Dissertations   Theses and Dissertations

2009-05-01

Campus Internationalization Initiatives: From Policy to Practice in Study Abroad Programming

Kira Mendez Espiritu PhD
University of San Diego

CAMPUS INTERNATIONALIZATION INITIATIVES: FROM POLICY TO PRACTICE IN STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMMING

by

KIRA MENDEZ ESPIRITU

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
University of San Diego

May 2009

Dissertation Committee

Athena Perrakis, Ph.D.
Catherine Hands, Ph.D.
Johanna S. Hunsaker, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

As U.S. colleges and universities prepare students to enter an ever-increasing global society, the pressure on higher education institutions to graduate globally competent and culturally sensitive students is growing. To respond to this demand, many colleges and universities are participating in campus internationalization initiatives that are broad-based efforts that create diversity on campus and expose students and faculty to a more global perspective. The presence of campus internationalization initiatives is relatively new, therefore there is little research regarding best practices in the area of campus internationalization. The practice of internationalization initiatives continues to grow and higher-level administrators such as presidents, provosts and directors of international offices on campus are beginning to incorporate elements of internationalization initiatives into their strategic plans. It is important that these officials have some sense of what has and has not worked and what factors in the larger collegiate environment facilitate and inhibit successful implementation of internationalization efforts.

The purpose of this study was to determine how one campus moved from developing a policy of internationalization to a successful and integrated practice. The specific unit of focus was study abroad programs as these programs have historically been the primary way undergraduate students become exposed to the world during their collegiate years. If we assume that the goal of higher education is to increase the personal development of individuals to become educated and competent citizens of society, it makes sense to analyze study abroad programs based on the documented positive impact they have on college student development. This study consisted of an in-depth analysis of one university using qualitative interviews, on-site observation, and document analysis. Information gathered from this study contributed to the development of a Stage-Factor

Model for comprehensive campus internationalization that may be explored at other universities. The reader of this particular case study can begin to formulate what a long-standing campus internationalization initiative looks like and develop strategies to adapt the initiative to other academic settings.

DEDICATION

This project is dedicated to my parents, Teotimo and Ellen Mendez, who have always led by example. From them I learned the value of hard work, persistence, and the importance of understanding, appreciating, and including others who are culturally different from myself.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is with heartfelt thanks that I acknowledge the following individuals who have supported me, guided me, and cheered for me during the journey of completing this dissertation. I have been energized by your good wishes and humbled by your care. Words cannot truly express how important you have been to me and to this process.

Alex: We have been through this together and I could never have made it without your unwavering support. You have been my biggest fan and have blessed me with your understanding even when it meant that I spent more time in the library than you thought was humanly possible. I love you and am looking forward to spending forever with you.

Athena, Cathy, and Jo: Thank you for your guidance, your support, and your wisdom. I am proud of what I have accomplished and know that it came about because of you pushing me to do my best. I truly respect and admire you and hope that we can work together again in the future.

My colleagues: To those of you who have completed the journey and to those of you who can see the finish line, I thank you. I thank you for keeping me sane and for talking sense into me when I wanted to quit. I thank you for your friendship and know for a fact that without you I would not be where I am today. Long live the cave dwellers of January 2009.

Dr. Denise Dimon and Dr. Katherine Waller: It is because of you that I am where I am today. Thank you for "insisting" that I enroll in the Ph.D. program. I am grateful for the experience and for your friendship and support.

My Mendez family: Mom, Dad, Erik, Tami, Bailey, Anthony and Olivia . . . thank you for your support and for always quietly asking, "Are you done yet, Auntie?" I am

finally done and I hope that my work can be an inspiration for you to continue to study hard. Anything is possible.

My "new" family: The Espiritus and the Santanas . . . thank you for all of your support and your encouragement. I am blessed to call you "mi familia."

My friends: Thank you for always understanding when I had to "write my paper." I really appreciate your support and look forward to fun times ahead with you.

The USD International Center: Thank you for your support throughout the last couple of crazy years. I appreciate the enthusiasm and the support as I finished up my degree. Watch out—I have free time on my hands and have already started a new "to do" list.

USD Administration: Dr. Lyons, Dr. Sullivan, and Dr. Jubran . . . thank you for the wonderful gift of my education. It has been a pleasure to work at USD and I hope to continue to serve you well in the International Center as we work towards creating a more internationalized campus community.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

xii

LIST OF FIGURES

PAGE

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background to Study

As United States colleges and universities prepare students to enter an ever-increasing global society, the pressure on higher education institutions to provide culturally sensitive educational programs is growing in intensity. Terms such as *globalization, internationalization,* and *diversity* are becoming buzzwords on campuses. In 2006, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings discussed these terms and what they represent with university presidents at the U.S. University Presidents Summit on International Education. This meeting reinforced the need to increasingly internationalize higher education in a more comprehensive way (American Council on Education [ACE], 2006). As a recent review of the literature (e.g., ACE, 1995, 2008; Ellingboe, 1998; Knight, 2004) has indicated, the creation of campus internationalization initiatives is a relatively new trend; most literature on this topic dates back only to the mid 1990s.

A status report labeled as a preliminary report entitled *Internationalization of U.S. Higher Education* was published in 2000 by the ACE. Campus internationalization initiatives are broad-based efforts that schools or colleges engage in to create diversity on campus and expose students and faculty to a more global prospective. These initiatives can be seen as an all encompassing and more embedded commitment on the part of colleges and universities that will help all their students—even those who do not opt to study in another country—become global citizens. The ACE recently released a report

entitled *Mapping Internationalization on U.S Campuses: 2008 Edition* which summarizes

the findings of a 2006 survey of approximately 1,000 U.S. higher education institutions.

The findings of the survey indicate that most campuses do not place a high priority on

issues of internationalization. The report (ACE, 2008) claims that 39% of institutions

have a direct reference about internationalization within their mission statement and that

only 34% of institutions categorize internationalization as a top strategic priority. Of the

institutions that participated in the survey, 44% stated that their campus had a committee

or task force that was committed to advancing internationalization efforts and 52% of the

campuses market international opportunities as part of their recruitment efforts. The ACE

2008 report also highlighted the fact that there is a decline in aspects noted to be

important to advancing internationalization initiatives on campus. The aspects that

declined on campuses in 2006 were: an international focus within general education

curriculum, a requirement of a "non-Western" course, and foreign-language as a

requirement for graduation.

To respond to the demand for students to become more globally aware and work

towards more comprehensive campus internationalization initiatives, many colleges and

universities have expanded already existing study abroad programs so that more students,

not just the limited number of students[1] who study at a higher education institution

outside of the United States, can have the opportunity to interact with other cultures and,

---

[1]According to the Institute of International Education's 2006 Open Doors Report, 205,983 U.S. students, out of approximately 17.3 million enrolled students, studied abroad during the 2004-2005 academic year (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2007).

in the process, become globalized. The number of study abroad programs offered to students has increased over time (Institute of International Education [IIE], 2007).

Study abroad programs are a subset of the larger internationalization initiative as they provide a means for students and faculty to have an international experience, parts of which they will integrate back on the main campus. Study abroad programs were the initial response by universities to internationalize students and faculty and they are the most replicated piece of campus-wide internationalization initiatives (ACE, 2008; IIE, 2008; Sanders & Ward, 1970). University campuses are looking for ways to comprehensively internationalize so that this important exposure to international programs and ideas is woven throughout the collegiate experience. Gacel-Ávila (2005) expanded on the idea of comprehensiveness by stating that "internationalisation strategies must affect all levels of the educational process to help improve the quality and relevance of higher education and to support the necessary changes in the educational system that will enable it to adapt to the new global reality" (p. 130).

Campus Internationalization Initiatives: Definitions and Models

A variety of definitions for internationalization exist and these definitions have changed over the years. Knight (2004) details these varied and changing definitions that include internationalization as a simple set of activities and a process. Soderqvist (as cited in Knight) expanded on the idea of internationalization as an "education change process" (p. 10). Ellingboe (1998) defined internationalization as "an ongoing, future-oriented, multi-dimensional, interdisciplinary, leadership-driven, vision that involves many stakeholders working to change the internal dynamics of an institution to respond and

adapt appropriately to an increasingly diverse, globally focused, ever-changing external

environment" (p. 199). For purposes of this research, which is focused on

internationalization within institutions of higher education, the operating definition comes

from a leading organization within international education, NAFSA: Association of

International Educators. NAFSA (2008a) most recently published a working definition

for internationalization as:

> The conscious effort to integrate and infuse international, intercultural, and global
> dimensions into the ethos and outcomes of postsecondary education. To be fully
> successful, it must involve active and responsible engagement of the academic
> community in global networks and partnerships. (NAFSAa, p. 1)

Throughout the literature there is much discussion regarding the distinction between

globalization and internationalization. Gacel-Ávila (2005) succinctly summarizes the

distinction by stating that internationalization "refers to the relationship between nation-

states, which promotes recognition of and respect for their own differences and traditions

[whereas] globalisation does not tend to respect differences and borders, thus

undermining the bases of the very same nation-states, and leading to homogenization"

(p. 124). For purposes of this study the term internationalization will be used and is

defined as stated above.

As a response to the desire to create globally competent citizens, universities

began to implement campus-wide internationalization initiatives in the 1990s.

Universities throughout the United States are at varying stages in development of campus

internationalization initiatives. Knight (as cited in Taylor, 2004) has labeled six unique

stages within the internationalization process: Awareness, commitment, planning,

operationalising, review, and reinforcement (p. 150). Some universities are just at the beginning of this process while others are in the groundbreaking stages of planning or operationalising. Still others, such as the University of Minnesota, have had a long, successful history of comprehensive internationalization and fall into more of a sustainable level of review and continue to improve already existing campus internationalization initiatives (Paige, 2003). For administrators at universities that are in the earlier stages of this continuum, it is extremely beneficial to become familiar with successful campus internationalization initiatives at other institutions in an effort to better understand the implementation process as it truly involves integrated collaboration within the administrative ranks and major commitment from the institution (Ellingboe, 1998; Taylor, 2004).

In 1995, The American Council on Education developed a list of ground rules for campus internationalization. These are: requirement of competence in a foreign language upon graduation, understanding of at least one additional culture other than one's own, increased understanding of global systems, curricula change to include international components, creation of international study abroad and internship programs for all students, faculty development opportunities and incentives for international work, examination of organizational needs that are specific to international education, cross-cultural collaborations between U.S. and international universities, and partnerships with local schools and communities. These ground rules can be quite helpful and are best understood when examined in the context of actual practice.

Ellingboe (1998) developed a conceptual model of successful internationalization through her qualitative, in-depth research of the University of Minnesota's internationalization efforts. This research provides a fruitful way of looking at how universities can create successful campus internationalization initiatives by conceptualizing the ground rules stated above. Through this research, Ellingboe concludes that in order for a university to achieve comprehensive, successful internationalization, six factors must be present.

The first factor is college leadership, by which Ellingboe means that internationalization has become a priority for the university as evidenced by rhetorical and financial commitment from upper administration (president, vice president, deans) and by inclusion of internationalization within strategic plans and hiring decisions. The second factor is faculty involvement in international activities. This factor includes faculty promoting international study options to students, traveling abroad to lead international study programs or collaborate with international colleagues in research activities, and a high level of contact on campus with international faculty members and scholars.

