necessary competencies for students to have as they begin their future careers. One faculty

member commented on how the development of increased cultural awareness and cultural

sensitivity in students would facilitate their success in international service and internship

opportunities as well as help them succeed as teachers in other countries. An administrator

agreed that the intercultural skills and knowledge from internationalization would help ensure

that "students will graduate with the capacity to really work and succeed in diverse types of

environments whether in the U.S. or in the global market place." A faculty member expressed

that students need to develop intercultural skills in order to succeed in their careers.

> If they're not really comfortable with a whole bunch of different cultures, if they're not comfortable being on teams with citizens of other countries and different cultures, if they're not comfortable leading those teams or being a team member, if they're not comfortable taking a position in another country for two or three months, or two or three years, they will not be successful.

Another faculty member shared a very similar view by commenting "many students will

eventually have to work in a multinational company" and emphasized that the "student training"

is very important. The faculty member continued to say that if "students gain early exposure to

interacting with people from diverse cultures, it will help them succeed in their careers."

Another faculty member said that it has always been important for students to have

"professional competency" and "technical competency" to be prepared to enter the professional

workforce. This faculty member went on to say that, "Today's global economy is creating more

and more multinational companies and multinational workforces. Graduates need to now also

possess global competency and feel comfortable working with people from different cultures."

The data confirmed that many of the research participants recognize the importance of

providing students with intercultural skills and competencies to help them interact successfully

with people from all cultures and succeed in their careers. The data also confirmed that some of

the research participants recognize that intercultural and global competencies are necessary for

students to lead multicultural teams, and compete and succeed in the multinational workforce.

Institutional recognition. Various research participants recognized the importance of developing an internationalized institution in order to increase the visibility and recognition of a university on both a national and international level. One administrator stated that, "As a research university, we want to be on the international stage and compete with other top universities not only nationally, but internationally." Another administrator addressed the importance of providing an environment that "encourages researchers from other countries to come here and collaborate" and expressed how this benefits both involved FSU faculty members as well as the institution.

A faculty member shared a similar view on how internationalization benefits the institution and the need to get more stakeholders to support that view by stating, "There has to be a sense that somehow—people have to be really persuaded of the value of making this [internationalization] move. And not so much what's in it for me, but how is this going to help move the university forward? How will this help move us up the ladder of reputation?"

Several other research interviewees addressed the importance of building an institution with a strong national and international reputation as a way to attract outstanding graduate students. One faculty member commented that, "If the institution is not nationally or internationally recognized, that can really prevent some of the good students from coming here because they have options." The faculty member continued on to say that getting top graduate students was crucial to the continued growth and reputation of research. "If you don't get the best students," the faculty member continued, "then we will not be competitive at the research level and this will degrade our research programs. So, it is double jeopardy." An administrator shared the same view by stating,

> We need to work to be nationally and internationally recognized in order to attract the top graduate students. They [top graduate students] want the Harvards, the Berkeleys, the

100

Michigans; and frankly, I don't want the questionable students. It's tough---it's being on the radar screen.

The data confirmed that several research participants recognize that internationalization helps the institution build a strong reputation that is essential to attract high quality graduate students. The data also confirmed that attracting high quality graduate students helps advance the growth and reputation of FSU research efforts.

Deterrents to Internationalization at FSU

The findings showed that the majority of the research participants do not yet consider FSU to be an internationalized campus and that the research participants acknowledge that there are many challenges preventing FSU from achieving comprehensive internationalization. The data showed that the participants recognize progress in implementing some internationalization efforts, but acknowledge that FSU is a long way from achieving systemic, campus wide internationalization. One administrator commented that he felt like FSU was in its 'infancy' stage in internationalization and added, "we still need a lot of growth." Another administrator shared her acknowledgement of the lack of internationalization at FSU by stating, "I just don't know that that whole kind of global awareness has truly permeated the culture to the extent that it might."

One administrator and one faculty member both gave similar responses acknowledging that internationalization is a 'fairly slim part' and 'very small part' of the campus culture. Another administrator reflected on how she was unaware of whether the FSU scientists felt connected to the global community and concluded, "The fact I don't know this suggests to me that it [internationalization] is not part of our common language." A senior leader recognized that there were some very 'interesting' things going on at FSU and that they have an 'international aspect'. The senior leader continued by saying, "If you step back and go 10 miles

101

out of Tallahassee and look over here, I don't think you'd say this is an internationalized campus." Another senior leader gave a detailed explanation of why she did not consider FSU to be an internationalized campus.

> I believe that FSU believes that it is an internationalized campus but I don't think it is. I think that remarkably few of our students actually have what I would consider intensive experiences working internationally. I also don't think that the curriculum in most areas really integrates international into it. We may have had some success in recruiting students internationally and to some extent that does help internationalize the campus but we really haven't integrated all of that into the experience of being at FSU. So, it would be very difficult for me to say that we're an internationalized campus.

A faculty member agreed with the senior leader's perspective on internationalization at FSU by commenting, "Our approach to internationalization is simply not as progressive as it should be." Another faculty member pointed out, "There's a smaller portion of undergraduates who actually have experiences whether it's encountering international students on campus or doing an intercultural or international experience or incorporating some kind of intercultural perspective into their existing course work." The stakeholders identified numerous deterrents to the advancement of internationalization at FSU leading to comprehension internationalization.

Need for Senior Leadership Support

Many of the interviewees in this study reflected on how internationalization had never been a top priority of the senior leadership at FSU because there has never been a university-wide mandate to internationalize the campus. One administrator commented that more concrete examples on 'change at other institutions' were needed so that stakeholders could envision the possible transformation internationalization could make at FSU. The administrator continued, "We need to be sort of sold on the notion that this [internationalization] really is going to be the truly transformative thing for our campus. And right now, I guess I don't hear this coming from the leadership." Another administrator supported this view by stating, "I see no changes so I

102

don't know if they [senior leadership] are committed to it [internationalization] or not. There's a bit of lip service to it." A similar view was voiced by a faculty member who shared, "But then you got to get the deans and the upper levels to really buy in but I haven't seen that buy in and I haven't seen it when I talk to different deans." Another administrator pointed out that internationalization had not moved systemically throughout the campus because it "had not been blessed by the upper administration."

One faculty member pointed out that top leadership of the past had never considered internationalization to be a top priority of the institution. The faculty member commented, "I think it could be argued that it's [internationalization] embedded in some of the priorities, but it's not the priority or one of the top priorities of the institution." Another faculty member shared this same opinion by stating, "I think they [senior leadership] are moving in the right direction slowly. But clearly, they have not set this [internationalization] as a priority." Many other participants discussed how they were hopeful that the new president and provost would work to change the institutional culture toward internationalization and make it a top priority. A senior leader pointed out the importance of the role of the new president and the provost in moving ahead internationalization following a long history without such support.

> We have to have the support of the top leadership. So unless the President sort of gets behind it [internationalization], or Garnett [Provost], if you don't have them, I don't see how you go very far. It would be one thing if we had had like thirty years of leadership and then they came in, then they would be building on something. But this [internationalization] has to be built up because it has never been a priority for this institution. There's lots of things out there, but it takes a lot to bring all those things together."

Several faculty members also talked about the long institutional history without senior level support for internationalization.

The faculty members discussed how no institutional-wide mandate to internationalize had been developed in the thirty years they had been at FSU. One faculty member commented, "The institutional lethargy was such that very little actually got done. There were three different Presidents and each one had to be brought on board but they just weren't interested." The faculty member continued to describe how the lack of support from senior leadership years ago to build up area studies and keep the cost of study abroad reasonable had helped establish a culture where growth in internationalization was not valued. A second faculty member discussed how the proposal to form a centralized office to oversee all international efforts was turned down by senior leadership years ago. The faculty member explained how this decision made it difficult to advance internationalization efforts and showed that senior leadership did not support such efforts.

A senior leader supported the view that FSU had a long history without any support for internationalization from senior leadership. The senior leader stated, "Bernie Sliger had the longest presidency and he just wasn't interested in anything international and neither were the ones following him. So that amounts to about 30 years of leadership where it [internationalization] was just not a concern."

Another faculty member reflected on the difficulty of getting support for internationalization from the senior leaders at FSU. The faculty member stated, "It's so hard to get anything done unless the president, the provost and the deans push it [internationalization]. With so many of them going in different directions and with different priorities, it's hard to get them focused to push things international." Another faculty member shared a similar perspective on the difficulty of getting senior level support by commenting, "Sometimes you can lay the groundwork for change and push and push and push to the deans and the provost and the

president and sometimes the idea will fit with other stuff and then things move ahead. Other times it will just take years and years and years, and then boom, nothing happens."

One faculty member commented on the lack of clarity in understanding the role of senior leadership in supporting internationalization efforts at FSU. The faculty member stated, "I don't know if there is anyone in Westcott [senior administration building] who is really leading the charge on behalf of internationalization or strengthening international programs. I couldn't tell you right now. I hope there is such a person or someone will emerge in that role, but... not yet." A senior leader commented that even he did not know who 'the champion or champions' of internationalization were. The senior leader shared that internationalization had originally been one of six topics considered by FSU for the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) as part of the Southern Association of Colleges and School (SACS) accrediting process. The senior leader stated, "Internationalization was mentioned early on for the QEP, but it didn't make the cut, it sort of fell off, and I just don't know who the champions are going to be." Synthesis of the data about senior leadership confirmed that FSU stakeholders agree that there has been a long history at FSU without senior leadership support for internationalization. The data confirmed that stakeholders recognize that senior leadership support is crucial to implement a university wide mandate to internationalize the campus. The data also confirmed that some stakeholders hold out hope that the new president and provost will provide the much-needed support for internationalization.

Need for Strategy and Vision

The majority of the research participants discussed the need to develop a university-wide strategy and vision on how to move forward with internationalization efforts at FSU. One faculty member recalled how years ago proposed plans to have an FSU campus in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) were not approved because "it would bring down our prestige." The faculty member pointed out that some of the top U.S. institutions are now in the UAE. "When you see those kinds of things happening," continued the faculty member, "you just know things aren't going to happen here. There isn't a vision for things international." Another faculty member commented on the lack of vision by stating, "There's a lack of vision and a lack of resources needed behind a vision." Several administrators pointed out similar views on the lack of a strategy to internationalize FSU. "As far as I can see," commented one administrator, "there is not a strategy from the senior level of Academic Affairs to internationalize this campus and as far as I know there never has been." Another administrator shared a similar point of view by adding, "FSU does not have a focused, strategic plan for internationalization. I think it [FSU] is receptive to internationalization but it's not necessarily encouraging internationalization."

One faculty member agreed with the administrators' perspective by adding, "FSU has got to have a strategy and it has to be a strategy that doesn't go out the window when there's a burp in the economy." One faculty member summarized her view on the lack of strategy and vision.

> A strategy and a vision to internationalize have yet to be articulated by the top-level administrators, something that really needs to be communicated from the president and the provost. There is a grassroots movement that is making efforts to move internationalization ahead here at FSU, but it needs to be met halfway by the senior administration. They [the senior administration] need to say that 'yes, this is what we want, we want to be a global university. We want to be internationalized, we want to increase global competencies' but that all has to be very clearly articulated from the top leadership.

Another faculty member explained his perspective on the need for a strategy and vision to internationalize FSU. "If you're going to get real change here," the faculty member explained, "it's [strategy and vision] got to come from both the bottom and the top." One administrator suggested that the selection of internationalization for the SACS Quality Enhancement Plan would push the institution to develop a comprehensive strategy and vision to internationalize the campus.

Another administrator commented on the importance of senior leadership providing the campus with both a vision for internationalization by stating, "It's one thing to dream big but leadership has got to give us at least an idea of how to connect the dots and get to that vision." The data from the interview participants indicated there is a perceived lack of a university-wide strategy and vision for internationalizing FSU. The data also confirmed the importance of developing a strategy and vision to internationalize FSU and the need for senior leaders' support in order to move internationalization efforts forward.

Behind Other Institutions

Many of the interviewees in the study commented on the many ways in which they saw FSU lag behind other institutions of similar size and stature in internationalization efforts. One administrator reflected on why FSU was behind other institutions. He discussed how there was a 'bandwagon' FSU had not gotten on in the last 10 or 15 years when other campuses "have come out and said we are going to become real leaders in being more international, being more globally aware and that kind of thing. We are very late to the game." One faculty member commented, "FSU missed the window of opportunity to internationalize. These things move quickly and you just cannot catch up." An administrator voiced a slightly different opinion of why FSU was behind other institutions.

But I feel like—if we've missed the window, to get my metaphor right I guess, to me, it's only that we don't have a compelling urge to do this. You know, if we don't feel like becoming a more international campus then we won't move ahead. And so in that case, it's not that we're too late, it's that we haven't embraced—we don't see how that fits into becoming who we want to be in the future.

An administrator discussed how FSU had resources in earlier years to 'commit to internationalization' but added that not enough people were interested at that time. The administrator continued by stating, "I would say that the impetus to get better at internationalization just came at the wrong time for us. We should have moved on this [internationalization] years ago." Another faculty member commented on how other institutions had made an early commitment to internationalize.

There's no natural reason why Michigan State should be so large, have the large international presence that it does, but people have made a commitment to that. So some of the big 10 universities are not based in large cities but have done pretty well in the last 15 or 20 years because people there made a commitment early on that that is the direction they wanted the institution to move in and the role they wanted it to have in the world.

One faculty member commented on the progress other institutions had made in internationalization and stated, "I've attended conferences over the last few years and I got to know a lot about what other universities were doing regarding internationalization. I was really impressed by their big operations and the serious resources." The faculty member added that he thought FSU should be more like other universities of similar size concerning internationalization.

Several interviewees commented on how institutions no longer had an option to internationalize because of the increasing need to educate students for a global society. A faculty member shared his views on the urgency for FSU not to continue to fall behind in internationalization by stating, "The time is rapidly passing when a university, especially a research university, can see itself as a domestically oriented institution with a few study abroad

108

programs." One senior leader discussed how there had not been as much development at FSU toward developing the academic centers focusing on different regions of the world. "We just don't have as many of these [Centers] as other institutions in the state and the country," said the senior administrator. The senior leader explained that FSU had a Middle East Center but added that it was not 'facultied up.' The senior leader also commented that there was a lack of faculty in specialized areas at FSU and pointed out that FSU did not even have a Chinese historian on the faculty.