While the first and second factors concern individuals and personnel resources, the third and fourth factors relate to integrated opportunities. The third factor is an internationalized curriculum meaning the inclusion of international concepts into all disciplines within the curriculum, the existence of resources such as web resources and travel grants to encourage faculty to include international components in all classes and majors. The fourth factor is international opportunities for students that include various

types of international activities such as study abroad, research abroad, and internships abroad. Issues such as availability, affordability and transferability are crucial for administrators to consider as international programs are created. Well-planned pre-departure and re-entry programs are important to help students plan for international study as well as readjust to life in the United States upon their return.

The final two factors detail how to programmatically integrate students into the internationalization initiative. The fifth factor is the integration of international students and scholars into the everyday campus life, which can be achieved through special programming across campus and a concerted effort to structure activities for international students and scholars to interact with their peers and produce a true sense of international understanding between individuals. The sixth factor is the existence of international co-curricular units and activities which includes campus-wide programming to heighten the campus' awareness of international issues and more explicit marketing of international options (both on and off campus) for students and faculty.

Ellingboe (1998) found evidence that there are a variety of factors present in attitudes of upper level administrators and faculty members that can both inhibit and facilitate the implementation of a comprehensive campus internationalization initiative. The factors which inhibit the initiative are the following: lack of ability by faculty members to make the cognitive shift required to include international components into curriculum; lack of incentives for faculty to internationalize their courses or participate in international activities; lack of funding for faculty to travel internationally to teach, research or consult; the promotion and tenure process that precludes junior faculty from

leaving campus to go abroad and the confusion created by faculty who may be more inter-

disciplinary than single-subject focused; the absence of internationalization from the

university's mission statement and strategic plan; and an insular attitude of each

discipline being an independent entity that is difficult to segregate into collaborative

pieces. Factors that were deemed as helping to promote the internationalization initiative

include: promotion of faculty involvement and international exchanges, fund raising for

the internationalization initiative, opportunities for administrators to gain international

experience, gauging student interest in international courses and study abroad programs,

and the existence of campus-wide discussion and communication about the

internationalization initiative.

Schoorman's (2000) research categorizes the key ingredients required for

successful internationalization initiatives into three overarching categories and provides a

lens for which to view internationalization. Schoorman's framework has three levels: the

core, basic elements required for internationalization which are very similar to

Ellingboe's six factors; the "microperspective" which involves how on-campus

constituents practice internationalization within their individual realms; and the

"macroperspective" which looks at the larger goals of international education and how

the various campus constituents can collaborate to meet the larger goal for the general

campus population (p. 7). Knight (2004) theorizes that there are a variety of approaches to

internationalization that can occur at the institutional level. These approaches help to

define how internationalization is being implemented on a campus. According to these

six definitional approaches internationalization is viewed as "activity, outcomes,

rationales, process, at home, [and] abroad (cross-border)" (Knight, 2004, p. 20).

Internationalization as an activity includes the actual opportunities available at the

institution such as study abroad programs, internationalized curricula, and "branch

campuses" which are extensions of the home university that operates overseas. Viewing

internationalization as outcomes means that from internationalization initiatives, there

should be a change in competencies among students and faculty related to

internationalization activities and, for example, an increase in international agreements.

The rationales behind internationalization include the behind-the-scenes

motivations for internationalizing such as the desire to increase diversity on campus,

increased revenue, and the need to meet the challenges of an increasing global society.

The at-home approach views internationalization initiatives as agents of positive cultural

change on campus in that they foster a level of increased understanding and sensitivity to

difference. The abroad (cross-border) approach defines internationalization as bringing

education to other countries by means such as distance learning or the opening of a

smaller version of U.S. institutions overseas. Qiang (2003) summarizes Knight's (2004)

rationales into four larger categories: political, economic, academic, and cultural/social.

Internationalization as a process means that the pieces of the internationalization initiative

are woven into the vital aspects of the institution such as learning and teaching.

Complementary to Knight's research, Qiang (2003) divides the actual approaches

to internationalization into four types: activity, competency, ethos, and process. Qiang

(2003) defines the activity approach as including the logistics and tangible aspects of

campus internationalization such as curriculum, study abroad programs, faculty exchange

and international students. The competency approach relates to the actual skill sets honed by internationalization activities. The ethos approach is related to the creation of an institutionalized culture on campuses that supports internationalization. The process approach involves the forming of campus policies that will support and sustain the internationalization initiatives. It is important that the process approach is kept in mind when initiating change on campuses because as Qiang (2003) notes, "internationalization must be entrenched in the culture, policy, planning and organizational process of the institution so that it can be both successful and sustainable" (pp. 257-258). Each of these approaches plays a role in campus internationalization as they are intertwined and necessary for the comprehensive and institutionalized nature of a campus-wide initiative. An initiative such as internationalization that is intended to reach all facets of an entire campus needs to be worked through in the methodical way that Qiang (2003) and Knight (2004) suggest.

Chan and Dimmock (2008) have recently added to the internationalization literature proposing three models of internationalization based on their case study of a Hong Kong university and a British university. They propose that three models of internationalization exist and that each model is suited to a particular kind of campus culture. Model number one is the internationalist model that appears to work best at strongly established, often research based universities located within the developed world. The internationalist model focuses on establishing an overseas network with other similar institutions and the outward or overseas delivery of higher education. The second model explored by Chan and Dimmock is labeled as the translocalist model. This model

works well in countries that are less highly developed and in need of establishing themselves as a nation-state. The primary focus within the translocalist model is that of on-campus internationalization rather than overseas initiatives. The third model of internationalization is labeled as the globalist model. This model tends to develop in countries where there are large numbers of expatriates seeking to educate their children using their old home country's model of education. Programs such as the International Baccalaureate Program stem from the globalist model of internationalization (Chan & Dimmock, 2008). These various models defined by Chan and Dimmock provide an understanding for the various ways in which campus administrators can frame the internationalization initiative for stakeholders. As evidenced by the research detailed above, there are a variety of ways that internationalization initiatives can be constructed on campus and a variety of reasons for engagement in internationalization initiatives.

Motivation for Campus Internationalization Initiatives

Motivations for campus internationalization include commercial incentives, the desire to brand national universities in an international setting, the potential to enhance language and cultural studies programs on campus and abroad, and the opportunity to update existing or create new curriculum (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Edwards, 2007). Warner (as cited in Qiang, 2003) suggests that there are basically three models that drive campuses to undertake internationalization initiatives. These models are labeled as: competitive model, liberal model, and social transformation model (Qiang, 2003). The competitive model refers to viewing internationalization as being helpful at moving the institution into a more prestigious place in the competitive market of higher education.

The liberal model suggests the reason campus internationalization helps students to become more equipped global citizens is by virtue of the fact that they have directly participated in or been exposed to the campus' internationalization activities, programs and initiatives. The social transformation model takes the liberal model one step further by suggesting that students who are affected by campus internationalization initiatives develop a deeper understanding and appreciation for differences that may help them to contribute in their own way to real social change.

Some of these motivations appear to have the students' best interest in mind. However, the motivations that fall into the competitive model category discussed by Wagner (as cited in Qiang, 2003) and the commercial incentives investigated by Altbach and Knight (2007) seem to allude to a slippery slope of equating monetary gains for a university as being equal to what is best for student development and student learning. This issue was recently raised with the investigations by the New York State Attorney General's Office regarding the interaction between study abroad program providers and universities. This investigation will be detailed later as part of the literature review.

Altbach and Knight (2007) raise serious questions in their research related to the rapid international expansion of U.S. higher education programs into other nations. In their research, Altbach and Knight discuss how various regions of the world are internationalizing higher education and note the differences between for-profit organizations and not for profit organizations in terms of motivations for internationalization. The questions raised by their research center around quality assurance, accreditation, recognition and policy issues. In terms of quality assurance,

Altbach and Knight point out that institutions in U.S. should be very cognizant of the types of providers they are partnering with overseas to insure that the providers are linked to a local or national system of higher education. As the old adage states, one should be careful with the company one keeps and Altbach and Knight drive this point home by stating:

> Social confidence in higher education demands giving priority to defining the roles and responsibilities of all layers involved in quality assurance—including individual institutions and providers, national quality-assurance systems, nongovernmental and independent accreditation bodies, professional associations, and regional or international organizations. Their roles defined, these players must collaborate to build a system that ensures the quality and integrity of cross-border education. (p. 302)

Quality in terms of academic rigor and institutional programming is crucial to the viability of U.S. institutions partnering with international universities and providers as is the importance of having appropriate accreditation standards. It is of utmost importance for administrators to remain focused on quality control issues when developing or expanding international initiatives.

<div align="center">Statement of the Problem</div>

Comprehensive campus internationalization initiatives often call for organizational change within a university. The complexity of handling organizational culture change can be challenging. Knight (as cited in Taylor, 2004) theorized that there are six levels that a campus moves through in the internationalization process. Universities that have successfully reached Knight's level of "operationalising" or "review" in the internationalization process should be viewed as paradigm examples.

Universities who are in the beginning stages of internationalization need models from which to gather ideas and tactics for success.

Private associations such as NAFSA and ACE have begun to recognize different campuses for successful comprehensive internationalization initiatives. Both NAFSA and ACE have developed guidelines necessary for creating successful campus-wide internationalization initiatives. The criteria set by these organizations for the awards can be viewed as a definition of success. Universities can look to the award recipients as models of success and can adapt the award-winning universities strategies to create a successful campus internationalization initiative. A desire to internationalize university campuses exists because of the understanding of the potential benefit to students and university constituents.

Many universities have begun the internationalization process, especially in the development of study abroad opportunities; however, few have been deemed as successful models of campus internationalization. A 2008 report published by the American Council on Education, notably the only report of its kind to detail overall data on campus internationalization, reported grim statistics regarding the status of internationalization on college campuses in the United States. According to this report, in 2006 approximately 417 of the 2,476 campuses surveyed for the report had a mission statement that referred to international or global education and only 364 campuses included global education as a top five strategic priority for the university (ACE, 2008).

Why are successful comprehensive campus internationalization initiatives not more widespread? To use the language of leading organizational learning researcher

Argyris (1976), there appears to be a disconnect between the "espoused theory" (the policy a university knows is good) and the "theory-in-use" (the creation and concrete establishment of a successful campus internationalization initiative). To internationalize a campus, many aspects have to be taken into consideration. Since study abroad programs have historically been the launching pad for integrated campus internationalization initiatives, they are a natural focal point for investigating how a campus can become truly internationalized. The literature defines the necessary components of campus internationalization initiatives and details what should be considered when undertaking these initiatives. However, in terms of the actual process of internationalizing a campus, the question remains: How can an institution procedurally move from policy to successful practice, particularly in terms of study abroad programming?