Financial Constraints

The number one challenge identified by the majority of the research participants was financial constraints. The research participants discussed at length the multiple budget cuts faced by FSU as an institution over the last years. One administrator commented that the budget cuts made it difficult to move ahead with internationalization efforts. The administrator stated, "I think we've just been so distracted by the budget cuts and the whole sense of just having to defend ourselves from the attacks that come from people who just don't feel this [internationalization] is the best use of state resources, that a true internationalization campaign just hasn't caught fire." Another administrator supported that view by adding, "We're trying to maintain what we have in a very difficult economic environment. So some of the things we see as priorities we'd like to do, we just can't afford." Another administrator summarized the difficult financial situation facing FSU and explained how the situation made it difficult to ask stakeholders to work towards campus internationalization.

> I think we're a resource-starved institution. And asking people to do one more thing right now is not a very popular thing to do. In some cases, it's just not possible to put one more thing on some people's plates. And so, I think it's a tall order for leadership in financial straits like we are to be able to-- I mean it's a tall order to change the course of a university anyway, but to do that in a financial environment that we're in when we're purging faculty and losing funding left and right, I think it's an exceptional challenge.

Another administrator supported the view that the current budget situation made it nearly impossible to make internationalization a priority. The administrator stated, "To move ahead with internationalization is going to require an infusion of new resources and that just won't happen as long as the powers that be are moving things around just to keep the quality at the current level."

One faculty member agreed that FSU needs more resources before making internationalization a priority. The faculty member commented that getting more resources "does not mean just slicing up the whole pie differently" but involves strategic fundraising efforts to increase the overall funding to FSU. Another faculty member agreed that more funding was needed in order to encourage faculty and staff to be engaged in internationalization efforts as well as to provide scholarships for international students and for FSU students to study abroad. Another faculty member had a more optimistic look on funding and said that he thought the economy would turn around and things would get better in about five years. "That will be the time," he remarked, "to strike and get a strong core of students, faculty, and administrators to unify this [internationalization] and finally get something done."

Mission

The research participants all acknowledged the primary mission of FSU as a research institution with a responsibility to provide high quality graduate education. The participants also discussed how the mission supported the generation of research for the state as well as on national and international levels. There was no consensus, however, from the research participants on whether the mission supported internationalization efforts. Many of the research participants reflected that the mission supported an emphasis on education for Florida state

residents with a heavy emphasis on research. Some research participants interpreted the mission to be supportive of internationalization as part of the role of a research institution. A review of the FSU mission statement on the FSU website shows that the mission references a commitment to international education and to study abroad.

> The Florida State University is a comprehensive, graduate-research university with a liberal arts base. It offers undergraduate, graduate, advanced graduate, and professional programs of study; conducts extensive research, and provides service to the public in accord with its statewide mission. The University's primary role is to serve as a center for advanced graduate and professional studies while emphasizing research and providing excellence in undergraduate programs … The University is strongly committed to its mission in international education. It provides study-abroad opportunities for its students and faculty . . .

One administrator commented, "We cannot lose site of the fact that we are a state university and we're funded that way, although less and less from the state, and that we're here to also meet the needs of the state of Florida." Another administrator shared a similar view by stating, "The mission as stated is really being in service to the state of Florida and to the country at large, but it really is a graduate research emphasis." One administrator pointed out that there were 'mixed signals' coming from the senior leaders at FSU and added, "I'm not sure the senior leaders or the deans know what they want Florida State to be."

A few research participants shared their perspectives on how they interpreted the FSU mission to be supportive of internationalization. One senior leader shared the following interpretation of the FSU mission.

> I think it's really the mission of any research university to support it [internationalization] because I think it [internationalization] is a central part of education today. And whether you do it [internationalize] by means of having our students engaged globally by experiences abroad or whether you do it by, you know, promoting the types of international experiences that one can actually have locally, it's all part of our mission as an institution of higher education.

Another administrator supported this same view by adding that a major research university "cannot be sequestered in its own little world" and added that internationalization goes 'hand in hand' with the role of educating students. A senior leader agreed that the FSU mission supports internationalization but added, "I just think that we've made a choice not to be as international as some other places. Yeah, maybe I'm wrong, that's just the way I feel." The data indicated that there was a wide variation of respondent interpretations of FSU's mission, with an equal disparity in views regarding the mission's support for internationalization efforts.

Focus on Research

The majority of all of the research participants discussed how the primary emphasis of the university was on research and how this made it difficult for faculty to be involved in and support internationalization efforts at FSU. One administrator pointed out that there is pressure on the tenure-track faculty members to "research and publish in top peer-reviewed journals" and expressed how research and the generation of knowledge is essential in a RH/UH institution like FSU. A faculty member agreed that research takes priority over internationalization at FSU by stating, "Faculty have their own challenges in trying to keep up with research and unless internationalization is presented as something that will strengthen research it just won't get that far with faculty." Another faculty member emphasized the importance of successful research for the career of a faculty member. The faculty member stated, "If they (junior faculty members) are just okay teachers but excellent in bringing in money, they'll get tenure. If they're excellent publishers and just so-so teachers, they'll get tenure. But if they are excellent teachers and just so-so researchers, they will not get tenure."

The research participants also shared very frank views opposing the idea of adding support for internationalization into the promotion and tenure process. One administrator

112

commented that he did not think anything would change by adding work in internationalization to the promotion and tenure process because "it [internationalization] is never going to take priority over publication. Publication and the creation of knowledge in a research institution can always wear the crown." Another administrator pointed out how at one time the university tried to make advising part of the tenure and promotion process to get more faculty involvement. The administrator said, "That was like the old carrot and the stick thing. We were just never able to work out the advising part and we ended up hiring professional advisors whose only job was just to advise. The faculty just didn't have the time."

One administrator strongly objected to the idea of including support for internationalization in the promotion and tenure process. The administrator expressed how the promotion and tenure process allowed for 'flexibility' and 'difference' across departments but added, "I think if one required something that was international, then you open the door to say, well, I want my favorite thing included and so forth. I'm not an advocate for any changes in the process." One administrator voiced further objection to internationalization as part of the promotion and tenure process.

> One of the things I think our international efforts have not paid adequate attention to – maybe they haven't paid enough attention to it at all, is that you know, you cannot – except for certain kinds of people, depending on what their research interests are, most people can't be engaged in internationalization or we're going to fire them. They really need to be doing their research.

Another administrator voiced opposition to including internationalization in the promotion and tenure process by stating, "So, I think that even though you could put it on paper, and say this is part of the things faculty have to do to get tenure, it will not ever have much attention paid to it."

Some of the research participants talked about alternative ways to support internationalization efforts on campus other than through faculty involvement. One faculty

member posed the idea for the main role in internationalization "to be taken on by administrators in my opinion because they have a larger block of time in their assignment of responsibilities every year for service activities." One administrator added the perspective that the most important thing that could be done to move internationalization ahead at FSU would be to have "non-tenure earning people involved in it since the tenure-track faculty hired need to be first class researchers who cannot play other roles." The administrator added that this solution would allow for a 'greater division of labor' and still allow internationalization efforts to move forward and faculty to focus on research.

External Environment

Many of the interviewees in the research study discussed the challenges to FSU's internationalization efforts from the external environment. The participants shared perspectives on how external bodies such as the Florida State legislature, the Board of Governors and even SACS presented challenges on the extent to which internationalization could move forward at FSU. One administrator commented, "I think we have to be very sensitive to what's going on in the legislative process and there are mixed signals of what the legislature wants us [FSU] to be." Another administrator shared, "We probably are under a little larger microscope in terms of our activities, and so I think we try and stay abreast of what is going on in the state capital, both in the legislative branch and the Board of Governors as well as the governor's office."

Another administrator shared the challenge of enrolling international students because of the "need to educate Florida residents." The administrator added that the Florida State legislature "has not been as supportive as many of us would like as it relates to bringing in international students. We have to walk a fine line since we are a state university and have limited slots." A faculty member pointed out the conflict between the Florida Legislature not

supporting international student enrollment and the importance of international student enrollment by stating, "And the other challenge here is that the state is not in favor of this [international student enrollment]. I mean, they just want Florida students to be educated in Florida institutions, but you can't get educated unless you have this international input."

A senior leader summed up the influence of the external environment on FSU by stating, "We [FSU] get buffeted and tossed and turned in the waves." The senior leader discussed how continual budget cuts to FSU's budget made it difficult to respond to the regional accrediting body of SACS and stated, "Right now we're in the middle of trying to respond to our regional accrediting body. We try to be responsive, but increasingly we just don't have the people to be able to pull off a really good response, so we're barely keeping level, would be my estimation." The comments from the interviewees showed the multiple challenges from the external environment to internationalization efforts at FSU.

Lack of Curricular Initiatives

Many of the research respondents commented on the challenge of implementing university-wide initiatives to internationalize the curriculum. There were multiple reasons why no major curriculum internationalization efforts had been undertaken ranging from time commitment to degree requirements. One administrator commented, "I think our curriculum probably needs some rethinking, but I don't know that I have the energy at this stage in my life to be the champion of that one." Another administrator said he thought many people were happy with the current curriculum and saw no reason to change it. Another administrator voiced that he thought some people would like to see a revised curriculum but pointed out the challenge of mandating this to the faculty.

> I don't think we have done a lot of internationalization of the curriculum. And again, you know different folks would want to be doing this differently. They would have a

different orientation towards it and want to see it revised in different ways. By and large, it's hard to go to a faculty member and tell him that he's going to have to do this or do that in his class unless it's only with the non-tenure track instructors.

Another administrator supported this same view, and acknowledged that it would be difficult to expect faculty to work to internationalize their current classes. The faculty member stated, "The faculty can hardly do what they need to do in terms of making students write. Our core educational functions have been compromised by class size." One faculty member commented that a workshop on curriculum internationalization was offered to the faculty one summer to help them integrate some 'intercultural learning outcomes' into their courses. The faculty member added that not one faculty member attended the workshop.

Another faculty member pointed out that curriculum internationalization would really be difficult for the institution to 'impose' and suggested that since degree requirements are left to the individual colleges and departments, that such a project would have to be undertaken by the individual faculties. An administrator supported this view by explaining the difficulty departments face in fitting 'one more thing' into the curriculum. The administrator explained, "Ideally the theme of internationalization would permeate throughout many of the courses and not be just an additional course."

The student participants in the focus groups explained the need to internationalize the curriculum in many areas and provide students with a more global perspective in their courses. One international student commented, "I am sorry to say this but the curriculum, to be honest, is very, very Florida." Another international student working on a master's degree shared a similar perspective about his program.

All of the classes in my program are for students who plan to work in Florida. It's like the professors think you'll by staying in Florida and you only talk about issues in Florida. I had to tell myself that, OK, I like this stuff but then I realized that I came here [FSU] to

116

expand my knowledge and get an international perspective and learn more about public administration as it relates to international development.

Another international student shared her disappointment in the selection of history courses available to undergraduates. "There were more choices on African American and Native American History than there were choices of history from other areas around the world" the student commented.

One of the domestic students in the focus group commented on how she had planned to major in international business at FSU. However, she pointed out, "When I got here the international business program was no longer an option—someone said it was due to budget cuts. I think it would be amazing to bring it back." The participant data on curriculum internationalization showed that there is no university-wide plan to revise the curriculum and there are multiple challenges to carrying out such a project.

International Student Enrollment

Participants in this study openly discussed their perspectives on the challenges of increasing international student enrollment at FSU as well as the challenges of having international students in classes. One faculty member pointed out how the international student enrollment at the undergraduate level had never surpassed several hundred students "due to the competitive nature of admissions to FSU and the pressure from the state to enroll Florida residents." The faculty member commented that having so few international undergraduate students limited the interactions domestic students could have with students from other cultures.

One administrator commented, "I think we do a decent job in being receptive to international students, but in terms of attracting students from other parts of the world at the undergraduate level to come and have an undergraduate experience, I don't think we've really measured up." One administrator supported this same view by stating, "I feel like the presence

117

of international students at the undergraduate level is pretty minimal and doesn't have a profound impact on domestic students." The administrator continued by saying that international students are simply "the exception to the rule.'

Several faculty members talked about efforts at the graduate level to attract international students with funding from their home countries. "I know some departments are making efforts to try and attract funded graduate students," commented one faculty member. "But there is no university-wide initiative to move this ahead." One administrator discussed how many academic departments did not have sufficient funding to offer assistantships and other incentives to attract highly qualified international students. "It's fine if they [international students] are paying. But if they have to be supported, which most of the PhD students are, we just really can't afford to do it." Another faculty member shared a similar view and stated, "It seems like we just say to international students that here's the cost and if you want to pay we'll be glad to have you. We're lucky to get the students that we do."

One administrator commented that he thought international students contributed a lot to FSU but added, "Although probably their contributions are not as appreciated as they might be." Another administrator added that there was sometimes a problem of domestic students complaining about international teaching assistants teaching their classes. "We run into the problem of students coming in, wanting to worm their way out of a class they're enrolled in because they cannot understand the international teaching assistant. That's unfortunate, but that's life in America and there is insensitivity to people who might have a little bit of an accent in the way they speak English." A faculty member pointed out that there is a 'huge learning curve' for FSU to become more welcoming to international students.

One faculty member talked about the resistance he perceived from other faculty toward having international students in class because of their English skills. "I think most of us would agree that from the faculty's point of view somebody who is struggling with English is going to take considerably more time and effort." An administrator supported this view and said, "So what may take to make it up to ten minutes with an English-speaking American may take 20 minutes with an international student and a lot of people get frustrated that they take up too much time and too much effort." Another faculty member pointed out that he had also noticed resistance to international student enrollment in the Council of Deans and various faculty committees.

> Those are the minds that need to be changed since an awful lot of them are still narrow. You bring up international students and they'll come up with an anecdote of how ten years ago they had a student that couldn't speak English or something, and you're fighting that whole same old battle.

One administrator commented on the importance of faculty members working to make classes with international students a 'very positive, enriching time.' "If they [faculty members] don't, then having international students in the class will be seen as a detriment by the domestic students." One faculty member voiced a similar view by stating, "The faculty just doesn't know how to take advantage of the rich diversity of the classroom. They are not trained on how to do that." One administrator gave his perspective on faculty attitudes toward international students. "The faculty feels that their task is to present material, educate the student, and do the research necessary for promotion and tenure. If they [faculty] feel they have presented the material, they may not feel it's their responsibility to spend excessive amounts of time trying to explain it all again." The findings on international student enrollment confirmed that there are ongoing challenges involved in recruiting international students as well as having them in classes.