<div align="center">Purpose of the Study</div>

The purpose of this study is to explore how one private, East Coast university (hereafter PECU) was able to move from the concept of a campus-wide internationalization initiative to the successful implementation through the institutionalization of study abroad programs. Due to the magnitude of elements that are usually involved in campus internationalization initiatives, the importance placed on study abroad programs by the U.S. government as a key way to globalize college students, and the increasing numbers of study abroad programs on campuses nationwide, the unit of focus in this particular study will be the international study abroad programs. This case study will benefit other small, private schools similar to PECU by serving as a model for these universities just entering or in the beginning phases of campus internationalization

initiatives. The information gleaned from this research, while not broadly generalizable, can help these universities decipher how to use study abroad programs to enhance and or kick start the campus internationalization process. The depth of description in this case study will be useful when administrators from other campuses may look to this study as an example. The level of detail related to how the PECU campus managed the internationalization process by institutionalizing study abroad programs in particular allows the reader to determine for him or herself how much of the information from this study can be transferred back to his or her particular campus.

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

Study abroad is often the largest component of campus internationalization and it is often the most replicated piece of the internationalization process within systems of higher education. This study looks at one piece of comprehensive campus internationalization—study abroad programs—and focuses on the administrative process of moving from policy to successful implementation and institutionalization of study abroad programs at PECU. The main research question guiding this study is *how has PECU moved from policy to practice in study abroad programming as part of its comprehensive internationalization initiative?* In order to investigate this process, the following sub-questions will guide the research:

1. What scaffolding was in place to guide the internationalization initiative and the institutionalization of the study abroad programs on campus?

2. Who was involved in the process to institutionalize study abroad programs?

3. What role did the administration and faculty play in the initiative and the implementation and institutionalization process?

4. What was the process for preparing the campus community for implementation of the initiative?

5. What factors facilitated and inhibited the implementation of this initiative?

The following literature review serves to frame study abroad programs within the context of comprehensive campus internationalization so that PECU is viewed as a model for success, which will help administrators at other higher education institutions understand how to advance and institutionalize study abroad programs (as part of a comprehensive internationalization initiative) on their own individual campuses.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The literature review provided here supports the need to study and understand the issues related to the process of institutionalizing a specific piece of campus internationalization initiative, namely the expansion of study abroad programs. This review of literature consists of the following three main bodies of literature: study abroad programs, college student development, and policy implementation and organizational change. Each of these bodies of literature helps frame the story of international education within higher education. Historical context is an essential tool for understanding a phenomenon such as international education so in order to situate this particular study a general overview of the history of study abroad programming is necessary. Since the particular unit of focus in this study is study abroad programs it is important to understand the role that these types of programs play on college campuses. Therefore, the literature is organized by the following subsections: history of international education programs and how they came to be part of higher education institutions, current status of study abroad programs, benefits of study abroad participation for college students, study abroad and its purposeful role in college student development, and study abroad policy implementation as organizational change.

History of International Education Programs

International education programs in higher education institutions began in the 1940s after World War II as a result of difficulties that individuals encountered in dealing

with foreign cultures and understanding the overseas issues that were brought to light during the war. Sanders and Ward (1970) recount that, "with the end of the war some educational and political leaders recognized that the national interest demanded preparation of specialists on every part of the world on a regular, continuous basis" and these leaders suggested that universities create "language and area study programs" (p. 2). Following these suggestions by political and educational leaders, major foundations such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, and the Ford Foundation contributed significantly to the development of research as well as the creation of "non-Western studies" programs for graduate and undergraduate students (Sanders & Ward, 1970, p. 2). The National Defense Education Act of 1958 confirmed that the United States government was aware of the need for and interested in establishing international education as a priority as the Act provided financial support for the newly established language and area study programs. Soon after the passage of the National Defense Education Act programs such as the Fulbright program and the Peace Corps were created to extend the opportunities for Americans to study other cultures in depth by working with and teaching overseas serving those in need. As Sanders and Ward point out, a high point in the history of international education came in 1966 when the International Education Act was passed. This act declared:

> The Congress hereby finds and declares that a knowledge of other countries is of utmost importance in promoting mutual understanding and cooperation between nations; that American educational resources are a necessary base for strengthening our relations with other countries; that this and future generations of Americans should be assured ample opportunity to develop to the fullest extent possible their intellectual capacities in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries, peoples, and cultures; and that it is therefore both necessary and

appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in the development of resources for international study and research, to assist in the development of resources and trained personnel in academic and professional fields, and to coordinate the existing and future programs of the Federal Government in international education to meet the requirements of world leadership. (Sanders & Ward, 1970, pp. 6-7)

The language of the International Education Act was much stronger than any government action that followed it. Sanders and Ward detail the many refusals of Congress to actually fund the act which resulted in a decline of foundation support for international education programs. The foundations were under the impression that Congress would honor and financially back the act and therefore the foundations began to fund other ventures. Ruther (2002) highlights both the financial stress and the strained international relations that the United States was experiencing during the 1970s due to recession, the Vietnam War, and the revolution in Iran as key factors in the decline of governmental financial support for the International Education Act. Due to the combination of these factors, international education programs fell under the leadership of university upper-level administrators who had to incorporate these programs into their overall budgetary plans (Sanders & Ward, 1970). Despite the financial setbacks, however, Ruthers does note that Americans were increasingly seeking out international opportunities during the 1970s. The status of world affairs in the 1980s launched the United States into the reality of dealing with challenges such as economic factors abroad, technological advances and military and political situations overseas. Ruther (2002) states that "higher education was seen as a key player in the national response" to these issues and challenges and that from these challenges "scholars and students found new intellectual opportunities and incredibly open access to the entire world" (p. 5).

Current Status of Study Abroad Programs

The desire to study abroad has existed long before the events of the late 20th century and universities have been meeting students desire to explore international lands. In fact, study abroad programs have been offered to students on college campuses since 1923 when the University of Delaware created its first program. Since then, the number of study abroad programs has increased. Sanders and Ward (1970) report that in the 1967-1968 school year, approximately 22,000 students participated in study abroad programs. That number has continued to rise. According to the Institute of International Education's 2007 Open Doors Report, 223,534 U.S. students, out of approximately 17.3 million enrolled students, studied abroad during the 2005-2006 academic year (National Center for Education Statistics, 2007). The current number of American students studying overseas accounts for just slightly more than 1% of the total number of American students pursuing higher education. Of those who go abroad, most study in Europe, although the number of students studying in developing countries and Asia has increased (Christie & Ragans, 1999; IIE, 2007).

A variety of study abroad programs exist between schools and even among programs offered within the same school. Due to the variety of programs, Engle and Engle (2003) propose five levels of classification for study abroad programs. They are as follows: study tour, short-term study, cross-cultural contact program, cross-cultural encounter program, and cross-cultural immersion program. According to Engle and Engle (2003), programs differ from one another according to seven variables. These variables are:

1. Length of student sojourn

2. Entry target-language competence

3. Language used in course work

4. Context of academic course work

5. Types of student housing

6. Provisions for guided/structured cultural interactions and experiential learning

7. Guided reflection on cultural experience

While this classification system can serve as a scaffolding for the large construct of international education, it is important that administrators determine a specific set of standards and desired outcomes for study abroad programs offered by their institution (Ingraham & Peterson, 2004). It would be almost impossible to have a set of standards and desired outcomes for every program throughout the United States; however, it is suggested that each study abroad program office develop its own set of standards and desired outcomes to ensure that all administrators, students and faculty have congruent expectations concerning what a study abroad experience means (Engle & Engle, 2003; Hopkins, 1999; Ingraham & Peterson, 2004).

The classification system that Engle and Engle (2003) propose appears to be comprehensive and may make assessments of study abroad programs easier to conduct. However, the hierarchical structure of this classification system may pose an unintended misrepresentation. The hierarchy gives the impression that study tours (the lowest level in the classification system) are not meaningful or worthwhile. Study tours are very short in duration and participation does not require local language skills or a host family stay. All

activities are done collectively and the students are basically hand-held through the entire

program (Engle & Engle, 2003). Just because study tours fall into the lowest category

level does not mean that they are not meaningful or that they do not contribute to student

development. For students who have never been abroad, these well-organized seemingly

comfortable programs may be a good fit as they allow students to ease into the idea of

studying abroad. As noted earlier, students who participate in short-term programs claim

to receive similar benefits to the students who participate in longer, more immersed,

programs. Therefore, study tours, although short in duration and low in immersion with

the local culture, may be a good introduction to students who would not otherwise

participate in study abroad programs to do so and to return home with a new found

appreciation for diverse cultures and international experiences.

Traditionally, study abroad programs were set up to be a semester-long experience

for students to develop their language skills; however, that trend is changing as the

number of students going abroad rises. Students now can study a variety of subjects while

abroad and can do so in multiple formats. Programs with a short-term format are

becoming more popular and are consistently attracting more and more students.

Currently one half of all students who study abroad participate in a program lasting less

than 8 weeks (IIE, 2007; McMurtie, 2005). Short-term programs are practical for students

who cannot afford the cost of going abroad for a semester, who are nervous about going

abroad but have a desire for an international experience, and for students who are in

majors that may not allow much course flexibility (Christie & Ragans, 1999; Hopkins,

1999; Lewis & Niesenbaum, 2005).

Although the number of American students who study overseas has increased over the years, it is still quite a small number when compared to the number of foreign students studying in the United States. Does the experience overseas enhance students' learning? Research indicates that longer programs allow for greater student development in areas such as language proficiency, cross-cultural awareness, and self-understanding (Engle & Engle, 2003; Ingraham & Peterson, 2004; Medina López Portillo, 2004). However, it has been demonstrated through qualitative and quantitative research that students who return from short-term study abroad programs experience similar development in these areas (Christie & Ragans, 1999; Lewis & Niesenbaum, 2005).

This trend toward creating short-term programs may also be moving forward at the urging of university senior financial officials. According to Woolf (2007), "chief financial officers (and presidents) may see semester study programmes as cost centres where tuition is lost to the home institution. In contrast, they may perceive short-term programmes as income generating profit centres" (p. 503). Despite the discrepancies in opinion, according to a report issued by the American Council on Education (2008), the number of institutions offering study abroad opportunities for their students has risen by about 25% over the last 7 years.

The quality and quantity of contact with the local culture is another dimension that is variable. Immersion into the local culture has been shown to be a vital component of aiding student development in overseas programs (Christie & Ragans, 1999; Laubscher, 1994; Lewis & Niesenbaum, 2005; Steffes, 2004; Weinberg, 2007; Wilkinson, 1998). Quality contact with local culture allows students to become more proficient in the local

language and develop a more enhanced cross-cultural awareness (Ingraham & Peterson, 2004; Medina López Portillo, 2004; Steffes, 2004; Vande Berg, 2007). This contact helps students to compare and contrast their previous ideas and understanding with their new learning. Woolf (2007) argues, "the level of integration is an entirely inappropriate measure of quality [yet] proximity alone does not necessarily create intimacy" (pp. 497-498).

Students who participate in "island programs," programs in which U.S. students live and study with other U.S. students and are not integrated into the local university, tend to not have much contact with the locals and, therefore, the study abroad experience can become what Gillespie (2002) calls "academic tourism" (p. 264). However, Woolf (2007) claims that "island programs" have positive aspects that benefit U.S. students studying abroad. Students in "island programs" do not have to worry about integrating into a new type of classroom culture specific to the host country. Also, "island programs" are not required to meet any host country academic regulations and therefore can engage in experiential learning opportunities outside of the classroom. Woolf claims that in the "island programs," "the walls of the classroom can be exploded, and the foreign landscape itself becomes the classroom. It may ultimately be possible to argue, in this context, that opportunities to penetrate the host culture are, paradoxically, greater" than they would be in a program that required the students to become fully integrated into the host university (p. 501).