Lack of Centralized International Office

Many of the research participants discussed how the lack of a centralized administrative structure to oversee all internationalization efforts at FSU was a major challenge to advance internationalization efforts. One administrator said that she found the current structure to be 'confusing' and added, "There are basically two separate offices which don't make sense. I understand it but it doesn't make any sense for internationalization." Another administrator shared a similar view by stating, "There's no set landing place for internationalization. In other words, whose is it [internationalization efforts]?" One faculty member gave some background on how the divided structure, with International Programs under Academic Affairs and the Center for Global Engagement under Student Affairs, came into existence.

> The idea in 1986 was to unite everything international, the Academic side with International Programs and the Student Affairs side with the International Center [now Center for Global Engagement]. But there was a senior leader in Student Affairs that simply didn't want that to happen. So it [the structure] stayed divided and it wasn't united. If it [the structure] had been united, that was the window to move ahead with internationalization on this campus. But, you had one person that prevented it.

Another administrator talked about the same decision not to establish a centralized structure years before. The administrator stated, "The right thing to do would have been to figure out the relationship between International Programs and the International Center, put some umbrella over that and put some money into it." One faculty member discussed how the current divided structure "is not just confusing to the students, it is confusing to the faculty, it's confusing to the Deans." The faculty member commented how students interested in going on a study abroad program or on an exchange program do not understand which office they need to go to get more information. "Ideally, there should not be that division," continued the faculty member, "but given our history and structure that is the way it is now even though it is not like that in other

120

universities." The faculty member emphasized that the lack of a centralized structure was a major challenge to internationalization at FSU.

One faculty member compared the lack of a centralized structure to the electrical wiring in an old building. The faculty member reflected on how old buildings do not have the electrical wiring to meet today's needs and said, "This is a big problem here [FSU]. Everyone talks about globalization, blah, blah blah; but the structures in place are not really equipped to deal with it."

Another faculty member discussed how difficult it was to try and set up bilateral exchange agreements or get support for new ideas supporting internationalization years ago at FSU. "We [departments] had to figure out everything by ourselves and there was no office or professional staff to help us," the faculty member commented. "This is better now that we finally have some help but we are still far behind the support other institutions provide to their departments for internationalization initiatives."

A senior leader shared the need "to develop a centralized office with a reporting relationship to the highest levels of the institution." The senior leader continued by stating, "We've got several units with people with a lot of ideas working on this [internationalization] but we truly need an office of International Education that has the capacity to work seamlessly across all areas and achieve common goals." The findings confirmed that the majority of the research participants acknowledge that the current structure with multiple departments involved in international activity is confusing to stakeholders and should be reorganized into a centralized department.

Decentralized Institutional Structure

The majority of all of the research participants commented on how the decentralized structure of FSU made it difficult to support internationalization efforts. One senior leader

commented, "It's just that we—I think we're so decentralized that we have a hard time moving in any direction. We're sort of stuck with all our different units doing mostly their own thing." An administrator mentioned that FSU was very 'compartmentalized' and added that most of the colleges do not even participate in any formal mechanism in support of internationalization. Another administrator mentioned that FSU was made up of many 'silos' and that decision making was decentralized throughout the colleges and at the departmental and program levels. A faculty member shared a similar perspective on the decentralized structure at FSU.

> The 16 colleges are silos and they don't interact that much. Within each college you have multiple departments, that in many cases are silos within the college, and then within departments you frequently have silos of research interest. Getting people to interact with others that may have different interests, different cultural backgrounds, is sometimes hard at a major research university, where the promotions, the rewards are predicated on how well you research and do your research.

Another faculty member talked about how all of the colleges worked quite independently and had no budget to promote internationalization efforts. The faculty member discussed how difficult it was to help move internationalization forward within such a 'decentralized' institution. Another faculty member shared a similar point of view. "Here we have a very decentralized model," said the faculty member, "and each college has its own budget, does its own fundraising and has a lot of autonomy." The faculty member continued that such a decentralized organizational structure presented challenges to institutional initiatives but that such a structure was necessary within a large research institution.

Focus on Study Abroad

Many of the research participants discussed how most study abroad opportunities available to students were limited to the four FSU study centers located in London, Florence, Valencia, and Panama City, Panama. Some of the participants discussed how the growth and development of FSU's International Programs [study abroad] was the main effort toward

122

internationalization for decades. The participants shared their views on the limitations of study

abroad programs where FSU students live and study together and discussed how they would like

to see more cultural interaction and more overseas options for students. One administrator

commented, "We have what I would consider traditional study abroad programs with four

campuses but that's not necessarily my conception of what internationalization is necessarily all

about, although that could certainly be a part of it." Another administrator described his view of

FSU student participation in study abroad through the four study centers by stating, "We just

plunk down kids in an American environment in a different country and there is not a whole lot

of interaction with other cultures. I'm not so sure that this type of study abroad experience even

qualifies as part of internationalization although I think that it is just a first step." One

administrator shared his view in support of FSU expanding study abroad options for students.

> The International Programs [study abroad] piece is well established and is something that
> FSU's known for and that's a positive thing, but that's a pretty, in a way, old school kind
> of thing to just be saying go study abroad in London or Valencia. I think the push to get
> students out of the sort of European circles- although, I mean, I would never say that it's
> not tremendously valuable to go to London or Paris or Florence or whatever, but there
> needs to be a push that says let's go to developing countries, let's go other places and
> let's bring more knowledge of those countries and cultures here. I think we still got quite
> a ways to go in terms of having that become just an everyday part of what we're doing.

Another faculty member supported the same view of expanding study abroad

opportunities beyond Europe by stating, "I think the study abroad stuff is too Euro-

centric. I think it needs to be expanded beyond the top tourist destinations of Europe."

An administrator and faculty member both discussed how the traditional study abroad

programs provided FSU students with limited cultural interaction with the local people. An

administrator said, "They [the FSU students] are all housed in a building with all American

students more than likely. They're not staying in homes, they're not getting added to the

community and not getting to understand or know the culture of the people." A faculty member

123

supported the same view by commenting, "They [FSU students] go to these study sites and have elaborate experiences and see amazing things. But, it's like they were just in a 3D museum. They aren't really interacting with the people." An FSU student who participated in a semester abroad in the FSU Study Center in London talked about her experience.

> It's really interesting to see how close we [FSU students] became because there's this special bond that you create with the person you're studying abroad with. We just really bonded over our experience and we bonded over what we're going through now that we are back. We'll learn about things that are happening on campus, international events and all that. And they'll [FSU students with shared study abroad experience] invite me and they'll let me know what's happening and I'll go along with them.

An administrator commented that the cost to study at one of the FSU Centers prohibited many students from participating. The administrator added that the high cost of study abroad prevents many students from having an international experience.

One administrator discussed the need to have more locations around the world and to provide students with different types of experiences. The administrator discussed an international experience some students had to the Amazon where they interacted with the local people and the culture. "They [the students] lived out in the Amazon and worked on a water project. It was a profoundly moving experience for them." The administrator explained that this type of non-traditional international experience gave students the opportunity to "truly engage and invest in what some of these communities are attempting to do." The findings from the study indicated that the research participants shared similar views on the need for FSU to expand study abroad opportunities outside of Europe and to provide students with experiences to interact and learn about the local cultures.

Communication

The majority of all of the interviewees in the research study shared their perspectives on how the large size of the campus made communication challenging. Faculty and administrators

124

discussed the challenges of trying to communicate with each other as well as trying to communicate with students. One administrator said that communication was so difficult at FSU not only because of its size but because of the restrictions placed on university wide communication. The administrator explained, "There's an approval process and you just can't send out a mass e-mail. It's got to be approved, but there's a good side to that—otherwise we could all be besieged by emails and surveys." Another administrator discussed how she did not even know that the International Advisory Group, made up of administrators and faculty members, existed or that the group had been meeting on a regular basis for over three years. "That is just an example of things that just do not get communicated as broadly as perhaps they could be," the administrator said. "I've asked to attend the meetings since I'm facilitating the President's Big Ideas [fundraising] on internationalization." Another administrator pointed out that she thought the information process at FSU was decentralized and that not all of the information was widely shared across the various colleges.

A faculty member added that there were still challenges to keeping everyone informed by stating, "You can easily be on this campus and not know what is going on in internationalization if you don't make it an effort to find out." One administrator pointed out the difficulties in trying to keep the students informed. "I know there's a huge amount of information about what's happening on this campus that students just don't know but that is part of being such a big university."

The students discussed the challenges they encountered with communication on campus and shared different ideas on how communication might be improved. One domestic student said there should be 'better, easier' access to more information on the different ways to study abroad such as through exchange programs. "A lot of students might want to study abroad,"

125

commented the student, "but they don't know about the other options such as exchange programs. So they just think of FSU Study Abroad and how expensive it is and they just don't go."

One student acknowledged that she had never heard of the Garnet and Gold Scholar Program, an initiative started by the president last year to encourage student engagement by completing requirements in three of the five areas of service, research, internships, international experience, and leadership. Another student said, "I've heard it mentioned, probably in passing, but I'm not you know, really sure other than hearing that name, what it is." Another student acknowledged that she heard the President talk about it at a special event, but added that she had not heard anyone else talk about it. Another student commented that she thought more students would get involved in programs like Garnet and Gold if they had a clearer idea of what Garnet and Gold Scholars really were. "Maybe more people would care if they were given clear ideas on what the Garnet and Gold Scholars are doing and that would help them see whether they might want to join the program."

Students discussed how they seldom read the email announcements they receive from the university because they receive so many that they all 'got lost in the clutter.' One student commented that she did not read any emails and another student said she reads the subject line and then "just deletes all of them." The students acknowledged that the university Blackboard system was also not an effective way of getting messages to them but said they did use it to get information about their classes. One student said that she got most of her information from what was going on around campus from her friends. "I didn't even know there were all of these international events on campus to be involved in," the student said. "I just hang out with my friends and no one has ever talked about all of this stuff." Another student agreed that word of

126

mouth was one of the ways she learned about many things on campus. "It would be helpful to have people talk to you and just say—hey, let me talk to you about this real quick and hand you a flyer as you walk across campus," said the student. "That would get my attention." Other students talked about how they used Facebook to communicate and sometimes would hear about cultural programs and activities from other friends. Synthesis of the data on communication at FSU confirmed the importance of communication in keeping stakeholders apprised of international and intercultural opportunities.

Support for Internationalization at FSU

The majority of the faculty, administrators and senior level administrators in the research study acknowledged that there was support for internationalization efforts at FSU even though the institution faced many challenges. All of the research participants acknowledged the growing support for internationalization throughout campus in the last five to ten years and discussed several of the changes that had taken place at FSU because of the support for campus internationalization. The research participants all articulated concrete examples of the changes and visible actions supporting the development of some internationalization initiatives in the last few years.

One faculty member, for example, commented on the increase in international activity at FSU in the last few years and commented, "It's heartening to see it grow lately." A senior leader acknowledged that FSU was still a long way from achieving comprehensive internationalization throughout the campus but added, "I see us moving on that continuum." An administrator acknowledged increasing support toward internationalization by commenting, "You know, I think we're certainly more internationalized than we were 10 or 15 years ago. We're moving in the right direction. Would I consider us an internationalized university? Probably not yet."

The responses from the participants in the focus groups for domestic students demonstrated that the majority of the students acknowledged much support for internationalization at FSU and even considered it an internationalized campus. One student from the focus group made up of students who had not been involved in any international or intercultural programs or activities commented that she considered FSU to be a very internationalized campus due to its international enrollment of students from over '50' countries and study abroad options in over '30' countries. The student concluded, "So, I definitely think it's (FSU) a perfect internationalized campus." Another student who has been very involved in intercultural activities and programs on campus also recognized the support for internationalization at FSU and sees FSU as an internationalized campus "because of my experience." She commented on how the international students are 'intertwined' with the FSU students and that everyone is very involved in "all of the international programs and activities we have here."

An administrator voiced his perspective on the increasing support for internationalization at FSU by stating, "It's taken great, great strides over the last six years. But, we still have a long way to go." Another administrator acknowledged that there were 'pockets of support' for internationalization throughout campus but added, "I suspect it's not something that's going to grow by leaps and bounds."

One administrator stated that she believed internationalization was now a higher priority on campus than it ever had been before and added, "I believe the buy in is becoming more broad as we move forward and people see the benefits and the things that students are doing." Another administrator acknowledged the growing support to provide students with a variety of international and intercultural co-curricular activities. "All you have to do is look at the rich

menu of international opportunities and activities that exist here [FSU]," said the administrator,

"and you can see that we are doing an excellent job in the co-curricular area. The framework for

the whole co-curricular aspect of internationalization is where it should be." One faculty

member summed up the progress in internationalization efforts at FSU.

> I think it has been in just the last five to seven years that I've seen a great increase in internationalization. I see it as a grassroots level movement to internationalize coming from primarily from one department on this campus with leadership for a vision for an internationalized campus and how that needs to be done. And it's supported by certain stakeholders across campus.

Synthesis of the data from the research participants resulted in the following subthemes.

Campus Culture

The majority of the research participants in the study talked about the multiple aspects of

the FSU campus culture that support the advancement of internationalization efforts. The

research participants discussed how the FSU campus culture was extremely warm and friendly

and very student centered. There was a sense of pride in the campus culture at FSU and many of

the respondents pointed out how 'unique' it is to have such a welcoming culture in a large,

research institution. Respondents discussed how the liberal arts history of FSU, and the

emphasis on promoting student engagement, were strengths supporting internationalization. One

senior leader summarized his view on the campus culture at FSU.

> We have here [FSU] a very special warmth, that sense of family, and a powerful sense of community. The value we place on the liberal arts, on the arts and humanities, on the broad based education really characterizes the uniqueness of our institution. Here you get the opportunities of a big research university in an atmosphere that is much more welcoming and supportive than you might find in a larger, urban atmosphere.

Synthesis of the data on the support for internationalization at FSU resulted in the following

subthemes.