Studying abroad and contact with local culture is a form of experiential learning. Montrose (2004) defines experiential learning as follows:

A method of teaching and learning that supports the individualized knowledge that occurs outside the classroom walls, and allows students to stretch in unique and creative directions. [It is] a pedagogy that actively engages the student in the phenomena that they are studying .... [allowing the students to] come face to face with an alternative worldview, learning through both action and reflection. (pp. 2-3)

A Chinese proverb nicely sums up the goal of experiential education. It is stated, "Tell me and I'll forget; show me and I may remember; involve me and I'll understand." Service-learning is a form of experiential learning that is being used more frequently within study abroad programs to enhance the immersion process.

Structured service-learning activities have been shown through both qualitative and quantitative research studies to be useful in helping students to increase their level of cross-cultural understanding (Myers-Lipton, 1996; Pisano, 2007; Tonkin & Quiroga, 2004). These types of activities usually take the form of service activities within the local community. Students participate in the community service activity and then actively reflect on the activity, usually with the help of a facilitator such as a faculty member or administrator who is accompanying them, or through journal writing. Due to the type of contact with the community that students experience while engaging in service-learning, they feel a greater connection to that community and become more deeply immersed and engaged during the process. This connection and engagement, along with the reflection component required by service-learning, enhances their cognitive development (Maher, 2003; Montrose, 2004; Myers-Lipton, 1996; Rauner, 1995; Tilstra & Van Scheik, 1999). Service learning helps to enhance study abroad programs and is recognized as an important component within a study abroad experience (Weinberg, 2007). While service-

learning is seen as a positive component within study abroad programming, the issue of academic rigor within study abroad programs, however, has often been seen by institution administrators as an area in need of improvement (Rooney, 2002).

There are varying viewpoints on the issue of grading and academic rigor within study abroad programs. One school of thought believes that "since cultural learning is a key part of the rationale for studying abroad, grades and transcript policies should be viewed in the context of broader motivation, not as an absolute end in and of themselves" (Trooboff, Cressey, & Monty, 2004, p. 203). Another school of thought is cautious not to allow their study abroad programs to be viewed as extended vacation or lacking in academic rigor (Rooney, 2002). Grading and academic rigor are important components to consider as colleges and universities are accredited based on the quality of education they provide. While some individuals believe that the cultural learning is most important in a study abroad program, administrators are cognizant of academic accrediting standards. Offering classes that lack academic rigor in study abroad programs has implications for the school, such as a bad reputation and ill-prepared students, and should remain a consideration for program administrators (Rooney, 2002).

The notion of creating globally competent students has been deemed so crucial within society today that the United States Congress has become involved. In 2006, Congress established the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Act to help increase the number of opportunities for students to participate in study abroad programs. Congress also authorized the Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act of 2007 which will help to increase the number of students studying abroad and also diversify the

types of study abroad opportunities for students (Committee on Foreign Affairs, 2007).

Both of these acts stemmed from the recommendations of the Commission on the

Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. The Lincoln Commission has a

goal of insuring that by 2017, one million college students in the United States will have

studied abroad annually (Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship

Program, 2005). The Commission rationalizes this bold goal in its *Global Competence*

and National Needs report (2005) by stating:

> Our national security and domestic prosperity depend upon a citizenry that
> understands America's place in the world, the security challenges it faces, and the
> opportunities and perils facing Americans around the world. Responding to these
> realities requires a massive increase in the global literacy of the "typical college
> graduate." (p. 25)

Leading international education associations, such as NAFSA: Association of

International Educators, are also setting high goals. One of the goals of NAFSA is to

increase the amount of study abroad opportunities and increase the number of students

studying abroad so that by 2015 all college graduates will have studied participated in a

study abroad program or gained extensive international experience. It is apparent that the

way in which "significant international experience" will be assessed has yet to be

determined, as it will certainly mean different things to different groups of people. In

order to reach these goals; it is important for university administrators to understand how

to institutionally manage study abroad programs.

To that end, NAFSA (2008b) formed a task force that set criteria for the

institutional management of study abroad programs. The task force concluded that four

over-arching criteria must be present within study abroad programs. Those criteria are:

institutional commitment, infrastructure, resources and accountability (p. 1). The task force expands each of the criteria into specific suggestions. According to the task force, institutional commitment includes embedding study abroad as a valid academic part of the college experience, ensuring that funding is available to sustain the expansion of study abroad programs, and having systems in place for proper oversight of the study abroad programs. Administrative infrastructure for study abroad includes program planning and engaging faculty in both the program approval and oversight process as well as, and perhaps most importantly, in the evaluation of the academic components of the study abroad programs. Policies on transfer of credits, risk management, and evaluation also are included in this criterion. The requirement for resources for study abroad offices highlights the personal resources needed such as administrators and staff who run the office as well as financial resources. The task force recommends that being able to control cost to students is essential to the survival of study abroad programs. The criterion of accountability includes clear communication of study abroad information to all constituents including policies related to study abroad programs and expectations. This criterion also includes the requirement of conflict-of-interest policies to avoid any questionable business practices or contract agreements that may not be in the best interest of the university.

Business practices and policies within study abroad programs have been scrutinized by students, parents, and most notably, the New York State Attorney General. There appears to be what Carl Jung would refer to as a "shadow side" within study abroad programs (Mattoon, 1981). Jung used the concept of a shadow to illustrate the areas

within a person's psyche that remain hidden yet have influence over decisions and reactions. This concept can also be extended to a group, therefore becoming a collective shadow. Egan (1994) applies this concept to organizations by summarizing the havoc that the shadow side can unleash by stating:

> Deals are cut, reputations are ruined, money disappears, rules in the company's manuals are not enforced while unwritten rules are, innocent people are blamed, the guilty are promoted. Such occurrences are costly, yet few figure up the costs. Welcome to the shadow side of organizational life. (p. 3)

Using the metaphor within the context of study abroad offices, this shadow side is comprised of the parts within the organization's structure and policy-making that administrators may not want to show to the general public. Allegations by New York State Attorney General Andrew Cuomo surfaced in August 2007 and brought the shadow side of these offices into the light by initially focusing on five major study abroad program providers and their relationships with the universities they serve. The allegations claim that these study abroad program providers may be entering into unethical practices with university study abroad offices by offering perks such as "free and subsidized travel overseas for officials, back-office services to defray operating expenses, stipends to market the programs to students, unpaid membership on advisory councils and boards, and even cash bonuses and commissions on student-paid fees" (Schemo, 2007a, p. 1). These unethical practices stem from the collective shadow. The main argument is that these arrangements are kept hidden by administrators and that they are detrimental to students. Because of the seemingly profitable partnership for the study abroad office and or the university, administrators may regulate which programs students can and cannot

participate in by placing restrictions on the types of credit students can receive. According to the allegations, the offices forbid credit transfers from non-preferred vendors. This limits options for students and some claim that the option for a student to choose a less expensive program (not a preferred vendor) is completely taken away by these limitations (Redden, 2007).

Representatives from various international education associations interviewed by the *Chronicle of Higher Education* for their reaction to the report claimed that these labeled "perks" such as subsidized travel for administrators are part of the job because the trips help the administrators ensure quality by visiting the overseas sites and evaluating the programs (Redden, 2007). The administrators who participated in this interview for the *Chronicle of Higher Education* all indicated that transparency and disclosure of these arrangements is critical to dispelling the claims of unethical business practices. The fact that the business practices within study abroad program offices are coming under scrutiny highlights the trend in the growth of study abroad programming across U.S. campuses. This growth is in reaction to the mandate by The Lincoln Commission (one million students abroad by 2017) and indicates that study abroad is becoming a big business.

Exploring study abroad as big business implies that study abroad programs or the experience of studying abroad can be viewed as a commodity that can be bought or sold by consumers (Bolen, 2001; Millington, 2002). Viewing study abroad as a commodity can set up unrealistic and sometimes detrimental expectations from students. Both Millington (2002) and Bolen (2001) point out that if studying abroad is viewed as a product that is purchased, students and parents may develop an unhealthy sense of

entitlement that unfortunately gets acted out upon study abroad offices and program providers when expectations are not met or, for example, if a student gets denied participation to a program. According to Millington (2002), this sense of entitlement comes out once students are abroad as students "may expect to be accommodated by the host culture rather than submit to it" (p. 61). Because the study abroad program is seen as a purchased good, academics may come second. Millington notes that study abroad program offices have the potential to be viewed as travel agencies for university students. This is quite dangerous as it dilutes the academic seriousness of international study and sends students, parents and host countries the wrong message. Millington (2002) claims:

> Travel is an integral and exciting part of study abroad, but it has come to be seen by some as the basis of a study abroad program rather than as a complementary aspect. Students who participate in study abroad programs to travel, with study as a spare-time activity, see the study abroad program as resembling a travel agency that caters to tourists between the ages of 20 and 22. (p. 61)

Bolen (2001) examines the relationship between the consumer mentality and the importance of leisure in American society and how these issues can negatively affect study abroad programs. Bolen argues that study abroad programs are sometimes created too quickly to meet the rising demands of consumers (student and parents). The hastiness in creating programs to meet popular demand causes potential trouble for program providers if quality assurance and standards are overlooked due to the sense of urgency created by consumers. According to Bolen (2001), "institutions that try to capitalize too quickly on fads may end up overextended, without solid student support services and with trouble attracting serious students. . . . In universities, following fashion may also lead to having an unconnected group of programs that do not mesh with the curricular strengths

of departments" (p. 190). Related to the shadow side aspects of study abroad programs that administrators need to be aware of, Bolen (2001) warns international offices to be mindful of their intentions and "to question closely why they or their institutions want to create programs if good alternatives already exist" (p. 191).

The scrutiny facing study abroad programs and the recognition that some students and parents may view study abroad as a commodity has forced administrators to take a very close look at their partnerships and their motivations. As noted above, NAFSA has included accountability as one of four main criteria for the institutional management of study abroad. The U.S. Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have named The Forum on Education Abroad (a member organization of approximately 300 colleges, universities, overseas institutions, and program providers) as the "Standards Development Organization for education abroad" (Forum on Education Abroad, 2008). The Forum recently issued a *Code of Ethics for Education Abroad* that was established to "provide a guide for making ethical decisions to ensure that those in the education abroad field provide services in accord with the highest ethical standards, with the ultimate goal of ensuring that students' international educational experiences are as rich and meaningful as possible" (Forum on Education Abroad, 2008). This code outlines ethical principles and provides examples for each principle in six main subject areas. The six areas explored as the necessary ethical considerations within education abroad are:

1. Truthfulness and Transparency

2. Responsibility to Students

3. Relationships to Host Societies

4. Observance of Law and Good Practice

5. Conflicts of Interest

6. Gifts, Gratuities, Discounts, Rebates and Compensation

These ethical considerations can help administrators and study abroad program offices to monitor their activities and decisions and, therefore, help avoid allegations of unethical business practices.