Friendly, welcoming environment. One of the most talked about strengths to support FSU's internationalization efforts was the friendly, welcoming campus environment. One administrator commented, "This is a very friendly engaging campus where it doesn't seem to matter whether it's students, faculty, or staff. If you walk across campus and you act like you don't know where you're going, people will speak to you and somebody will offer to help." A senior leader supported this same view by stating, "I think most people try to go out of their way to help students if they can. I think it [FSU] is very student friendly, and relative to some other places, very student nurturing." Another administrator commented that FSU was trying to define itself as one of the most student friendly campuses in the country. The administrator continued, "I know we're doing it [becoming student friendly] very well compared to other flagship universities in this state." A faculty member talked about his perspective of FSU as being both very collegial and very friendly and said there were many people at FSU who cared about their jobs, and about the students. The faculty member explained, "If I had to give this a term—I would say it's very collegial. There are pockets where people seek excellence." An international student shared a similar perspective on the friendly atmosphere of FSU.

> If you come from another culture, well, it's just awkward in the beginning. I went to a
> different school for a summer course when I first arrived in the U.S. They [other school]
> treat international students differently than this school [FSU]. When I got here I realized
> how well international students are treated and everyone was so friendly.

Another international student talked about the friendliness of the FSU culture. The student stated, "Anything at all that you need help with, you can find people here at FSU that will help you with that. Anything at all, in terms of classes, or activities, clubs, all kinds of things, anything at all that you need, you can find help. People are all so friendly and helpful, and that was very much a relief for me." The data confirmed that there is consensus among all stakeholders that FSU has a very friendly and welcoming environment and that such an

environment provides support for internationalization efforts. The data also confirmed that the
majority of the international student participants in the research study found the campus
environment to be welcoming and supportive.

Liberal arts tradition. Several of the research respondents in the study talked about the
strong liberal arts tradition at FSU and the impact such history had on the culture. One senior
leader commented that FSU had many traditional elements found in a research institution but
added, "It's got a lot more emphasis on liberal arts and fine arts than most research one
universities do. So that gives it an interesting air." An administrator supported a similar view by
commenting, "We have a lot of the traditional elements of a research institution, and being this
size is difficult. But I think we try to be a caring, small, liberal arts college within a large state
university." A faculty member shared his view on the influence of the liberal arts tradition on
the FSU culture.

> I think our long history as Florida State College for Women and the strong liberal arts
> traditions that we had, and then our history of becoming a co-educational university in
> the late 40s have all influenced who we are today. We've tried to retain that the liberal
> arts traditions which values learning for the sake of learning, values individual
> differences and becoming a scholar and a citizen of the world.

The comments from the research participants confirm the influence of FSU's liberal arts history
in helping create a culture that supports internationalization efforts.

Student engagement. Many of the research participants talked about the emphasis on
student engagement at FSU as another strength in support of internationalization. The
participants commented on the variety of activities and programs available for students on
campus. Some of the respondents also referred to the President's initiative to make FSU the
most highly engaged student campus in the U.S. One administrator explained his perspective on
this. "We emphasize the whole student, as I think most institutions would like to do," said the

administrator. "We recognize that education is not just lectures and homework, and we try to offer an environment that fosters growth in all areas of the student's life; social, cultural, intellectual and physical." A faculty member shared her view on the involvement of faculty and administrators in promoting student engagement. "I think we are so large," said the faculty member. "But when it comes to getting students involved everyone focuses on helping the students find their niche outside of academics and in helping them succeed in whatever extracurricular activities they choose." An administrator talked about the numerous options available to students through service organizations, student clubs, Greek Life, and a very 'active' and 'powerful' FSU Student Government Association.

A domestic student talked about the opportunities to be engaged at FSU. "I've met people from all over the place through the different clubs and activities that I am involved in. There are just so many outlets to get involved in and to have great experiences here." Another domestic student supported that same view by commenting on how it was very easy to get involved at FSU because there are so many opportunities 'to seize.' Another domestic student explained about the activities she was engaged in at FSU.

> I'm really involved with Peace Jam. I live, breathe Peace Jam through the Center for Leadership and Civic Education. I also go out to the public schools and teach about Peace Jam and the curriculum is based on diversity. We learn a lot about the Nobel Peace Laureates that come from different countries to speak at FSU every year. I'm also a Service Scholar and that keeps me involved in ongoing community service projects.

An international student talked about the many social and extracurricular activities available by commenting, "There are so many events going on at the Globe and so many of these try to get international and domestic students to interact. There's International Coffee Hour, all sorts of exchange programs and lots of study abroad opportunities. This campus offers so much." The data confirmed that there is much support, including

Presidential support, to develop a very student-engaged campus. The observations from

the research participants showed that there are multiple co-curricular activities and

programs for students and that such engagement promotes interaction between

international and domestic students. The data confirmed that the emphasis on creating a

highly engaged student campus at FSU supports internationalization efforts.

Change Supporting Internationalization

The research participants acknowledged multiple positive changes that have taken place

at FSU over the last few years in support of internationalization even though there is no

institution-wide mandate to internationalize. Many of the research participants commented on

how administrators within Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and some faculty members had

worked together to plan and implement programs in support of internationalization.

Collaborative efforts between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs resulted in the development

of curricular and co-curricular programs with an intercultural and international focus. Many of

the research participants claimed that the increased visibility of campus internationalization

through these new programs and activities, and the positive student response toward these

efforts, led to increased involvement of stakeholders throughout the campus. The data also

showed that senior leadership in Student Affairs supported emergent change efforts originating at

the departmental level and such support was essential in implementing internationalization

initiatives on a campus without a university-wide mandate to internationalize.

For example, one administrator commented, "I think that there's been a very positive

change in the last eight years or so and we now have some young leadership working in the area

of internationalization." He acknowledged that the young leaders had done a great job in

increasing the interaction among students of diverse cultures and added, "I think that that is one

133

area where we can say that we have made progress." A faculty member supported a similar view by adding, "The people involved in internationalization on campus here are doing a fine job and have already done a great deal of work. If we just keep continuing at this pace . . . this will turn out to be a very positive experience." Synthesis of the interview data on change supporting internationalization initiatives resulted in the following three major areas of development.

Center for Global Engagement. The majority of all of the participants in the research study cited the Center for Global Engagement (CGE) as the biggest indicator of the change FSU has made toward internationalization in the last few years. One faculty member said the following about the CGE. "I mean there is no question that the CGE has been the catalyst for change in internationalizing this campus." Other faculty members referred to the CGE as 'our number one strength' and as a 'tremendous asset.'

One faculty member commented, "I have been delighted to see the emergence of the CGE. The programs that go on there, the leadership that is provided there, and the opportunities for all students to interact with people of all cultures and have intercultural experiences." Another faculty member supported that same view by adding that he considered the CGE to be the unit on campus that 'spearheaded' the internationalization process at FSU. The faculty member commented, "It is not just the vision that was provided [by CGE leadership], but the ability to implement that vision in a way that is strategic, that speaks to a variety of different stakeholders and has been like the main driver towards implementing a comprehensive strategy." One other faculty member said, "The CGE is doing the most towards internationalizing the campus, and I mean they're carrying the lion's share of the effort." According to document analysis, the CGE is located in a newly constructed building, often referred to as the 'Globe,' which is shared with the Center for Multicultural Affairs. Document analysis also shows that a

senior leader in the Division of Student Affairs approved and supported construction of the Globe and that both units within the building are under the Division of Student Affairs. Document analysis also shows that the senior leader in Student Affairs supported the expansion of the mission of the Center for Global Engagement from a focus on providing international student and scholar immigration services and support to a campus-wide role of promoting internationalization.

Many of the participants in the research study used the term the 'Globe' when referring to the physical facility as well as when referring to CGE activities and staff. One faculty member commented on the outstanding facilities of the Globe and expressed how the new building had 'exponentially' changed international activity on campus. The faculty member added, "I just see more and more students taking advantage of all of the programs and activities there and it is nice to see such a mix of academic activities, talks and programs."

An international student compared the Globe to buildings on other major campuses housing International Student Services. "When I compare this building [Globe] to the other buildings at schools like University of Delaware, Michigan State and Florida Atlantic University, I will say that this building is the best. And, I'm not making that up." Another international student commented on the Globe facility, "I feel like this building is so different than other buildings at FSU. You have classrooms, a kitchen, a huge auditorium, even a meditation room. And, the energy, the architecture, the colors bring so much positive energy." Another international student added that the biggest turning point for him at FSU was when the Globe was constructed. "This changed everything for me," commented the international student. "I come here for International Coffee Hour every week and this is like my second home." Another international student commented that she found the Globe to be a great facility and added, "The

people who work here are so nice and welcoming and really make you feel at home and help you adapt to life here [U.S.]. It's like one big family, and you feel part of it when you're here [Globe]."

Role of Student Affairs. Some of the research respondents commented on the important role the Division of Student Affairs played in supporting internationalization efforts on campus. Several senior leaders, some of the administrators and some of the faculty members acknowledged how senior level support from Student Affairs increased the visibility and the credibility of internationalization initiatives at FSU. In addition, some of the research participants discussed the key role played by a senior leader in Student Affairs in supporting and becoming actively involved in internationalization initiatives on campus. One senior leader commented that there are many people on campus with ideas to support internationalization but added, "Student Affairs has been the voice in promoting it." Another FSU senior leader commented that the senior leadership in Student Affairs really did help 'push this thing [internationalization] forward'.

One administrator mentioned that in his opinion, the only senior leader in Westcott [main FSU administration building] involved in internationalization was the senior leader of Student Affairs. "I just haven't seen much interest or much involvement from anybody else up there," said the administrator. "The involvement of the senior leadership of Student Affairs has certainly raised awareness about campus internationalization and that has been a very good thing." A faculty member explained how the role of a senior leader in Student Affairs helped move internationalization forward at FSU.

> About five or so years ago, the senior leader in Student Affairs got behind the Director of the International Center and supported the efforts there [to internationalize]. I think that the interest of the senior leader, and the fact that she showed up at meetings and

136

participated, gave this whole idea of internationalization the attention it needed. That helped many people from Academic Affairs start to pay attention and to get involved.

Data from the interviews confirmed the majority of the senior leaders, administrators, and faculty members recognized that the support from Student Affairs senior leadership was instrumental in bringing about the change needed to implement internationalization initiatives at FSU. The data also confirmed that the majority of the research participants recognize that the support from the senior leader in Student Affairs was critical to the growth and success of internationalization ideas emerging from the administrators in the Center for Global Engagement.

Collaborative leadership. Many of the interviewees in this research study commented on the various projects accomplished at FSU in the last few years due to the collaborative leadership between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Many of the interviewees discussed how committees, made up of administrators and faculty from Student Affairs and Academic Affairs, helped increase the visibility and support for internationalization on campus. One administrator commented, "I think there's probably more interaction and discussion among some of the key players at the midlevel administrative level in making the effort to internationalize than we have ever had from the senior administrative level." A faculty member commented on how he credited the collaborative leadership efforts as key in "involving a lot of faculty members in internationalization efforts even without a university-wide plan to internationalize." The faculty member added that the administrators and staff from both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs had been actively involved in organizing and leading committees and trying to get more faculty and students involved in internationalization efforts. One administrator said the following about the collaboration among departments.

So right when we have all of this energy and enthusiasm about internationalization was just at the time when we didn't have extra money. We were faced with huge budget cuts in the last years. So, whereas in prosperous years we would have been able to add staff and had money for programs and scholarships, etcetera, but we have just not had that. We've had to do this [internationalization efforts] on a barebones budget and through a lot of collaboration across different departments.

A faculty member shared a similar view in stating, "I credit the collaborative leadership we have had here in the last few years for starting the discussions, sharing information, and coordinating academic and co-curricular activities." Synthesis of the data from the participant interviews and through document analysis showed that collaborative leadership between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs was essential to the success of internationalization efforts at FSU. The synthesis of the data on collaborative leadership identified the following committees as being instrumental in promoting this collaboration.

International advisory committee. Several research participants mentioned the International Advisory Committee as one of the examples of collaborative leadership at FSU. Document and website analysis shows that the committee is made up of thirteen members from Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and the members include faculty, administrators, deans and one vice president. One faculty member, who is not a member of the committee said "I think the International Advisory Board [Committee] is a good example of cross collaboration and brings together the academic and student affairs areas to work on strategic plans and initiatives to internationalize campus." A senior leader agreed that the International Advisory Committee showed that "progress is being made in collaborative efforts between student affairs and academic affairs." One committee member spoke about the various subcommittees formed to address different areas of internationalization such as recruitment, organization and structure, and faculty involvement. The faculty member said, "I've enjoyed participating on these

subcommittees. I have learned a lot about the process [internationalization] and it's been a good way for Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to interact more openly."

One administrator said that she thought the work of the International Advisory Committee had helped lay the groundwork for a strategy for internationalization at FSU. "I'm not sure that we're quite there," commented the administrator. "But I think the strategic plan that has been put forward [by the International Advisory Committee] has got a lot of really good pieces to it. I think our Big Ideas [President's fundraising initiative] is adding some more pieces to it. Yes, we have some goals, I'm not sure we have a clear sense of how we would achieve those goals." A faculty member credited the support and involvement of a senior leader in Student Affairs to providing the committee credibility and to increasing the importance for campus internationalization. Comments on the International Advisory Committee confirmed the importance of the collaborative efforts between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs in supporting internationalization efforts at FSU.

Exchange committee. Several of the participants in the research study discussed the role the FSU Exchange Committee had in formalizing the process to set up and manage bilateral student exchange agreements and cooperative agreements between FSU and international partner institutions. The committee convened in 2008 and was chaired by a senior leader in Academic Affairs with committee members from the Graduate School, CGE, and Office of the Registrar. One administrator gave some background on exchange agreements at FSU.

> Years ago, we had very few exchange agreements and these were being set up without a university-wide process by one office on campus. Most academic departments were unaware that exchange agreements could be set up and there was no information available throughout the university on how to do this. Several administrators identified this problem and the Exchange Committee was formed so that we could centralize the exchange agreement process and set up a university-wide process to increase the number of exchange agreements.

Document analysis shows that exchange agreements grew from 15 exchange agreements in 2007 to 45 in 2012. One faculty member talked about the importance of increasing the number of exchange agreements at FSU. "Participating in an exchange program gives the FSU student the enriching experience of being immersed in another culture, studying in a university with students from that culture. Exchanges are much less expensive than study abroad through FSU International Programs since students pay home tuition for the exchanges and not an expensive program fee." One administrator discussed how she would like to see even more exchange opportunities set up to "provide students with options around the world to study and engage with other cultures." Document analysis shows that a fulltime exchange coordinator was hired in 2008 to set up and manage the university wide exchange process and to assist academic departments in setting up exchange agreements. The data from interviews on the exchange committee at FSU confirmed that the number of exchange and collaborative agreements has increased at FSU. The data also confirmed that faculty and administrators value the cultural immersion provided through exchange experiences for students and would like more exchange agreements to be established.

Successful Internationalization Initiatives

The majority of all of the research participants talked about the increased number of programs and events with an intercultural or international focus now available to students and mentioned how such activity demonstrated the growing interest in internationalization at FSU. Many of the research participants were familiar with some of the more publicized and successful internationalization initiatives available to students. Synthesis of the data from the interviews about successful internationalization initiatives at FSU identified the following as significant emergent programs.

Global Pathways Certificate. Many of the research participants mentioned the Global

Pathways Certificate as an example of a successful internationalization initiative implemented in

the last few years at FSU. One faculty member commented, "I think that the Global Pathways

Certificate is probably the most important initiative with a combination of academic and co-

curricular activities. There was collaboration across Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to

develop this Certificate involving requirements such as intercultural activities, international

cross-cultural experience, academic course work and a language requirement." One

administrator pointed out that students "do not necessarily have to go abroad" to earn the Global

Pathways Certificate. The administrator explained that students can substitute intercultural

experiences in the U.S. and work with people from a culture different than their own to meet the

requirement for the extended intercultural/international experience. One domestic student

reflected on her desire to enroll in the Global Pathways Certificate program.

> I want to do Global Pathways because I feel like before I never really considered getting outside of the little bubble that I'm in. Now that I have gone on Beyond Borders [cultural exchange program] it really changed my perspective and outlook on things a lot more. I haven't really had that much international experience, so I'd like to appreciate it more. I'd just like to be more globally competent as a person in general. So that's why I'd like to do more of the classes now that I have gone abroad so I can reflect more and more and earn the Global Pathways Certificate.

Another domestic student who is enrolled in the Global Pathways Certificate program

commented, "I like being part of Global Pathways. I always look at the website and they

always have so many events going on that will count toward the certificate." An

administrator said he supported the Global Pathways Certificate because students blended

different types of experiences and then had to reflect on and synthesize those experiences

in the final project.

141

A faculty member said he is in favor of Global Pathways because "it's not dealing with theory. It's dealing with the practice. It's confronting concrete issues and asking how to solve them. I think Global Pathways has been a great contribution to the internationalization of Florida State." Another faculty member voiced that he would like to see some of the course requirements for the Global Pathways Certificate changed for an alternative such as a project. The faculty member said that it was too difficult for engineering students to meet the course requirements for the certificate because of the structure of the engineering curriculum. The data from the Global Pathways Certificate confirmed that some stakeholders see this as one of the most successful initiatives resulting from the collaborative efforts of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. The data also confirmed that faculty and administrators value the combination of curricular and co-curricular requirements in the certificate program. Data also confirmed that the certificate requirements do not meet the needs of all of the majors at FSU because of the highly structured nature of the curriculum.

Pre and post international experience classes. Several of the research participants talked about the new academic classes offered at FSU to prepare students before engaging in international experiences as well as reflecting on and applying their experiences upon their return from abroad. Document analysis confirmed that the classes were a collaborative effort between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. Further analysis showed that classes reached maximum enrollment during the four semesters they were offered. One senior leader remarked that the classes "are great evidence of the growth in efforts we are making toward better preparing students before international experiences." The senior leader continued, "These started as non-credit workshops and evolved into credit classes because of student demand." One domestic

142

student talked about the relevance of the pre-departure class for his internship in NYC in a multicultural environment.

> We literally had people from every culture. In the administrative office alone which is where I ended up, we had a Colombian, Ecuadorian, two women from Japan, and three interns from Korea. It was like a complete patchwork quilt of different cultures. Interactions between them were fascinating. I was able to interact successfully with all of them because of the concepts of intercultural communication I learned in the class. It [pre-departure class] was very focused on how to determine the difference between high context and low context cultures and know how to act and speak accordingly.

Another domestic student commented on her participation in the pre-departure class after having returned from abroad. "I didn't have time to take the class before going abroad and my whole experience was kind of superficial," said the student. The student explained that she is currently enrolled in the class and learning about collectivist societies, individualist societies, and many things about culture she said she wished she had known before going abroad.

One senior leader said, "Well, it would be wonderful if we had resources to have more credit courses where we worked on the issues related to internationalization and helping our students move along that continuum of intercultural competence." The senior leader emphasized that resources could also be used to help support more faculty and student involvement in international experiences. The data on pre and post international experiences classes confirmed that not all stakeholders are aware of the recent implementation of these classes to help students maximize their international experiences. The data confirmed that the students enrolled in these classes find them to be extremely helpful and provide them with valuable knowledge about how to interact successfully in other cultures. The data also confirmed that FSU does not currently have the resources to add additional sections of the pre and post classes.

Garnet and Gold Scholar Society. Multiple interviewees in the research study mentioned the Garnet and Gold Scholar Society as another example of promoting student

143

engagement in international experiences. Document analysis showed that the Garnet and Gold

Scholar Society is a direct initiative of the FSU President and was implemented in 2011 by a

joint committee of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs administrators and faculty. One

administrator said the following about the new initiative.

> The Garnet and Gold Scholar Society is probably the best example of involvement of the most senior leadership in student engagement on campus. The president selected five areas that he felt really deepen student's learning and expanded learning beyond the classroom; internships, service, leadership, research and international experiences. Students choose three of the five and complete the requirements for each one. Having an international experience included as one of the five choices gives broader visibility to internationalization across campus.

Another administrator shared a similar view on the inclusion of the international

component as an option in the Garnet and Gold Scholar Program. The administrator said,

"I think including an international experience got a lot of publicity and talk going across

campus that put things international into discussions where they probably wouldn't have

been before."

One administrator commented on how quickly the Garnet and Gold Scholar Program was

developed and implemented at the mandate of the President compared to the lengthy process of

implementing the Global Pathways Certificate, which was not a mandate of the President.

"Global Pathways took meetings after meetings and approvals after approvals," the administrator

said, "But Garnet and Gold was created rather than evolving." The administrator continued on to

say she thought this contrast showed a lot about the need for senior level support to make things

happen more quickly. The data confirmed that the Garnet and Gold Scholar Program encourages

student engagement in international experiences. The data also confirmed that the Garnet and

Gold Scholar Program was implemented at the request of the President and that his support for

this initiative expedited the development and implementation of the program. Data also

144

confirmed that the Garnet and Gold Scholar Society is another successful internationalization initiative planned and implemented collaboratively between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs administrators and faculty.

Conclusion

The data collected on internationalization efforts at FSU represented the point of view of multiple stakeholders across the campus. The stakeholders, made up of senior leadership, administrators, faculty members, and students discussed their perspectives on internationalization and shared their experiences in the internationalization efforts at FSU. The data from the stakeholder interviews was synthesized and triangulated to generate findings to show how stakeholders define internationalization, how they envision an internationalized campus, and the benefits resulting from internationalization. Synthesis and triangulation of the data also generated findings showing the challenges facing FSU in trying to internationalize as well as the support for internationalization at FSU.

CHAPTER V:

CONCLUSIONS

This dissertation was designed to explore the relationship between organizational culture and change and the internationalization efforts at FSU. There is no institution-wide mandate, strategy or initiative at FSU to internationalize the campus. However, there have been positive changes made in the last few years at FSU to increase the awareness of the need to internationalize, and to implement some internationalization efforts. Therefore, the study provided important data on how the FSU stakeholders perceive, define, and value internationalization within an institution where internationalization has not been identified by the senior leadership of the institution as a top priority. The study also provided valuable data on stakeholder perspectives of the current state of internationalization at FSU that included delineating both the deterrents as well as the support for internationalization. Finally, the study provided data indicating how the organizational culture and change supported or deterred internationalization efforts.

The findings from this study clearly demonstrated that the FSU stakeholders see internationalization as an important part of educating students for the 21st century, and showed that the stakeholders have a strong commitment and belief in internationalization. The stakeholders acknowledged the multiple benefits an internationalized campus provides to students and clearly articulated beliefs that all students should have both curricular and co-curricular opportunities to learn about and engage with other cultures without having to study abroad. The stakeholders' views on the importance of providing a culturally rich campus environment in order to provide all students with opportunities to gain cultural competencies and

increased cultural awareness was somewhat surprising considering the long history at FSU in focusing internationalization efforts on the FSU Study Centers in Europe and Panama.

The findings from this case study also provided valuable insight into the culture of the institution and showed the ways in which the culture supported the changes necessary to initiate and support internationalization efforts in an institution where internationalization did not have university-wide support. The findings also showed how some of the changes made in support of internationalization have begun changing some of the institutional culture. Tierney's (1988) framework on organizational culture and Kezar and Eckel's (2002) framework on organizational change were used to review and analyze the ways in which the organizational culture and change related to the internationalization efforts at FSU. Following are the two research questions used to guide this study and a summary of the findings to answer the research questions. Connections between the findings and research in the literature review are highlighted. The chapter also includes recommendations to advance internationalization at FSU, study implications, limitations of the study, and recommendations for future study.

Research Question 1: How do Florida State University Stakeholders Perceive Internationalization?

All of the research participants articulated clear definitions of what internationalization meant to them and why having an internationalized campus was an important part of educating students. The research participants described the multiple benefits an internationalized campus provided to both students and the institution and explained their expectations for developing a culturally rich campus environment. The interviewees also discussed the importance of students being culturally immersed and having opportunities to interact with and learn from the local people and culture during international experiences. The research participants also shared their

expectations for expanding international experiences for students around the world and for providing a variety of different types of experiences.

Defining Internationalization

The data confirmed that the stakeholders define internationalization as an important component of educating students and provides them with the intercultural skills, knowledge, and awareness to succeed in the 21st century. The stakeholders acknowledged that internationalization involves providing students with curricular and co-curricular programs and opportunities to help them develop increased cultural awareness, an understanding and appreciation of difference, and expanded world views. The stakeholders also defined internationalization as the process through which students develop intercultural and global competencies to help them interact successfully with people of diverse cultures.

The stakeholder views on internationalization demonstrated that the stakeholders have a keen awareness of the important role of the institution to integrate intercultural and international learning opportunities into the educational experience of all students. The stakeholders emphasized that the development of intercultural and global competencies, the expected learning outcomes of internationalization, should be a part of the education of all students. The stakeholder definitions and expected benefits of internationalization are much in alignment with research by Deardorff (2006) on intercultural competence as an expected outcome of internationalization; and by Hunter, White, and Godby (2006) on developing global competence in students.

Benefits of Internationalization and an Internationalized Campus

The findings highlighted the multiple benefits that internationalization provides to students and to an institution. The stakeholders emphasized the important benefit of providing students with intercultural and global competencies necessary to help students interact successfully with people of different cultures. The stakeholders acknowledged that the development of intercultural and global competencies is a valuable preparation for students to interact successfully on multicultural work teams and to compete and succeed in a global workforce.

The findings confirmed that all of the stakeholders support the need to develop an internationalized campus in order to provide a culturally rich learning environment for all students. The findings highlighted that one of the primary benefits of having international students on campus was to provide opportunities for domestic students to gain exposure to other cultures. The findings confirmed that stakeholders recognize the importance of promoting international and domestic student interaction in both academic and social settings. Multiple researchers support the stakeholders' view on the importance of providing students with opportunities for interaction with diverse cultures in order to develop intercultural and global competencies. Research by Deardorff (2006) supports the view that students develop intercultural competence through the ongoing process of interacting and reflecting on experiences with people of diverse cultures and points out that this competence is not achieved through a onetime study abroad experience. A study by Hunter et al. (2006) shows that global competence is acquired through ongoing interaction with people of diverse cultures and not through such things as learning a foreign language or participating in a study abroad program.

The findings also confirmed that stakeholders recognize that not all students will study abroad and a culturally rich campus environment serves to provide all students with opportunities to develop intercultural and global competencies. The data confirmed that the stakeholders' description of a culturally rich campus environment to provide students with both curricular and co-curricular programs and activities with an international and intercultural focus closely resembles the 'Internationalization at Home' concept described in research by Mestenhauser (2003) and Paige (2003). Both Mestenhauser (2003) and Paige (2003) describe 'Internationalization at Home' as the concept of enriching the campus environment through a variety of curricula and programs with an international and intercultural focus. Paige (2003) described 'Internationalization at Home' as the university providing a culturally rich learning environment for all of those students who would not participate in international experiences.

Expansion of International Opportunities

The data confirmed that research participants value and support providing students with international experiences abroad, as well as on the home campus, as part of the learning process provided through internationalization. The majority of the research participants expressed strong desires to see FSU expand the types of international experiences for students beyond the traditional study abroad programs held at the four FSU Study Centers. The findings confirmed that the FSU stakeholders believe international experiences should immerse students into the host cultures so that the students develop increased cultural awareness and understanding. The findings also confirmed that the stakeholders would like to see increased international opportunities available to students through internships, service projects, and exchange programs.

The findings confirmed that stakeholders recognize that both culturally rich home campuses, as well as meaningful international experiences, are important components of

150

internationalization. The stakeholders' perspectives on the importance of both an internationalized campus and international experiences for students align with research by Knight (1997) and Olson, Green, and Hill (2006). Research by Knight (1997) and Olson et al. (2006) supports the concept that institutions need to strive toward an integrated approach to internationalization that provides a balance between the international and intercultural opportunities offered on the campus and the international opportunities offered abroad.

<div align="center">

Research Question 2:

How do Organizational Culture and Change Support or Deter Internationalization Efforts

at Florida State University?

</div>

The findings from the study highlighted both the deterrents and the support for internationalization at FSU. The findings confirmed that FSU faces many challenges in trying to advance internationalization efforts on a campus that has not committed to implementing a university-wide initiative to internationalize the campus. However, the findings also confirmed that FSU has support to advance some internationalization efforts and to increase opportunities for students to develop intercultural and global competencies.