In addition to the business side of study abroad programs, another way to think about ethics within international programs is to question whether or not study abroad programs are actually preparing students to face the challenges of the global community to help "create a more peaceful, just, and egalitarian global order" (Skelly, in press). Skelly, a well-known international education and peace studies scholar, has illustrated this question in an essay in which he argues that "study abroad, and the hosting of international students, has been seen through the lens of national interest and as such, tends to put the United States, and its individual citizens, first" (p. 4). His essay goes on to detail that the students who participate in study abroad programs are merely exposed to the surface of complex global problems rather than forced to examine the deeper culturally, politically, socially and environmentally rooted issues at play.

Skelly (in press) challenges those responsible for study abroad programming to develop programs that can provide "a critical perspective on the imperatives of global corporations and the institutions of states by helping to create a global public sphere where students and faculty, acting as global citizens, can foster much needed debates about international norms on a variety of issues" (pp. 15-16). The focus of international

education, according to Skelly, should be on the entire globe and not just the hot-spot location of the year and programs should force students to critically reason, ponder ethical issues and develop a respect and understanding of human rights. Skelly offers concrete advice for international educators to help ensure that study abroad programs are engaging students as members of a global, civil society. Skelly (in press) notes:

> International education exists to serve the global public interest and . . . it must not be dealt with as a commodity, nor should students be considered customers . . . regardless of the type of program, we should be building in reflexivity— reflexivity about the culturally constructed nature of one's Self, one's home society, and our understanding of the larger world.

Despite the uncovering of the shadow side of business practices within study abroad programs and the potentially ethno-centric nature of study abroad programs, the benefits to students by participating in an international experience continue to be well documented.

Benefits of Study Abroad Participation

In addition to knowing how to successfully manage study abroad programs from an institutional perspective, administrators also need to understand how a study abroad experience affects students. The effects of a study abroad experience have been well documented through the qualitative and quantitative research on international education. The effects are found to be highly positive and appear to be generalizeable to the majority of overseas experiences. The effects include a substantial increase in a student's interest in, understanding of, and sensitivity toward other cultures; a sense of increased independence; and overall enhanced personal development.

Kitsantas (2004) surveyed 232 college students to assess how study abroad program participation affected them. Using the Study Abroad Goals Scale (pre-departure and post-departure) and factor analysis, Kitsantas' research verified that the study abroad program enhanced the skills necessary in dealing with cross-cultural issues and helped students become well-versed in the subject matter that they were studying. In a separate study, Kitsantas and Meyers (2002) used the Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory test in a pretest and posttest assessment of 24 students participating in study abroad programs. This study showed that students who study abroad score higher after their study abroad experience in the dimensions of emotional resilience, flexibility and openness, perceptual acuity, and personal autonomy than do the students who did not participate in a study abroad program. McLeod and Wainwright's (2009) focus group research and Cash's (1993) cross-sectional research triangulate the findings of Kitsantas and Meyers (2002).

McLeod and Wainwright (2009) conducted focus-group research in two countries with 44 American college students in an attempt to explore Social Learning Theory and its relation to study abroad experiences. Social Learning Theory considers an individual's locus of control defined as "the extent to which people see a connection between what they do and what happens to them" (p. 67). According to their research, McLeod and Wainwright determined that students experienced both stressful and successful events during their time overseas. The successful events led to an increase in their feelings of self-confidence as well as personal changes in perception of themselves and of the world. Relating these changes to social learning theory, McLeod and Wainwright determined that "individuals bring their locus of control perspectives with them into the new

experience of traveling abroad; these, along with the specific expectancies they learn while being part of the program, will determine how they behave and how much they enjoy their experience" (p. 68). This new research complements Kitsantis and Meyer's (2002) research and it seems to confirm that the idea of a self-fulfilling prophecy. That is, McLeod and Wainwright's research confirms that students who study abroad have both negative and positive experiences and the positive experiences help students develop more self-confidence which then manifests itself in post-study abroad research conducted by individuals such as Kitsantis and Meyers. McLeod and Wainwright seem to claim that it might not necessarily be the actual study abroad program that helps the development of self-confidence in students but rather the exposure to successful and positive experiences and the opportunity to exert their own locus of control over these experiences abroad.

Cash (1993) surveyed students about their study abroad experiences over a period of 10 years and had response rates of over 59% for his surveys. The areas in which Cash found that students experienced the greatest growth were: appreciation and understanding of other cultures (88.1%), independence and maturity level (84.9%), self-awareness (80.9%), increased tolerance for different ideas and people (75.8%), and interpersonal skills such as being able to interact with a variety of people and handle stress (69.3%). Cash's research again shows that study abroad students increase their capacity for independence and maturity that may manifest itself in an increased level of self-confidence as well.

The overall finding of much of the research on study abroad programs has been divided into four general categories (Wilson, 1993). These four categories show that

students gain and benefit from "substantive knowledge, perceptual understanding, personal growth, [and] interpersonal connections" (p. 22). Qualitative and quantitative research gathered from students who return from study abroad programs supports this idea that students develop within those four general categories (Fernandez, 2006; Golay, 2006). Other research has shown that in addition to the kinds of development listed above, students who study abroad also return to the United States with an increased desire to travel again, a heightened interest in other subjects such as foreign languages, a more positive perception of globalization, openness to diversity, and the importance and appreciation for international understanding (Christie & Ragans, 1999; Douglas & Jones-Rikkers, 2001; Fernandez, 2006; Wortman, 2002; Younes & Asay, 2003). Clearly, study abroad programs are also beneficial for college students because they aid in the personal and cognitive development of students.

Study Abroad and College Student Development

Understanding the role that study abroad programs can have in the personal and cognitive development of college students is beneficial for higher education administrators. This understanding can help administrators support and market the idea to campus constituents that creating opportunities for study abroad is an important and worthwhile investment. While in college, students not only progress academically year-by-year, they also progress developmentally (Astin, 1993). Within higher education students need to be challenged both academically and personally so that they can successfully move from the stage of adolescence into the stage of young adulthood. It is during this transition period throughout the college years that opportunities for

involvement and personal development are crucial. Colleges provide students with a myriad of opportunities to enhance their personal development.

As students enter college they are in the late stages of adolescence and trying to confirm their individual identity in relationship with others (Erikson, 1980). While progressing through college, students begin to move from an individual perspective to a more relationally based perspective. Expanding on Erikson's work, Kegan (1982) defines the late adolescence period as "interpersonal." He states that during this timeframe individuals are "embedded in mutuality" (p. 165). By this, Kegan means that individuals in late adolescence are fully engaged in being in relationship with one another. Forming relationships and sustaining them is of utmost importance to individuals in this stage of development. Kegan argues that individuals can go forward and backward through the developmental levels according to the given circumstances during a particular time in their lives. However, many individuals progress from the interpersonal level to the next level called "institutional" when they enter college.

While in the institutional stage of development individuals negotiate relationships and continue to form their own identity. There is a movement from mutuality to personal autonomy or personal independence (Kegan, 1982). When students begin college they are typically transitioning from the interpersonal to the institutional level where they begin to define their own place in the world. As they find their place in the world college students can more easily begin to understand and appreciate different cultures. Higher education can foster this level of development in students by encouraging such activities as study abroad programs. As a student progresses through college both academically and

chronologically, a study abroad experience may help to solidify his or her movement toward the higher levels of development. As stated previously, study abroad experiences have been proven to help students improve in such areas as interpersonal communication, increased tolerance for differences, as well as an increased sense of independence and personal autonomy. Improvements in these areas are essential for students to be better able to understand themselves and how they can connect in the world around them. A general assumption is that life skills such as these are developed during the college years.

To help better understand what happens during the college years, Perry (1970) focused his work specifically on college student development. Perry found that when a student initially enters college he or she thinks in a dualistic mode: something is either right or it is wrong. As the student progresses through college he or she begins to move from the absolute frame of mind toward an understanding of multiplicity, that is, that there can be more than just two ways to view something. Eventually students move from multiplicity to relativism where they are capable of understanding that concepts are not absolute and actually vary from situation to situation. In relation to study abroad experiences, it is during the time that the student is abroad, that he or she can more quickly discover the level of relativism and come to understand and appreciate that concepts are indeed quite different and unique from culture to culture. Qualitative and quantitative research has proven this to be true. The results of these studies show that students' study abroad experience had a major positive impact on their life (Cash, 1993; Kauffmann, Martin, Weaver, & Weaver, 1992; Medina López Portillo, 2004; Wilkinson, 1998). In order to triangulate previously reported data, researchers at Michigan State

University included reflections from faculty who had taught in study abroad programs in their research findings.

The faculty reports validated what the students reported quantitatively and qualitatively about their perceived personal and intellectual development (Ingraham & Peterson, 2004). In addition, the faculty also commented on the question of whether students learn more or learn differently while they are studying overseas. Ingraham and Peterson collected written reports from seven faculty members who had led a study abroad program for Michigan State University to ascertain their perceptions and gathered a great response from a faculty member who stated that students certainly learn more and at a deeper level while overseas. The faculty member reported the following:

> Everything that happened, everything they saw, everything they did and heard and noticed and didn't like supported, subverted, questioned, challenged, added to, confirmed, altered, verified, disputed what they had learned "formally," which just couldn't have happened had they taken eight credits in East Lansing. (p. 93)

Although it was not reported in Ingraham and Peterson's research, it is quite probable that the faculty members themselves had a profound experience while teaching overseas. The development that occurs in students during a study abroad program does so in a foreign environment where almost everything is unique and different. The interaction of exposure to a different environment and cognitive development has been extensively researched by Piaget.

Piaget (1975) researched cognitive development in children; however, his theory can be expanded to all individuals because development is facilitated by the inescapable interaction between people and their environment. Individuals are constantly interacting

with their environment and therefore must adapt to that particular environment. As individuals adapt, they develop (Piaget, 1975; Pulaski, 1980). Kauffman et al. (1992) discuss a model related to Piaget's theory that highlights how students develop while participating in a study abroad program and summarize the research on developmental changes while studying abroad. Kauffman et al. found the following:

> Those students who can be described as less developmentally mature prior to the study abroad experience but who dive into the local culture and open themselves thoroughly to contact with the local culture are the ones who demonstrate the most personal growth. Students who are more mature at the start report greater change in their understanding of the other culture and in their appreciation for its values. Those students who report little change in global awareness and personal maturation are those who can be described as less mature developmentally and who—for whatever reason—have only superficial contact with the local culture. (p. 93)

This suggests that the developmental level of students prior to their overseas experience is as important as the actual components of the overseas program in increasing a student's level of interpersonal growth and understanding. This seems to be an important recognition for program administrators to keep in mind when selecting students to participate in study abroad programs.

The research of Erikson (1980), Kegan (1982), Perry (1970), and Piaget (1975) has greatly contributed to the understanding of cognitive development. If the role of college is to aid students in their development, then the work of these theorists can certainly help administrators to develop comprehensive and solid study abroad programs that will allow college students to develop to their full potential. College students enter college and are very dependent on others, such as friends or family (Erikson, 1980). As they grow older and progress through college, students become more self-confident and

become more autonomous. College students begin to recognize that there are multiple possibilities and that one right answer does not exist in many situations. Students move towards a more inter-dependent level of development when they are able to recognize and understand situations as being pluralistic meaning that the answers to a given situation can vary from situation to situation or from culture to culture (Kegan, 1982; Perry, 1970). It is the movement into this type of thinking that study abroad programs can help to foster.