Deterrents to Internationalization

The stakeholders identified multiple deterrents to internationalization both external and internal to the organization. The primary deterrent identified by stakeholders was the need for FSU senior leadership to support a university-wide mandate to internationalize the campus. The stakeholders acknowledged that there has been visible growth in some internationalization efforts on campus in the last five to ten years. However, the data also confirmed that stakeholders see FSU in the beginning stages of a developmental process leading toward comprehensive internationalization. The stakeholders emphasized the need to have the president

and the provost commit to implementing a university-wide initiative to internationalize the campus. The findings also confirm that the stakeholders recognize the important role of the president and provost to provide the vision and leadership needed to move the campus from the beginning stages of campus internationalization to comprehensive internationalization. The data confirmed that the stakeholders recognize that FSU is falling behind other institutions that have long ago implemented comprehensive internationalization plans and are building renowned national and international reputations.

The data also confirmed that there is a need for FSU to develop a centralized department to oversee all international initiatives on campus. The data confirmed that the current organizational structure with multiple units involved in internationalization causes confusion to students, faculty, and administrators because there is not one point of contact for inquiries or for the dissemination of information. Not all stakeholders were aware of the internationalization efforts or successes realized in the last few years and others knew very little of the accomplishments made in the last few years. The data confirmed that communication is a deterrent in a large, decentralized institution and that there are many silos and barriers to overcome to involve all campus constituents in internationalization initiatives.

The data also showed that stakeholders see the long-held institutional commitment to traditional study abroad programs at the four international study centers as a deterrent to internationalization. The stakeholders acknowledged the value of the study abroad experiences in the centers but shared the need to develop international opportunities that allow students to immerse in the host cultures. The data confirmed that stakeholders want to see increased international internship and service opportunities for students.

The findings from the study confirmed that stakeholders value the presence of international students on campus but that there is no university-wide recruitment plan to increase the number of international students enrolled at FSU. The findings showed that the stakeholders value the development of a culturally rich campus environment to provide all students with opportunities to interact with people from diverse cultures. The stakeholders identified the need to increase the number of international students on campus and see the lack of a recruitment plan as a deterrent to move FSU internationalization efforts forward. The findings also highlighted the perceived difficulties some faculty members face in providing the additional time and effort to work with international students. The findings also highlighted the difficulties experienced by some domestic students in classes taught by international teaching assistants.

Another major deterrent confirmed by the data was the influence of the external environment. The stakeholders shared the difficulties faced by FSU in the last few years with decreasing state funding resulting in program closures and loss of tenured faculty. The data confirmed that all of the stakeholders recognize that it is a major challenge to try to internationalize an institution in a time of limited resources. The data confirmed that the decrease in state funding has made it challenging for academic departments to offer graduate assistantships to talented international students to attract them to FSU. The study also showed that talented graduate students are essential to the research efforts of an institution and continued growth of such an institution depends on highly qualified graduate students.

The data confirmed that stakeholders recognize the need to revise and internationalize the curriculum. However, the data also confirmed that the stakeholders recognize that such an enormous project cannot be undertaken without a university-wide plan to guide the efforts. The

stakeholders also confirmed that such a project could not happen without the necessary financial resources.

The findings confirmed that another major deterrent to internationalization at FSU is the mission of the institution and the focus on research. The findings showed that stakeholders agree that the primary mission of the institution is to educate graduate students and generate research. FSU is a RH/UH institution and the findings supported the strong emphasis on research and the expectations of junior faculty members to research and publish. Stakeholders confirmed that research responsibilities precluded the involvement of junior faculty in internationalization initiatives. The data confirmed that all of the stakeholders recognize that there are many obstacles to including work on internationalization initiatives in the promotion and tenure process. Therefore, the data showed that the majority of the stakeholders available to support internationalization efforts are administrators, program staff, and tenured faculty.

Support for Internationalization

The findings highlighted the support at FSU that has helped advance internationalization efforts on a campus without a university-wide initiative to internationalize. The study showed that the stakeholders viewed the friendly, welcoming campus environment, and the university emphasis on creating a highly engaged student campus, as components of organizational culture which support the advancement of internationalization efforts. The data also confirmed that the support from the senior leader in Student Affairs, and the collaborative leadership of administrators and faculty had provided much support for internationalization efforts at FSU.

The data confirmed that the support from the senior leader in Student Affairs allowed the CGE to expand its mission and to take a leadership role in campus internationalization. The senior leader also approved of the construction of the Globe, a non-academic building, to

154

increase student engagement in intercultural and international programs and events and help

advance internationalization efforts at FSU. The data confirmed that the construction of the

Globe increased the visibility and the importance of internationalization on the campus. The

data also confirmed that the Globe is the primary venue on campus that promotes the interaction

between domestic and international students through social, cultural, educational, and

experiential programs and events. The active involvement of the senior leader from Student

Affairs in the development of international initiatives also gave increased credibility and

visibility for those initiatives throughout the campus.

The data also confirmed that collaborative efforts between Student Affairs and Academic

Affairs resulted in increased opportunities for students to be globally engaged on campus and to

develop intercultural and global competencies. The data confirmed that the development of the

Global Pathways Certificate and the Garnet and Gold Scholar Society provided opportunities for

students to combine curricular and co-curricular learning and engage in intercultural and

international experiences. The data confirmed that academic classes were developed to help

students develop intercultural skills and knowledge before their international experiences, as well

as to help them process and reflect on these experiences upon their return.

Application of a Theoretical Lens

Data collected in this study provided multiple perspectives from the various stakeholders

across the campus on the deterrents and the support for internationalization at FSU. The

participant data is synthesized through Tierney's (1988) framework on concepts of culture in

Table 4 and Kezar and Eckel's (2002) framework on change strategies in Table 5. This synthesis

facilitates the analysis of how different aspects of the FSU organizational culture and change

supported or deterred internationalization efforts at FSU.

Table 4

Tierney's Concepts of Culture

	Support Internationalization	Deter Internationalization
Environment	Friendly, caring Liberal arts tradition Student engagement	Financial constraints Educate Florida residents
Mission	Quality undergraduate education	Research institution
Socialization	Student Affairs' role to support and engage	Junior faculty dedicated to research and publications
Information	Involved students read and seek out	Not uniformly disseminated, Information overload
Strategy		No strategy to implement comprehensive internationalization No strategy to recruit international students
Leadership	Senior leader Student Affairs	Need for President and Provost involvement

Table 5

Kezar and Eckel's Change Strategies

	Support Internationalization	Deter Internationalization
Senior Administrative Support	• Senior leader Student Affairs	• Lack of involvement from President and Provost
Collaborative Leadership	• Student Affairs and Academic Affairs • Administrators and faculty	• Junior faculty cannot participate
Robust Design	• Globe Facility	
Staff Development	• Training and workshops for interested faculty and staff	• Need for faculty and staff workshops to better understand internationalization
Visible Actions	• Programs, certificates, Intercultural classes	• Focus on study abroad

Environment. The findings confirmed that aspects of the external environment deter the advancement of internationalization efforts at FSU. The recurring budget cuts from the state legislature prevent the allocation of resources needed to internationalize the curriculum, provide incentives for faculty involvement, provide student scholarships for international experiences, and to fund the cost of implementing a comprehensive internationalization initiative at FSU. The data also confirmed that some stakeholders perceive an expectation from the state legislature to educate Florida residents and there is no recruitment strategy to increase the enrollment of international students. What the data did not show, however, was that six other state institutions in Florida have higher international student enrollment than FSU and those institutions fund international student recruitment efforts.

The data confirmed that aspects of the internal environment support the advancement of internationalization efforts at FSU. The findings highlighted the warm, friendly internal environment with a caring, supportive culture. The data confirmed much stakeholder pride in the existence of a small liberal arts type college culture for undergraduate students within a large research institution. The data highlighted the strong emphasis on creating a highly engaged student culture through both curricular and co-curricular activities, with support by dedicated faculty, administrators, and program staff.

Mission. The data confirmed that there is much agreement among the research participants in defining the mission of FSU as a state research institution with the primary focus on the generation of research. The data showed that the emphasis on research deters internationalization efforts. Stakeholders agreed that research takes priority over teaching and service, and that there are many obstacles to including internationalization into the promotion and tenure process. The data confirmed that some stakeholders interpret the mission as providing a quality undergraduate education and this supports internationalization efforts. However, the data also confirmed that there is not stakeholder consensus on what the mission of FSU is.

Socialization. The findings confirmed that there are extremely high expectations on junior faculty to research and publish in top tier journals. There was consensus from the stakeholders that junior faculty members needed to work to meet the high standards in each of the areas of research, teaching, and service. The findings confirmed that the socialization for junior faculty deter internationalization efforts since junior faculty have limited opportunities to be involved in such efforts. Findings through document analysis confirmed the multiple opportunities for administrators and professional staff to learn about expectations for their roles.

158

Findings through document analysis also confirmed that there is a great emphasis on creating a highly engaged student campus and there are many programs and initiatives to support this effort. The socialization of administrators and professional staff, and the encouragement for them to be involved in a student-centered campus, supports internationalization efforts.

Information. The findings highlighted the difficulties in ensuring that all stakeholders receive information about international initiatives. The findings confirmed that some of the faculty and administrators in the study were not aware of the committee work on internationalization or some of the progress made in internationalization over the last few years. The data also showed that some stakeholders were not aware of the support structures available to faculty and departments to set up exchange agreements. The data showed that many of the research participants were unaware of the development of several new intercultural classes to help students maximize their international experiences. The findings confirmed that some of the student respondents were unaware of the Globe facility and the opportunities to become actively involved with students from other cultures. The above findings confirmed that many aspects of communication at FSU deter the advancement of internationalization efforts.

However, the data also confirmed that there are well-informed stakeholders who have been active participants in internationalization efforts throughout the last few years and receive regular communication about internationalization. The data also confirmed that many students read information sent to them about intercultural/international programs and activities and are well-informed about the many opportunities available to them on campus. The above findings confirmed that limited aspects of information at FSU support internationalization efforts. Overall, however, the data confirmed that the current system of information sharing is not

159

effective in keeping all of the campus stakeholders equally apprised and deters the advancement of internationalization efforts.

Strategy. The findings confirmed that the majority of all of the research participants agree that there was no FSU strategy for implementing campus-wide internationalization and no strategy for recruiting international students. The data confirmed that the stakeholders recognize the need for the President and the Provost to develop a strategy and vision to internationalize the campus. The data showed many participants felt that the lack of a university-wide strategy had caused FSU to fall behind other institutions in campus internationalization. The findings from the study confirmed that the lack of strategy deters internationalization efforts.

Leadership. The data showed that the majority of the research participants recognize that past senior leaders at FSU have not provided the necessary leadership to make internationalization a top university priority or to implement a university-wide initiative to internationalize. The findings confirmed that the stakeholders are hopeful that the new president and provost will help internationalize the university.

The data confirmed, however, that many stakeholders acknowledge the leadership role of a senior leader in Student Affairs in support of internationalization efforts. Data also confirmed that stakeholders recognize the efforts of administrators and faculty who serve as informal leaders in working together to implement multiple internationalization initiatives. Following is an analysis of the data through the lens of Kezar and Eckel's (2002) *Five Change Strategies* to show what change strategies were used to support or deter internationalization efforts at FSU.

Senior administrative support. The findings confirm that past Presidents and Provosts have not provided the leadership or support necessary to implement change to advance internationalization efforts. The data also confirmed that there is not a centralized administrative

structure to support all internationalization efforts at FSU, and many stakeholders viewed the lack of such a structure as a deterrent toward campus internationalization.

The findings confirmed that many stakeholders acknowledged that the support of a senior leader in Student Affairs was key to implementing the changes necessary to begin to internationalize the campus. The data showed that the senior leader in Students Affairs provided resources for internationalization that included a large facility and expanded mission of the CGE to spearhead campus internationalization efforts. The data also confirmed that the active involvement of the senior leader from Student Affairs through the International Advisory Committee increased the visibility and interest in campus internationalization. The findings confirm that the senior leader involvement from Student Affairs supported the change necessary to implement some internationalization efforts.

Collaborative leadership. The data confirmed that collaborative leadership from administrators and faculty from both Academic Affairs and Student Affairs has been a successful change strategy at FSU. The study highlighted various committee work and initiatives worked on collaboratively by campus stakeholders to implement some internationalization efforts. The findings highlighted how initial proposals and plans to implement some internationalization initiatives resulted from emergent change efforts at the grassroots level. The findings also confirmed that senior leadership in Student Affairs supported emergent change initiatives for internationalization, and that this support allowed the initiatives to develop into successful programs benefitting the entire campus. The findings confirm that collaborative leadership supports internationalization efforts.

Robust design. The findings confirmed that the Globe facility represented the most obvious change in support of internationalization on the FSU campus. The data confirmed that

161

the facility provided increased opportunities for all campus stakeholders to be engaged in intercultural and international opportunities. The Globe facility and the role it played in increasing the visibility and the importance of internationalization at FSU was an overarching theme throughout the research on progress toward internationalization.

Staff development. The data confirmed that there is a need to provide campus stakeholders with workshops and forums to increase understanding of the need to internationalize and to involve more stakeholders in internationalization efforts. The study confirmed that there are pockets of involved administrators, faculty, and students across campus actively engaged in internationalization activity but that much programming and communication needs to take place to ensure campus-wide participation. Increased staff development is necessary in order to support change to advance internationalization efforts.

Visible actions. The data confirmed that there are multiple curricular and co-curricular programs and activities resulting from the internationalization efforts. The findings highlighted programs and certificates that promote student engagement in intercultural/international programs and activities, and participation in intercultural classes and international experiences. The findings confirmed that there is much student interest and demand for increased intercultural and international opportunities at FSU and this indicates that there is high interest in the continued internationalization of FSU.

<div align="center">

Discussion

</div>

The FSU stakeholders recognize the importance of internationalizing the campus to provide all students with opportunities to increase their cultural awareness and develop intercultural competencies on the home campus as well as abroad.   Awareness of the need, purpose and the benefits of internationalization is the first phase of the internationalization

process according to Knight (1994). The institution has made progress toward increasing intercultural learning opportunities on campus in the last few years but has a very long way to go before reaching comprehensive internationalization. Comprehensive internationalization requires a university-wide plan and commitment to internationalize the campus and to ensure that there is balance and integration between the 'internationalization at home' and the 'internationalization abroad' components.

Emergent change efforts by some administrators and faculty resulted in the development of innovative curricular and co-curricular programs designed to help students increase their interaction with people from diverse cultures and expand their worldviews. These efforts received senior level support from the Vice President of Student Affairs and helped increase the visibility and interest in internationalization at FSU. However, without the support of the President and Provost to commit to a university-wide plan to internationalize the campus, which is the crucial second phase to the internationalization process, FSU will not advance toward comprehensive internationalization.

In order for FSU to advance in the internationalization process, it is necessary for the President and the Provost to establish internationalization as a priority for the institution and to provide leadership, vision and resources to advance such a university-wide initiative.

<center>**Recommendations for FSU**</center>

Based on an analysis of the data gathered from the participants in the study, the following recommendations were developed to support the implementation of a university wide-initiative to internationalize the campus.

<center>163</center>

Defining Internationalization for FSU

The senior leadership of FSU should facilitate the definition and expectations for what internationalization means for FSU. Stakeholder input and research on comprehensive internationalization will help senior leadership recognize that universities across the U.S. are working to develop both the 'Internationalization at Home' concept as well as 'Internationalization Abroad'. FSU should strive to develop both aspects of internationalization. There also needs to be recognition that only a limited number of students will have the funds or the opportunity to participate in international experiences, regardless of the fundraising efforts made to support these efforts. The importance of developing a culturally rich learning environment on the campus, in addition to providing international experiences for student, should be recognized as a critical part of educating all students for today's global society. The data from this study on stakeholder views on internationalization show that there is a strong consensus that internationalization should provide all students with opportunities to develop intercultural and global competencies. Data from this study also shows that stakeholders support the development of curricular and co-curricular programs and activities on campus to provide students with the learning opportunities needed to be prepared to compete in a global workforce.

Enhancing International Experiences

FSU should evaluate the student learning outcomes resulting from the current study abroad opportunities. Data from this research study showed that many stakeholders would like to see the international experiences provide students with immersion into the local cultures and to result in increased cultural awareness and understanding. The current FSU Study Centers should provide increased opportunities for students to be involved with the local culture as well

as provide classes designed to help students reflect on and process their intercultural learning experiences throughout their time abroad.

FSU should develop a strategic plan to increase international experiences for students abroad through exchange programs, internships, and service opportunities. A task force made up of representatives from all of the colleges should be formed to address the university-wide need to expand international opportunities for students strategically. FSU needs to be pro-active in establishing a plan for international growth that provides students in all majors with international opportunities.

Senior Leadership, Strategy and Vision

Senior leadership should ensure that all FSU stakeholders understand why internationalization is a priority of the institution and what internationalization means for students and for the institution. A university-wide strategic plan to internationalize should be developed that includes both short-term and long-term goals for internationalization on the campus and abroad. The plan should include clear strategies for Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to work together to build a culturally rich learning environment in which students develop intercultural and global competencies through both curricular and co-curricular programs. An incentive plan to encourage faculty involvement in internationalization through curriculum internationalization projects, international experiences and service should be developed. FSU should appoint a task force made up of representatives from both Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to assist with the development and implementation of a comprehensive internationalization plan.

Administrative Structure

A review and revision of the multiple administrative structures responsible for different areas of international activity at FSU should take place to avoid duplication of efforts and to ensure a seamless, comprehensive approach to campus internationalization. The current structure involves four different units and centers dedicated to different aspects of internationalization divided between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. The Director of International Programs (Study abroad and the FSU Study Centers) reports to a senior administrator within the Provost's office, and the Director of the Center for Intensive English Studies reports to the Dean of the Graduate School. The Director of the Center for Global Engagement reports to the Vice President for Student Affairs. The Program Director for exchanges reports to a senior administrator within the Provost's office but has an office and support system within the CGE.

The senior administration should consider forming an executive committee made up of the three directors and one program director of the various units involved in international activity at FSU. The executive committee would work with the senior level administrator in the Provost's office in charge of international initiatives at FSU to ensure a unified, comprehensive approach to international activity. Such a committee would provide a structure for the various areas involved in internationalization to be represented and to have input into decisions made about internationalization activity at FSU. This executive committee would ensure that all decisions made about internationalization at FSU are made holistically and for the benefit of the university. The formation of such an executive committee would not require a major reorganization of departments within FSU in the short-term, but still allow for a much more organized and centralized approach to international initiatives.

166

FSU will need to consider the benefits in the long-term of carrying out a major reorganization to combine all of the various departments involved in international activity into one central department. Setting up a centralized structure to oversee all of the international activity and programs at FSU would streamline internationalization efforts and allow FSU to be more strategic in implementing a comprehensive internationalization plan. There should be a senior level administrator, such as an Assistant Vice President for International Initiatives, to oversee the newly formed department. This would provide FSU with a centralized model for international initiatives similar to those models used in other research institutions. A centralized department for all international activity would eliminate the confusion that internal and external constituents now have concerning the responsibilities of the different departments and provide one main contact for all questions concerning international activity.

Communication

FSU should improve university-side communication on the progress of internationalization efforts, and the roles of the multiple departments involved in international activity. All FSU stakeholders need more information about the variety of international and intercultural services, programs, and activities available to them throughout the campus. Deans and faculty need presentations on the support structures in place to assist them in developing and managing bilateral exchange programs as well as support to set up special academic programs for non-degree seeking students.

There should be one faculty member per academic department to serve as the contact for international efforts and serve as the liaison between the academic department and the either the newly formed Executive Committee or the point person in the provost's office responsible for internationalization. Regular meetings with these faculty contacts would help ensure that

information about programs and services is disseminated throughout such a highly decentralized organization. This forum would also provide opportunities for academic departments to share questions or concerns about internationalization. Focus groups should be held with administrators and faculty throughout the academic departments to facilitate communication concerning international and intercultural initiatives and ensure that all departments have a voice in discussions on how to further internationalization efforts at FSU. Focus groups should be held with international and domestic students to identify how FSU can better meet their needs through curricular and co-curricular programs and services.

Internationalization as FSU Quality Enhancement Plan

It is highly recommended that FSU consider selecting internationalization as the topic for the 2014 Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The QEP is required every ten years as part of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accreditation process to enhance student learning through an institutional improvement plan. The selection of internationalization for the FSU QEP would ensure that there is university-wide support to improve the student learning experience through internationalization.

The QEP process would require FSU to develop goals and intended student learning outcomes for internationalization, establish assessment and evaluation of the student learning outcomes, set up a timeline for implementation and develop a management and a fiscal plan for the QEP. The required structure for the QEP would facilitate the development and implementation of comprehensive internationalization at FSU and eliminate the need for FSU to address internationalization as a separate priority. The development and implementation of a campus-wide internationalization initiative in a large research institution requires campus wide commitment and financial resources that may not be readily available in these challenging times.

Therefore, FSU should consider that many other major research institutions have implemented comprehensive internationalization by selecting internationalization as their QEP.

Limitations of Study

This single site bounded case study reviewed the overall internationalization efforts of one institution. Therefore, this study does not provide data on the successes or challenges of specific internationalization activities, programs or other initiatives. This study also did not measure student-learning outcomes of specific programs or provide any data on the effectiveness of such programs. The findings and the conclusions, based on data from this study, are specific to this study.

Study Implications

This research study on internationalization at one institution is the first study to use the perspectives of multiple campus stakeholders to explore their experiences in internationalization efforts. This study adds to the current field of research on internationalization by providing insight into the challenges and the successes of internationalization at a research institution that does not have a university-wide initiative to internationalize. This study showed how internationalization efforts began on a campus through grassroots efforts and developed into successful initiatives due to senior level support. The findings from this study also demonstrated the importance of collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs in the development and implementation of internationalization initiatives.

The findings from this study provided FSU with a comprehensive overview of stakeholder perspectives on internationalization and an analysis of their views on current internationalization efforts at FSU. The study also provided FSU leadership and stakeholders with the challenges facing the institution and deterring the advancement of internationalization

efforts. The study also provided FSU leadership and stakeholders with recommendations on how to continue to advance internationalization at FSU and move the institution from the initial stages of the internationalization process to comprehensive internationalization.

This study also provided the data on stakeholder perspectives on internationalization efforts at FSU that can be used as the baseline for future studies on internationalization at FSU. The use of Tierney's (1988) framework on the *Six Concepts of Culture* and Kezar and Eckel's (2002) framework on *Five Change Strategies* to explore the relationship between organizational culture and change and internationalization efforts expanded the use of these frameworks. The use of these frameworks, with internationalization as the unit of analysis, helped show how various components of culture deter or support organizational change needed to implement internationalization at one institution.

Recommendations for Future Study

There are several recommendations for future study based on the findings from this research study. Future research in internationalization should include a comparative study on the institutional challenges and successes of implementing internationalization initiatives at a research institution compared to a small, liberal arts college. Another recommended research study is to examine how a research institution progressed through the process of internationalization and successfully achieved comprehensive internationalization with both the necessary components of 'Internationalization at Home' and 'Internationalization Abroad'. A study on successful curriculum internationalization initiatives implemented at research institutions as part of campus internationalization efforts is also recommended. More research on internationalization efforts at research institutions would also be very beneficial to the field. Another recommended research study is to explore the relationship between institutions choosing

170

internationalization as a QEP, versus institutions without internationalization as a QEP, and the success of internationalization on those campuses.

Future research on internationalization at FSU should review the success of specific programs, classes, and activities developed in support of internationalization both on campus and in the FSU Study Centers. Such research should measure the effectiveness of the programs, classes, and activities and assess student-learning outcomes. Such research is necessary to monitor and assess the overall effectiveness of comprehensive internationalization.

Conclusion

Analysis of the research data through the frameworks of Tierney (1988) and Kezar and Eckel (2002) demonstrate that there is a relationship between organizational culture and change and internationalization efforts within an institution. The data confirmed that some aspects of FSU's environment, mission, socialization, information, and leadership deterred internationalization efforts while other aspects of those same concepts supported internationalization efforts. Data analysis of the culture of FSU also showed that the strong emphasis on research, ongoing financial constraints, and perceived lack of leadership from past presidents and provosts served as deterrents toward internationalizing the campus. However, the strong emphasis on creating a highly engaged student environment to enhance student learning, and the support from senior leadership in student affairs helped create a campus culture which facilitated the use of change strategies necessary to advance internationalization.

The data confirmed that the majority of the FSU stakeholders are strong supporters of internationalization and recognize the need to internationalize the campus systemically in order to provide all students with opportunities to develop intercultural and global competencies. Such commitment by administrators and faculty supported emergent change efforts originating in the

171

Center for Global Engagement to develop a more globally engaged campus community. The support from senior leadership in student affairs toward the emergent change efforts to internationalize helped the efforts develop into collaborative projects involving collaborative leadership and participation from academic affairs and student affairs. The successful changes resulted in multiple intercultural and international programs and activities for students and served to increase the visibility for the need to internationalize the campus. The data showed that the FSU stakeholders realize the importance of providing students with both curricular and co-curricular learning opportunities to help them develop increased cultural awareness and expanded worldviews on campus as well as abroad. The data also showed that there is growing demand from both domestic and international students for FSU to continue to internationalize and provide them with a culturally rich learning environment to promote the development of global and intercultural competencies.

REFERENCES

Absalom, M., & Vadura, K. (2006). Student perceptions of internationalization of the curriculum: An Australian case study. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, 5*(3), 317-334.

Agnew, M., & Vanbalkom, W. D. (2009). Internationalization of the university: Factors impacting cultural readiness for organizational change. *Intercultural Education, 20*(5), 451-462.

Arthur, N., Patton, W., & Giancarlo, C. (2007). International project participation by women academics. *Canadian Journal of Education, 30*(1), 323-348.

Ayoubi, R. M., & Massoud, H. K. (2007). The strategy of internationalization in universities: A quantitative evaluation of the intent and implementation in UK universities. *International Journal of Educational Management, 21*(4), 329-349.

Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher Education, 45*(1), 43.

Bess, J., & Dee, J. (2008). *Understanding college and university organization*. Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bogotch, I., & Maslin-Ostrowski, P. (2010). Internationalizing educational leadership: How a university department jumps the curve from local to international. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 46*(2), 210-240.

Boyce, M. (2003). Organizational learning is essential to achieving and sustaining change in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education, 28*(2), 119-136.

Burnett, S., & Huisman, J. (2010). Universities' responses to globalisation: The influence of organisational culture. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 14*(2), 117-142.

Chan, W. W. Y., & Dimmock, C. (2008). The internationalization of universities: Globalist, internationalist and translocalist models. *Journal of Research in International Education, 7*(2), 184-204.

Childress, L. K. (2009). Internationalization plans for higher education institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 13*(3), 289-309.

Childress, L. K. (2009). Planning for internationalization by investing in faculty. *Journal of International and Global Studies, 1*(1), 33-49.

Chow, P. & Bhandari R. (2010). *Open Doors 2010 Report on International Educational Exchange*. New York: Institute of International Education.

Clarke, V. (2004). Students' global awareness and attitudes to internationalism in a world of cultural convergence. *Journal of Research in International Education, 3*(1), 51-70.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Prentice Hall.

Cummings, W. K., & Bain, O. (2009). The internationalization of the U.S. academy in comparative perspective: A descriptive study. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 10*(1), 107-115.

Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10*(3), 241-266.

Dewey, P., & Duff, S. (2009). Reason before passion: Faculty views on internationalization in higher education. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning, 58*(4), 491-504.

Eckel, P., Hill, B., & Green, M. (1998). On change: En route to transformation. *American Council on Education,* 1-12.

Edwards, J. (2007). Challenges and opportunities for the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade: Planned and opportunistic initiatives in American institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3-4), 373-381.

Green, M. F. (2005). *Measuring internationalization at comprehensive universities.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Green, M. F., Luu, D., & Burris, B. (2008). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Gu, Q., Schweisfurth, M., & Day, C. (2010). Learning and growing in a "foreign" context: Intercultural experiences of international students. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 40*(1), 7-23.

Hamza, A. (2010). International experience: An opportunity for professional development in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 14*(1), 50-69.

Hatch, M. M. J. (1997). Relations between organizational culture, identity and image. *European Journal of Marketing, 31*(5/6), 356-365.

Horn, A. S., Hendel, D. D., & Fry, G. W. (2007). Ranking the international dimension of top research universities in the United States. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3-4), 330-358.

Hser, M. P. (2005). Campus internationalization: A study of American universities' internationalization efforts. *International Education, 35*(1), 35-48.

Hunter, B., White, G. P., & Godbey, G. C. (Fall 2006). What does it mean to be globally competent? *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10*(3), 267-285.

Jurgens, J. C., & Robbins-O'Connell, C. (2008). A comparative study of intercultural and global competency opportunities on American and Irish university campuses. *International Education, 38*(1), 66-75.