_____The benefits of participating in a study abroad experience are well documented and the literature on college student development helps to make the connection for how important study abroad experiences are for college students. Understanding the role that study abroad programming plays for college students is certainly important; however, there is much more to be considered from an administrative standpoint in order to insure that all students are afforded the opportunity to participate in these beneficial experiences. It is one thing for administrators to understand the importance of study abroad program participation; however, they must also understand how to create a culture that fosters this type of activity. Creating and shaping campus culture to embrace study abroad program participation is an organizational challenge that requires deep consideration.

Organizational Change and Policy Implementation

As a major force of change, campus internationalization efforts are causing universities to weather through waves of organizational culture change. Taylor (2004) claims "internationalization represents one of the most significant drivers of change facing the modern university" (p. 168). Olson (2005) states that internationalization

should be approached as a "change process rather than a set of activities" (p. 51). A change such as internationalization will augment the culture of a university. Schein (2004) defines culture of a group or organization as

> a pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 17)

When going through culture change, an organization is forced to reexamine the basic assumptions that have been operating in a seemingly undetectable way. This reexamination process can produce great anxiety because it forces an organization to question and challenge prior notions of its perceived successful day-to-day operations. Schein (2004) notes that it is the organization's leaders who have the responsibility for helping the organization successfully weather through these periods of anxiety and culture change. In a university setting the leaders are the upper level administrators who guide the campus internationalization process. Knowing that this type of organizational culture change can produce such high levels of anxiety and, perhaps, distress, is important as universities are at differing stages within the internationalization process.

The upper-level administrators within higher education institutions must have the skills needed to guide the often chaotic and unsettling process of organizational change. Whereas Schein (2004) emphasizes the need to change the culture of an organization in order to create successful change, Kotter and Cohen (2002) emphasize the need to change the behavior of individuals within the organization. Kotter and Cohen claim that organizational change happens when eight criteria are present. These criteria are: creating

a sense of urgency, assembling a team of leaders rather than appointing one individual to lead change, creating a detailed vision and specific strategies to get to that vision, communication of the vision and the strategies, working to remove obstacles to action, focusing on small victories to establish trust and confidence in the change, keeping the momentum of change moving forward step by step, and embracing and helping to nurture the new behaviors once change has been established (pp. 3-7).

According to a Delphi study conducted by Lambert, Nolan, Peterson, and Price (2007), there are generally agreed upon skills and knowledge necessary for upper level university administrators. Lambert et al. (2007) surveyed 35 senior international education administrators in a variety of institutions within the U.S. and found consensus on the necessity of the following skills within their positions. These skills fell within five main categories: "personal qualities, background knowledge, specialized knowledge, functional skills, [and] specialize skills" (p. 3). In terms of personal qualities, the main skill deemed necessary for upper level administrators was diplomacy and tact. Having an academic background was the most often cited skill needed within the category of background knowledge. The area of special knowledge showed that a solid knowledge and understanding of the home institution was most important. Communication and teamwork were the two most cited skills within the functional skill category and cross-cultural skills was the most cited skill within the specialized skill category.

Upper level administrators are important key players who can set the stage for change and provide guidance during the overall change process. Van Loon (2001) notes that, "most of the reinvention of the organization will be done by those already in it"

(p. 298). Therefore, according to Van Loon, it is essential that higher-level administrators, be able to determine who the change leaders are and rely on them to carry out the initiatives that are put forward. Presidents and provosts may initially spark the idea for a comprehensive internationalization initiative and help shape policy for institutionalizing the ideas; however, as Van Loon alludes, it may be the administrators in the various departments across campus who get tasked with the day to day logistical implementation that requires an understanding of organizational change.

Organizational change within a university is complex. Olson (2005) claims that if internationalization is truly comprehensive throughout a university it will cause "transformational change" that will be "broad and deep" (p. 67). Ellingboe (1998) states that "to internationalize its curriculum, programs, faculty, students, and, most important, its leaders, requires proposing system-wide incentives, fostering intercollegiate cooperation, and making individual commitments." Ellingboe is careful to also point out that the change must occur on "three levels of human relations—systemic, group, and individual" (p. 200). The existence of communication vehicles to help spread the word about the campus internationalization initiative is a key component of helping a university weather through the ups and downs of organizational change (Ellingboe, 1998; Lewis, 2000; Van Loon, 2001). Lewis (2000) found that for those who are trying to implement change, communication problems related to the difficulty explaining the change and communicating the overall vision tend to be a large part of the failure to implement change within an organization. Van Loon (2001) states that "the organization —which means the people in it—must be very certain that the change is necessary; and,

even then, a substantial number of people will judge the cost to have been too great. Many of those directly affected will leave; but some will not, and some rancour will remain" (p. 295). Lewis claims that there are five elements that help an organization remain committed to change. These elements are: "creating vision, maintaining buy-in to mission, sense-making and feedback, establishing legitimacy, and communication goal achievement" (Lewis, 2000, p. 151). To help curb resistance to change, feedback sessions between the implementers and those expected to carry out the change are critical (Lewis, 2000).

Organizational change and policy implementation go hand in hand. When a policy is implemented, organizations undergo change. Implementation research has been helpful in understanding about how policies can be effectively implemented. The main perspectives in implementation research are the "top down" and "bottom up" approaches (Fitz, 1994; Harris, 2007). The top down approach suggests that an organization's leader or formal authority figure is responsible for policy formulation while the views of lower level employees and stakeholders (who are responsible for carrying out the policy) are not taken into consideration. The top down approach suggests that there is no room for negotiating the policy and that the policy cannot and should not be changed. On the other hand, the bottom up approach views the lower level agents within an organization as being capable of forming and implementing a policy as they are often on the front lines and able to decipher strategies and other factors that can assist in implementing a successful policy. The bottom up approach allows for changes within the policy or within how it is being implemented based on evaluation during the implementation process.

Harris (2007) suggests that there is another approach to policy implementation that is well-suited for higher education institutions. Harris states that a "sociocultural approach to studying policy implementation provides a context for analysis particularly important for examining policy in organizations that are heavily influenced by culture such as colleges and universities" (p. 4). This approach takes into consideration the interplay of constituents' realities and how these realities may affect their understanding of and ability to implement particular policies. Harris conducted a qualitative study at a large, East Coast university to explore the idea of how culture affects the implementation a new policy on a university campus. Harris studied a policy on tuition increase in this particular case; however, his findings can be applied to the policies of internationalization that are spreading across U.S college campuses today. In his study, Harris found that when friction arose between constituent groups regarding the policy and how it was to be implemented, this friction was often tied to the varying values, culture, and personal beliefs of the various constituents. When each group viewed the policy, their own individual socio-cultural perspective tinted the lens through which they were looking. Harris summarized his findings by stating:

> Campus constituencies must also come to a clear and consistent definition on the institution's mission to build relationships and support for the collective goals. By establishing a consensus between the academic, economic, and political pressures facing higher education, campus leaders are better able to make market sensitive decisions that do not violate the core beliefs and values that compromise the effectiveness of the institution. (p. 13)

The value of recognizing the arduous task of organizational change cannot be overlooked. As stated above, this recognition of the fact that all constituents must be on the same page when implementing policy is the glue that holds the initiative together.

Conclusion

This review of literature provides a background history of international education programs, reveals the current status of study abroad programs, highlights the benefits of study abroad participation, discusses the relationship of study abroad and college student development, and utilizes study abroad policy implementation as an example of organizational change within higher education institutions. The literature review focused primarily on study abroad programs because they are the focus of analysis related to comprehensive campus internationalization on the campus discussed in this particular case study. Because of the novelty of comprehensive campus internationalization efforts, there are few examples of success that can serve as role models for universities that are looking to begin on this path. In an effort to detail the process of comprehensive campus internationalization from the perspective of administration, an in-depth case study was undertaken on the campus of a noted leading university that is a true success story within the field international education.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study is a single case study of one, private East Coast university (PECU). Single case methodology was employed so that the phenomenon of PECU moving from policy to successful practice could be looked at in depth as it is a unique and exemplary case (Merriam, 2002; Yin, 2003). PECU has been recognized as a leader within international education. Since this study is primarily concerned with questions of process, case study methodology was well suited as it is the "preferred strategy when 'how' or 'why' questions are being posed" (Yin, 2003, p. 1). The desired outcome of an in-depth understanding of PECU's process and journey towards campus internationalization called for a single-site case study.

I chose to concentrate on PECU as the single subject of this case study because it fit the scope of my intended research. I was primarily interested in how PECU *itself* moved through the process of internationalization since they have been labeled as a model campus. Stake (2000) highlights the usefulness of single-site case studies when one's primary focus is the specific case. Stake details three different types of case study, one of which fits this particular research is the "intrinsic case study" (p. 437). Because this research study is aimed at understanding the nuances of how administrators at PECU undertook internationalization on their campus, this study can be viewed as an intrinsic case study. Single-site case studies are meant to provide "descriptive narrative so that readers can vicariously experience these happenings and draw conclusions" (Stake, 2000,

p. 439). The study of campus internationalization at PECU and its story are intended to inform readers (particularly university administrators) about the process of internationalization at PECU so that they can begin to develop strategies for their individual campuses.

Additionally, access issues confirmed my choice of PECU as the site for the case study. I was generally familiar with PECU's programs and internationalization initiatives and had the means to gain access to administrators and faculty who have played a role in the different phases of the initiative. Limited resources (primarily time and money) were a third rationale for the choice of single site case study methodology.

<div align="center">Context</div>

PECU is a small, private, liberal arts university with a student body population of approximately 3,600. In 1988, PECU began a campus-wide internationalization initiative. Over the past 20 years, PECU has weathered the storms of institutional change as it maneuvered through implementation of the internationalization initiative. Since the launch of the campus internationalization initiative, PECU has internationalized its curriculum, its faculty, and its students. In a strategic move to secure their uniqueness, PECU created several international programs and began to serve as a program provider for both their own students as well as non-PECU students throughout the United States. Currently, PECU sends approximately 3,000 students abroad each academic year through a dedicated Center solely focused on international opportunities for students. The Center at PECU has approximately 40 campus-based staff members as well as approximately 45

employees located throughout the world who serve as on-site resident directors of their

programs.

Site Selection

PECU was selected as the intended site for this single case study because it is an

exemplar case in the realm of international education in terms of how a campus can

utilize study abroad programs to begin to internationalize the campus. The year 2008

marks the 60th year that PECU has been offering international education opportunities for

students. The university has been awarded several accolades including winning the 2007

Senator Paul Simon Award for Campus Internationalization, ranking in the top 20 within

the study abroad category by *U.S. News and World Report*, and ranking 2nd nationally in

2007 by the Institute for International Education for percentage of students studying

abroad. In 2001 the American Council on Education identified a number of PECU's

international programs as examples of innovative campus strategies and best practices for

education abroad programs.