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. (2002). The effect of institutional culture on change strategies in higher education: Universal principles or culturally responsive concepts? *The Journal of Higher Education, 73*(4), 435-460.

Kezar, A., Gallant, T., & Lester, J. (2011). Everyday people making a difference on college campuses: The tempered grassroots leadership tactics of faculty and staff. *Studies in Higher Education, 36*(2), 129-151.

Klak, T., & Martin, P. (2003). Do university-sponsored international cultural events help students to appreciate "difference?" *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*(4), 445-465.

Knight, J. (1994). Internationalization: Elements and checkpoints. *Canadian Bureau for International Education, 7*, 1-14.

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

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 8*(1), 5-31.

Knight, J. (Fall 2001). Monitoring the quality and progress of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 5*(3), 228-243.

Lee, P. (2006). Bridging cultures: Understanding the construction of relational identity in intercultural friendship. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 35*(1), 3-22.

Lee, J. J. (2010). International students' experiences and attitudes at a US host institution: Self-reports and future recommendations. *Journal of Research in International Education, 9*(1), 66-84.

Lee, J. J., & Rice, C. (2007). Welcome to America? international student perceptions of discrimination. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning, 53*(3), 381-409.

Levy, A. (1986). Second-order planned change: Definition and conceptualization. *Organizational Dynamics, 15*(1), 5-23.

Marshall, Catherine and Rossman, Gretchen. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McMillan, J. & Schumacher, S. (1997). *Research in education:* Longman.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mestenhauser, J. (2003). Building bridges. *International Educator,* 6-11.

Miles, M., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nesdale, D., & Todd, P. (2000). Effect of contact on intercultural acceptance: A field study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24*(3), 341-360.

Olcott, D., Jr. (2009). Global connections to global partnerships: Navigating the changing landscape of internationalism and cross-border higher education. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education, 57*(1), 1-9.

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

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

Olson, C. L., & Kroeger, K. R. (2001). Global competency and intercultural sensitivity. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 5*(2), 116-137.

Olson, C. (2005). Comprehensive internationalization: From principles to practice. *Journal of Public Affairs, 8*, 51-74.

Otten, M. (2003). Intercultural learning and diversity in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 7*(1), 12-26.

Ouchi, W. G., & Wilkins, A. L. (1985). Organizational culture. *Annual Review of Sociology, 11*, pp. 457-483.

Paige, R. M. (2003). The American case: The University of Minnesota. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 7*(1), 52-63.

Peterson, M. & Spencer, M. (1990). Understanding academic culture and climate. *New Directions for Institutional Research,* 1990(68), 3-18.

Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education, 1*(2), 248-270.

Ray, W., & Solem, M. (2009). Gauging disciplinary engagement with internationalization: A survey of geographers in the United States. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 33*(1), 103-121.

Robson, S., & Turner, Y. (2007). "Teaching is a co-learning experience": Academics reflecting on learning and teaching in an "internationalized" faculty. *Teaching in Higher Education, 12*(1), 41-54.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychologist, 45*(2), 109-119.

Schoorman, D. (2000). *How is internationalization implemented? A framework for organizational practice.* Retrieved from ERIC.

Schoorman, D. (2000). What really do we mean by 'internationalization?' *Contemporary Education, 71*(4), 5.

Schuerholz-Lehr, S., Caws, C., Van Gyn, G., & Preece, A. (2007). Internationalizing the higher education curriculum: An emerging model for transforming faculty perspectives. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 37*(1), 67-94.

Schweisfurth, M., & Gu, Q. (2009). Exploring the experiences of international students in UK higher education: Possibilities and limits of interculturality in university life. *Intercultural Education, 20*(5), 463-473.

Stromquist, N. P. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning, 53*(1), 81-105.

Summers, M., & Volet, S. (2008). Students' attitudes towards culturally mixed groups on international campuses: Impact of participation in diverse and non-diverse groups. *Studies in Higher Education, 33*(4), 357-370.

Theobald, R. B. (2008). Internationalization: Institutions, people and programmes in Colorado. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 32*(2), 205-216.

Tierney, W. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 59(1),* 2-21.

Turner-Essel, L., & Waehler, C. (2009). Integrating internationalization in counseling psychology training programs. *Counseling Psychologist, 37*(6), 877-901.

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Volet, S., & Ang, G. (1998). Culturally mixed groups on international campuses: An opportunity for inter-cultural learning. *Higher Education Research and Development, 17*(1), 5-23.

Wildavsky, B. (2010). *The great brain race*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research* (Fourth ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zaltman, G; Duncan, R. (1973). *Innovations and organizations.* NY, NY: Wiley Publishing.

Zhao, C., Kuh, G. D., & Carini, R. M. (2005). A comparison of international student and American student engagement in effective educational practices. *Journal of Higher Education, 76*(2), 209.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Interview Protocols for Senior Leadership, Administrators, Faculty and Students

Senior Leadership Protocol

Organizational Culture

1. How does FSU define its environment?

2. What is the mission of FSU?

3. What do new members need to know to survive in this environment?

4. What strategies are used for decision-making?

5. Who makes the decisions?

6. What do members expect from the leaders?

Internationalization

7. How would you define internationalization?

Definition for Study

For the purpose of this study, internationalization will be defined as the process of developing a culturally rich campus-learning environment with curricular and co-curricular programs designed to provide all students with opportunities to develop the intercultural skills, and cultural awareness and understanding necessary to succeed in the 21st century.

8. What are the desired outcomes of internationalization

9. To what extent do you see internationalization as part of this campus culture?

10. Would you consider FSU to be an internationalized institution? Why or why not?

11. Do you think the mission of FSU supports internationalization? Why or why not?

12. Does FSU have a clear strategy for implementing campus wide internationalization Why or why not?

13. Who are the formal and informal leaders of internationalization efforts on campus, and what are their roles?

14. What resources or administrative structures are provided to help support internationalization?

15. How would support for internationalization change if work in this area were made part of the promotion and tenure process?

16. How is information about internationalization efforts generated and communicated throughout the campus community to involve more stakeholders?

Organizational Change

17. How has senior leadership supported changes in support of internationalization efforts?

18. How has collaborative leadership supported changes necessary to implement internationalization efforts?

19. What programs, activities or initiatives at FSU have developed in the last few years that are evidence of internationalization efforts?

Other
20. What do international students contribute to the campus environment?

21. What are the challenges of having international students enrolled at FSU?

22. What are the major strengths FSU has to support internationalization efforts?

23. What are the major challenges FSU faces in trying to internationalize?

Administrator/Faculty Interview Protocol

Organizational Culture

1. How does FSU define its environment?

2. What is the mission of FSU?

3. What do new members need to know to survive in this environment?

4. What strategies are used for decision-making?

5. Who makes the decisions?

6. What do members expect from the leaders?

Internationalization

7. How would you define internationalization?

Definition for Study

For the purpose of this study, internationalization will be defined as the process of developing a culturally rich campus-learning environment with curricular and co-curricular programs designed to provide all students with opportunities to develop the intercultural skills, and cultural awareness and understanding necessary to succeed in the 21st century.

8. What are the desired outcomes of internationalization

9. To what extent do you see internationalization as part of this campus culture?

10. Would you consider FSU to be an internationalized institution? Why or why not?

11. Do you think the mission of FSU supports internationalization? Why or why not?

12. Does FSU have a clear strategy for implementing campus wide internationalization Why or why not?

13. How would you describe your experience in the internationalization process?

14. How are faculty and staff involved in the internationalization process?

15. How would support for internationalization change if work in this area were made part of the promotion and tenure process?

16. What efforts have been made toward internationalizing the curriculum?

17. What needs to be done to increase understanding and involvement of campus stakeholders in the internationalization process?

Organizational Change

18. How has senior leadership supported changes in support of internationalization efforts?

19. How has collaborative leadership supported changes necessary to implement internationalization efforts?

20. What programs, activities, or initiatives at FSU have developed in the last few years that are evidence of internationalization efforts?

21. Have there been faculty and staff development workshops or seminars to help ensure that internationalization is understood throughout campus? Why or why not?

Other

22. What do international students contribute to the campus environment?

23. What are the challenges of having international students enrolled at FSU?

24. What are the major strengths FSU has to support internationalization efforts?

25. What are the major challenges FSU faces in trying to internationalize?

U.S. Student Focus Group Protocol

Students Involved in Intercultural/International Courses and Programs

1. Would you conside FSU to be an internationalized campus? Why or why not?

   Probe: How many international students do you think are enrolled at FSU?

2. What opportunities are there for you to be involved with people of diverse cultures on this campus?

   Probes:

   What interaction do you have with international students in your classes? Outside of class?

   What experiences have you had with international faculty or teaching assistants?

3. What types of discussions do you have in your classes with an international focus or about different cultures?

4. What types of intercultural and international experiences have you been involved in?

5. What are the opportunities to be involved in intercultural and international activities and programs on this campus?

   Probe:

   What is the Global Pathways Certificate?

   What is the President's Garnet and Gold Scholar Society?

   How do you get information about the opportunities for intercultural and international engagement at FSU?

6. Do you see the senior leadership as supportive of internationalization efforts? Why or why not?

7. What types of programs, courses, or activities would you like to see at FSU with an international/intercultural focus?

8. Do you consider yourself to have the intercultural competencies and global awareness needed in the global society of the 21st century? Why or why not?

9. Do you think that students with intercultural competencies and global awareness will have an advantage over those without those skills and awareness? Why or why not?

U.S. Student Focus Group Protocol

Students without Experience in Intercultural/International Courses and Programs

1. Would you consider FSU to be an internationalized campus? Why or why not?

   Probe: How many international students do you think are enrolled at FSU?

2. What opportunities are there for you to be involved with people of diverse cultures on this campus?

   Probes:

   What interaction do you have with international students in your classes? Outside of class?

   Probes: Why have you not interacted with international students?

   What experiences have you had with international faculty or teaching assistants?

3. What types of discussions do you have in your classes with an international focus or about different cultures?

4. What types of intercultural and international experiences have you been involved in?

   Probe: Why have you not been involved in any intercultural or international

   experiences?

5. What are the opportunities to be involved in intercultural and international activities and programs on this campus?

   Probes: What is the Global Pathways Certificate?

   What is the President's Garnet and Gold Scholar Society?

How do you get information about the opportunities for intercultural and international engagement at FSU?

6. What extracurricular activities did you choose to participate in?

    Probe: Why did you choose these types of activities instead of ones with more of an intercultural or international focus?

7. Do you see the senior leadership as supportive of internationalization efforts? Why or why not?

8. What types of programs, courses, or activities would you like to see at FSU with an international/intercultural focus?

9. Do you consider yourself to have the intercultural competencies and global awareness needed in the global society of the 21st century? Why or why not?

10. Do you think that students with intercultural competencies and global awareness will have an advantage over those without those skills and awareness? Why or why not?

International Student Focus Group Protocol

1. Do you feel that the FSU environment is welcoming and friendly? Why or why not?

2. What types of interactions do you have with U.S. students?

3. What kinds of interaction have you had with your professors?

4. Would you consider FSU to be an internationalized campus? Why or why not?

5. What is it like being an international student at FSU?

6. How do you spend your time outside of class?

7. How do you learn about events and activities on campus?

8. What type of information do you need to help you better integrate into the campus and community?

9. In what ways are the leaders at FSU supportive of internationalization?

10. What types of programs, courses, or activities would you like to see at FSU to help you meet and interact with U.S. students?

11. Are you glad you decided to come to FSU? Why or why not?

Appendix B

University of Alabama and Florida State University Institutional Review Board Approvals

February 14, 2012

Office for Research

Institutional Review Board for the
Protection of Human Subjects

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA
R E S E A R C H

Cynthia Green
101 S. Woodward Street
Tallahassee, FL 32306

Re: IRB # 12-OR-051: "Examining the Relationship between Campus
Internationalization and Organizational Culture and Change"

Dear Ms. Green,

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for
your proposed research.

Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR
part 46. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as
outlined below:

*(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but
not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity,
language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or
research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program
evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.*

Your application will expire on February 13, 2013. If the study continues
beyond that date, you must complete the IRB Renewal Application. If you
modify the application, please complete the Modification of an Approved
Protocol form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval,
except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants.
When the study closes, please complete the Request for Study Closure form.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this
application, please include the assigned IRB application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Carpantato T. Myles, MSM, CIM
Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office for Research Compliance
The University of Alabama

358 Rose Administration Building
Box 870127
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0127
(205) 348-8461
FAX (205) 348-7189
TOLL FREE (877) 820-3066

March 21, 2012

Cynthia Green
101 S. Woodward Street
Tallahassee, FL 32306

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA
R E S E A R C H

Re: IRB # 12-OR-051 (Revision):   "Examining the Relationship between
        Campus Internationalization and Organizational Culture and Change"

Dear Ms. Green,

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has reviewed the
revision to your previously approved expedited protocol. The Board has
approved the change in your protocol.

Please remember that your approval period expires one year from the date
of your original approval, 2/14/2012, not the date of this revision approval.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this
proposal, please include the assigned IRB application number. Changes in
this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when
necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Carpantato T. Myles, MSM, CIM
Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office for Research Compliance
The University of Alabama

Office of the Vice President For Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2742
(850) 644-8673, FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 2/10/2012

To: Cynthia Green [cgreen2@admin.fsu.edu]

Address: 4216
Dept.: STUDENT AFFAIRS

From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
Examining the Relationship between campus internationalization and organizational culture and change

The application that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and one member of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Expedited per 45 CFR Â§ 46.110(7) and has been approved by an expedited review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which may be required.

If you submitted a proposed consent form with your application, the approved stamped consent form is attached to this approval notice. Only the stamped version of the consent form may be used in recruiting research subjects.

If the project has not been completed by 2/7/2013 you must request a renewal of approval for continuation of the project. As a courtesy, a renewal notice will be sent to you prior to your expiration date; however, it is your responsibility as the Principal Investigator to timely request renewal of your approval from the Committee.

You are advised that any change in protocol for this project must be reviewed and approved by the Committee prior to implementation of the proposed change in the protocol. A protocol change/amendment form is required to be submitted for approval by the Committee. In addition, federal regulations require that the Principal Investigator promptly report, in writing any unanticipated problems or adverse events involving risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the Chair of your department and/or your major professor is

190

reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protection. The Assurance Number is FWA00000168/IRB number IRB00000446.

Cc: Mary Coburn, Other
HSC No. 2012.7745