Data Collection

This study was approved by the University of San Diego's Institutional Review

Board on September 23, 2008. Following approval, data collection commenced. Data

were collected through the three basic sources of information in qualitative research:

interviews, observation, and document collection (Glesne, 2006). Initially, I had an

informal conversation with the key administrator who led the Center for Education

Abroad for the past 20 years. He was instrumental in developing the internationalization

initiative. During an email exchange he detailed a list of 21 individuals who played a role

in the initiative. Prior to contacting any of these individuals, I reviewed the university

web site to find more information about these individuals. After researching their

background I determined that all 21 individuals would be good candidates for interviews

based primarily on their position and length of tenure at PECU. This initial list of contacts

included PECU's former president, the current president, the Provost, 10 faculty members

who have actively participated in the international opportunities, 7 senior-level

administrators from academic and student affairs, and 1 retired senior-level administrator

who currently serves as a consultant for the university. All of these individuals have

worked at PECU for periods ranging between 5 and 23 years with the exception of one of

the administrators who had only been in her position for a few months at the time of the

data collection.

I had originally intended to conduct telephone interviews to acquaint myself with

the participants, ask them the interview questions, and follow up with an in-person

interview to expand on their answers. However, due to the timing of the academic

calendar and conflicting schedules I had to send the introductory questions to the

participants via email. Eighteen participants were solicited via email (see Appendix A) on

October 14, 2008, after I received confirmation from my main contact that I could

proceed with my research. The initial email contained a set of questions that were

intended to gather general information from the participant (see Appendix B) as well as

the Research Participant Consent Form. The questions were general in scope and were

aimed at determining the interviewee's level of and length of involvement in the PECU

campus internationalization initiative. Also, the questions resulted in snowball sampling

effects (Patton, 2002) as additional interviewees were determined based on suggestions from initial participants.

As responses were returned to me via email, notes were taken to summarize the content of each questionnaire. Due to the time-sensitive nature of the in-person interview schedule and the need to make travel and logistical arrangements in a short amount of time, I requested the participants' availability for an in-person interview in my initial email to each of them (see Appendix A). I sent a follow-up email on October 19, 2008, to the participants who I did not respond to my initial inquiry (see Appendix C). Two additional participants were solicited via email on October 19, 2008, after they confirmed with my key contact that they would be willing to participate. Through snowball sampling, on October 24, 2008, one additional participant was solicited and confirmed to participate in the project. In total, there were 14 participants who agreed to participate in this study.

Based on participant response and other work commitments, I changed my in-person interview dates from October 26-31 to October 23-27, 2008. I interviewed 13 individuals. One person cancelled upon my arrival and could not reschedule. All in-person interviews were scheduled at a time and location convenient for participants. An interview guide was used during all in-person interviews (see Appendix D) and the Research Participant Consent Form (see Appendix E) was reviewed and collected from each participant prior to the start of each interview. All in-person interviews were conducted over the 5-day visit to the PECU campus and 11 of the 13 were tape-recorded. Two interviews were not tape-recorded due to technical difficulties; however, extensive

notes were written by hand during these two interviews. Notes and comments regarding body language and researcher observations were written in a notebook during the interviews to serve as reminders regarding significant points of the interview (Glesne, 2006; Patton, 2002). Each in-person interview was approximately 1 hour in length. Due to the size of the participant sample, qualitative software was not necessary for managing the interview data for this project.

While on-site at PECU I observed various aspects related to the internationalization initiative. Over a period of several days, I was able to observe the physical artifacts of internationalization such as banners, flags, and decorative items in common areas as I maneuvered through the campus during my stay. I also noted how individuals interacted with me and also was aware of the physical layout of the university. Since all of the interviews except for one were held in private offices, I was able to also note details about my observations of participants' individuality that is hinted at by the physical set up and decoration of their offices. The notes I took on campus were organized in the evening after my meetings to make sure that I captured the most vibrant essence of what I had observed during the day.

In addition to interviews and observations, a document analysis, as defined by Glesne (2006) and Patton (2002), was conducted using key pieces of information including marketing materials for parents and students, handouts developed for faculty, and articles and materials related to PECU's undergraduate course curriculum. These documents were gathered during my site visit to campus. During the document analysis, I looked for information regarding consistency of themes related to the internationalization

initiative and details as to the processes put in place in order to overcome institutional

change obstacles and move from policy to practice. Before and after my site visit I also

carefully reviewed PECU's web site to look for evidence of the role and importance of

internationalization at PECU. In addition to PECU's web site I also looked at outside web

sites such as Petersons.com, an online search engine for information about colleges. This

document and web site analysis helped triangulate the data from the interviews and

observations with actual practices at PECU (Mathison, 1988). As Patton (2002) notes, the

information within documents and the web site can be just as insightful as the

information gathered from in-person interviews. I developed a check-list (see

Appendix F) that I utilized when reviewing documents and the web site to keep track of

the information and maintain consistency in my analysis of codes and emerging

categories.

<div align="center">Data Analysis</div>

Each interview was professionally transcribed verbatim by a professional agency.

Upon receipt of the transcriptions I carefully read through each one to insure accuracy by

comparing the written transcription with the digital version of the interview. I contacted

all of the participants who were interviewed via email to share the copy of their

transcribed interview with them. They were each invited to read the transcription and to

make any changes or clarifications to it. They were instructed to make the changes and

email me the edited version so I could code the updated transcript. Only five participants

made changes to their transcripts. After insuring that I had the most recent version of each

transcript, I read each transcript individually and began to code the data.

Due to the manageable length of the transcripts, I coded the data only using the features within Microsoft Word. I highlighted sections of the data and color-coded the data by themes. I italicized sections that were poignant enough to include as direct quotes in the analysis section of this report. I made notes in the margins using the "comment" feature in Microsoft Word and coded the transcribed interviews and analyzed the data using an Analysis of Narrative approach (Polkinghorne, 1995). Using this approach, the data were divided up and organized (by colors) into pre-determined code categories. The Analysis of Narrative approach was utilized because this study is focused on capturing the story of the institutionalization of study abroad programs as part of the overall campus internationalization initiative at PECU. The categories and codes, when sewn together, create the narrative of internationalization at that has developed over time at PECU.

The categories used in coding the data came from the review of literature and were determined to be familiar aspects especially within the literature on campus internationalization. I read each of the transcripts keeping these categories in mind so that I could keep a constant comparative across all of the transcripts (Merriam, 2002). The initial categories were:

- Proponents—those things that helped carry the internationalization initiative forward on the PECU campus

- Inhibitors—those things that contributed to the delay or dysfunction of the internationalization initiative on the PECU campus

- Constituent Roles—the various roles that faculty and staff held during the internationalization initiative process

- Change Management—the issues that arose as the internationalization initiative was being implemented

This particular list of categories provided a good basis for understanding the factors that may have contributed to and or inhibited the internationalization initiatives at PECU. Within these categories, more specific codes (i.e., process, curriculum, tension, culture, and motivation) further detailed not only who or what contributed to or inhibited the initiative, but also what was accomplished as part of the initiative, how it was accomplished, and how PECU moved procedurally from policy to successful practice.

<div align="center">Delimitations and Limitations of Study</div>

Researcher Bias and Subjectivity

I currently work in the field of international education and believe in the value of campus internationalization and especially study abroad programs. I may be predisposed to highlight the positive aspects of internationalization initiatives. I tried to limit this bias by including interview questions that ask about how the initiative may have been inhibited and negative perceptions of the initiative, therefore recognizing that the initiative may not have created positive change. I remained open to all kinds of information whether it be positive, negative, or neutral and looked for disconfirming evidence so as not to paint only a rosy picture from the interviews and document analysis. Another way I tried to safeguard for this issue was to ask the interviewees for the names and contact information of other people who may have a different perspective from them so that I can include a variety of perspectives. This study did not include the perspective of students and that is a limitation. The study was aimed at understanding how the

internationalization initiative was implemented from an administrative standpoint using the institutionalization of study abroad programs as the main focus point.

Since I have experience in this field I have certain perspectives and insights about internationalization initiatives and therefore I needed to monitor this subjectivity while I conducted the research, especially during interviews (Glesne, 2006). The interviewees may have assumed that as we talked, I had a comprehensive understanding of internationalization initiatives since I am in the field and therefore may not have shared things in a clear manner with me. I probed when necessary and did not take things at face value.

Generalizability and Validity

This study is a single case study in which the $n = 1$; therefore, the results of the study cannot be generalized to all campuses with internationalization initiatives. Even if one re-thinks the notion of generalizability as transferability (Donmoyer, 1990), findings may not be transferable to many campuses. PECU is a very small, private school; therefore, the results of the study may not be able to be transferred to much larger, public schools.

In order to establish a high level of validity in this study, two main strategies, triangulation and member checks, suggested by Merriam (2002), were employed. Triangulation of data using documents helped to add another level of understanding about the phenomenon in addition to what I gained from interviews and observations. Member checks where I shared the raw transcripts with participants allowed the participants the

opportunity to review what they had said to make sure their stories were correctly documented.

Significance of the Study

This significance of this study is found in the analysis of how PECU moved from policy to practice as it employed a comprehensive campus internationalization initiative. The documentation of the process of moving from policy to practice (using study abroad programs as the main unit of analysis) will be useful as a model for universities that are in various stages of campus internationalization initiatives. It may provide a scaffolding from which other universities can analyze where they are on the spectrum moving from policy to practice and serve as a limited, yet useful, shortened version of a best practices guide for campus internationalization. An additional point of significance for this study can be found in viewing the case study's generalizability in terms of the schema theory (Donmoyer, 1990). When viewing the case study from this point of view, PECU can be seen as an exemplary case of success from which there is great value to be gained. The reader of this particular case study can begin to formulate what a campus internationalization initiative looks like in action and develop initial ideas about how to adapt the initiative to another setting, even one that may be quite different from the setting being focused on in this study. Study abroad programs are often the most tangible piece of campus internationalization initiatives and therefore other campuses can look to PECU as a model for how to utilize study abroad programs to advance the comprehensive internationalization initiative.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

This chapter details the discussions that I had with the research participants and includes the content from my personal observations and document analysis. The goal of this chapter is to present the data that was gathered in a narrative form so that the reader is able to recognize the story of internationalization at PECU. The story began 60 years ago and there is much to be learned from it.

In 1948 a small, initial group of students traveled to London with one faculty member from PECU. Since that initial trip, the international opportunities available to PECU students have increased exponentially as there are now over 100 programs for students to choose from. The importance of international education was sparked by that initial trip 60 years ago and evidence of the international vision of PECU continues to be pervasive. This was most evident in the conversations that I had with PECU faculty and administrators. This chapter discusses the relevant findings related to the overall question that guided this study: How has PECU moved from policy to practice in study abroad programming as part of its comprehensive internationalization initiative? Additionally, the following sub-questions of this study will be analyzed. The sub-questions are:

1. What scaffolding was in place to guide the internationalization initiative and the institutionalization of the study abroad programs on campus?

2. Who was involved in the process to institutionalize study abroad programs?

3. What role did the administration and faculty play in the initiative and the implementation and institutionalization process?

4. What was the process for preparing the campus community for
   implementation of the initiative?

5. What factors facilitated and inhibited the implementation of this initiative?

It is important to situate the reader in the context of this particular case study site so that

he or she will be able to discern the aspects of these findings that might be most

applicable to his or her campus. Therefore, this chapter begins with a description of

PECU as an institution and a more in-depth summary of research participants to place

them within context of PECU as an institution. The chapter then moves into the findings

from my campus visit including interview data, in-person observations and document

analysis, all of which help to answer the main research question of this study.

Institutional Context and Mission

PECU was founded just over 150 years ago and is located in eastern Pennsylvania.

It is important to detail the type of community where PECU is located as PECU generally

attracts students from the local community. According to data from the U.S. Bureau of

the Census' 2000 report, the community where PECU is located has approximately 7,900

residents. The median age of the residents is 36.5 years, the overwhelming majority of the

population (89%) are classified as white and close to 94% of the community speak only

English in their homes.

PECU offers close to 60 fields of study at the undergraduate level, 13 fields of

study at the graduate level, and about a dozen certificate programs. Of the 3,600 students

who attend PECU, 55% are undergraduates and 45% are graduate students.

Demographically, the undergraduate population is disproportionately female and close to

85% of the population is ethnically white/non-Hispanic (Petersons.com).

According to the PECU's web site, approximately 95% of PECU undergraduate

students receive a financial aid package comprised of need-based and merit-based awards.

The number of international students is dismal with only about 60 total international

undergraduate and graduate students currently enrolled at PECU. The International Center

is a distinctive and unique feature of PECU and is viewed as a unit within PECU;

however, it is located just off of the main campus and functions rather independently

from the rest of the university.

The mission of a university sets the course for how an institution establishes itself

and how it wants to be perceived. According to the PECU web site, the mission of PECU

is as follows: "[PECU] prepares students for life in a rapidly changing global society. As

a comprehensive, independent institution, [PECU] offers men and women a broad range

of undergraduate and graduate programs on its suburban . . . campus and through its

[International Center]." Along with this mission, PECU claims three elements help to

make it a distinct institution. These elements are: "global perspectives, integrated learning

and personal attention."

Research Participants

This section is an extended and more detailed description of the research

participants that was outlined in Chapter 3. The participant group consisted of seven

tenured full-time faculty members, four of whom also have administrative duties on

campus, and six full-time administrators (see Appendix G). The administrators who were

interviewed represented both academic affairs and student affairs and all of the participants were involved in at least one aspect of the study abroad programming that takes place at PECU. Many of them had either participated in overseas program reviews or had taught abroad at one point during their career at PECU. These 13 individuals were very forthright and open with their comments about the internationalization process at PECU. The rest of this chapter is a summary and synthesis of the insights gained from the in-person interviews along with triangulated data from PECU documents and the PECU web site. By looking at the scaffolding that was in place prior to the launch of the initiative, the distinct phases of the initiative, how buy-in was created and how the idea was sold, and the factors that inhibited and facilitated the institutionalization of study abroad programs, one can begin to understand how PECU moved from policy to practice.

<div align="center">Analysis</div>

Upon analyzing the data I noticed a distinction that participants made between what happened at PECU before the launch of the internationalization initiative and what happened after it. My findings from data collection were, therefore, coded into themes that are organized into four main categories: campus context, pre-launch scaffolding, three-phases of the initiative, and telling the story.

Campus Context

The PECU campus is small and is comprised of only about 20 buildings that include residential housing space for students. A few administrative buildings (i.e., University Relations, Institutional Technology Services, and University Advancement) are located off-campus but can easily be reached in a few minutes on foot. The campus

grounds are well manicured and the campus is lined with trees creating a naturalistic, contained environment that makes one forget that he or she is so close to a major metropolis. A central field lies in the middle of the campus with the main buildings surrounding the field including the newly renovated library.

On the main walkways throughout campus strategically placed international flags adorn the light posts. These flags represent some of the various locations where PECU students can study abroad. International destinations are also extremely prominent in the student center and dining area located in the middle of campus. Every wall in this area is covered with material similar to wallpaper that highlights various international experiences PECU students may participate in. The pictures showcase PECU students abroad engaging in a variety of activities across the world: classroom learning, visiting with the local community, and sightseeing. Each picture had a quote that was enlarged enough to be readable across the room. These quotes help to personalize the experience and summarize the effect of the study abroad programs for students in students' words—quite a powerful marketing tool.

In addition to the wall murals, there were posters displayed throughout the dining and common areas that were enlarged versions of the brochure covers for the various study abroad program destinations. While the walls displayed stories of the international education opportunities at PECU, the food offerings on campus included several internationally inspired options from Mexico, Italy, and the Pacific Rim. Since the student center and the cafeteria appeared to be the central gathering point for students on campus

it was clear that the university puts a lot of thought and energy into sending the message about the international opportunities available to students both explicitly and implicitly.

The campus had a small-town feel as if it would be really easy to know everyone yet the campus walkways were quiet most of the time. Everyone that I interacted with on campus was very nice and helpful, from the woman at the main visitors information booth to the cooks in the cafeteria to the student worker in the Institutional Technology Department who helped set up my wireless connection to the administrative assistants in the offices that I visited. I was greeted with smiles and felt welcomed by these individuals even though my interaction with them was very brief. I was a bit surprised at how calm and quiet the campus was even though the semester was in full swing. The campus was sparsely populated with people and I only ever saw mid-sized groups of students gathered together in the classrooms, the cafeteria, and the library. I noticed that administrators, faculty, and staff appeared to easily interact with students in hallways, classrooms, offices, and public spaces such as the library. I interacted with the 13 research participants on a different basis, but they were all also very welcoming and very generous with their time and the information that they shared with me.

Pre-Launch Scaffolding

Prior to the internationalization initiative being announced to the general campus it was necessary for proper scaffolding to be put into place to help support the initiative. This main scaffolding, primarily the ability to reinvent the campus image and support from senior administrators, was what helped hold PECU together as it weathered the changes sparked by institutional change. According to Nancy, a senior-level administrator

and faculty member, PECU has always been good at strategically reinventing itself based on the needs of the community. She recounted:

> We were in Western Pennsylvania. We moved here. We were a music school at one point. I mean there are all sorts of things. In the '70s, the reinvention was going coed and starting [up] continuing education in a big way. [Then] University of Pennsylvania, wanted to give up their Physical Therapy Program. We took that on. That completely changed our profile. We have this Master's in Physical Therapy; we now have a doctorate. We brought life back to the institution. We became financially solvent again.

This ability to reinvent the campus to enable it to remain a main player within higher education required a certain level of flexibility on the part of the administration to think creatively and to find ways to simply make things work so that the entire campus community could benefit from the changes. According to Robert, another senior level administrator, the PECU administration was acting out of desperation in the mid-1980s when the initiative to internationalize campus began. He claimed:

> In 1988, we had fewer than 900 students enrolled, both graduate and undergraduate and endowment of about $400,000. We were really living hand to mouth. The only real source of income was student tuition and we were just pretty desperate to get students to come here. We were trying to make a number of efforts in a variety of different directions to get more students and none of them really seem to be working. And the president and I talked about the fact that the one thing we did have that was going well was the [International Center] which was successfully serving students from other campuses. So [the President] said, "You know, let's put the international aspect of this place, the fact that we have an opportunity to study abroad, up front in our efforts to try to recruit students."

From what I gathered, there is an entrepreneurial spirit at PECU and ideas take flight. The ability for senior administration to ask for ideas and then embrace them and support them is an important piece of the scaffolding that was in place at PECU as the internationalization initiative began. The decision to capitalize on the existence of the

international center's overseas programs was strategic because PECU needed to not only attract more students but create a niche for themselves in an over-saturated market filled with several other big-name institutions. According to Robert, "no endowment, shrinking enrollments, and fierce competition for students from the some 80 other colleges and universities in this area" helped to "[convince] the Trustees to adopt internationalization (through learning about the world and study abroad) as the new identifying characteristic of this institution in 1992." This drive and desire to create a niche for themselves, helped PECU embrace the idea of moving forward with the internationalization initiative.

In 1993 with the support from senior administrators and flexibility to embrace new ideas, the time had come to institutionalize internationalization throughout PECU's campus and curriculum. Moving forward with this idea would not have been possible without the second piece of scaffolding in place—the resources, namely the International Center and its Director, financial support, and constituent buy-in. The following section details how these pieces of scaffolding played a role in the internationalization of PECU.

Resources as Pieces within the Scaffolding Frame

International Center. PECU is truly a unique place because of an enormous resource that exists within the university, the International Center. It was made clear to me that internationalization on the PECU campus would not have been possible without the International Center. One administrator, Lisa, when asked about how PECU was able to internationalize the campus directly claimed that "[it] probably would not have happened here if it hadn't been for the money generated by the [International Center]."

The Center operated and continues to operate today as a provider for study abroad programs for students throughout the United States. It is run like a mini-campus within the larger university. The Center has a director and a large, distinct staff dedicated to study abroad programming. It has its own web site and also conducts its own marketing and recruiting. It is also physically located off of the main campus. The Center was established on the PECU campus in 1965 and until the mid-1990s served primarily non-PECU students. There were a variety of explanations given for why the Center did not service PECU students. These explanations described how the "the habit became not including [PECU] students in our programs overseas." One faculty member, Steve, detailed more clearly how this habit was cultivated. He remarked:

> [The International Center] didn't really want our students to go on the programs because they weren't good enough. Because the [International Center] at that point was the leading campus-based study abroad provider and they got people from Harvard and Berkeley and Chicago and so on, and so on, and so on. So, [PECU] students, not so much.

The International Center had existed independently within PECU and it was not until the late 1980s when administration changed in the Center that collaboration with the main PECU campus began.

Prior to this change in the International Center's administration, the International Center and PECU were two completely separate units on campus. Charles summarized the historical separation of the two units. He said:

> They're a separate unit. They have an executive director. They have their own financial people, their own recruiting people, and their own marketing people. They budget separately. They are even audited separately. I mean that's how separate it is. And it was done historically for a reason back in the '70s and early '80s, in particular, and even to the mid-80s. It was not treated separately from a

budgeting perspective. They were budgeted along with the rest of the college but what was happening was that [the International Center] would be carrying the rest of the school. So what they would do is set the fees for [International Center programs] as a way to balance the rest of the college's budget. And so the board finally decided, no, this doesn't make sense we've got to make sure that the college operates—stands on its own and is operating in the black and can't use CEA to basically balance the rest of college's budget. So that's why they separated it and made it a completely separate unit, forcing the college to stand on its own which was a wise move at that point.

This separation and the fact that PECU students were not participating in International Center programs led to tension between the International Center and the main campus. As mentioned above, the leadership change in the late 1980s was instrumental in helping PECU view the International Center as a resource. Prior to this change, according to Charles, "people weren't really thinking about [the International Center] as an important and valuable component for the university other than that they make some money and they help support the university."

Robert was heralded by several of the research participants as one of the true, main champions of the internationalization process at PECU especially in terms of institutionalizing study abroad programs. He slowly worked with campus constituents to bridge the gaps that had existed for so long between the International Center and the main PECU campus. During my visit to PECU I heard many stories and examples of how this individual helped to integrate the International Center so that it could be seen as and thought of as a true resource for the entire campus. As a participant in this study, Robert summarized how he intentionally worked with various constituents on campus to gain support and respect for the International Center. He said:

I sent our advisory board overseas to review programs. I always included a member of the PECU faculty to go along with that group just to . . . again, so they feel that they're part of the process . . . I kept trying very deliberately to shift responsibility and understanding of responsibility from the International Center to the faculty.

From the faculty standpoint, this was very helpful in creating scaffolding that enabled faculty to support the study abroad programs. Nancy recalled that "people who were sure to be seen as faculty leaders or administrators or whatever were picked and sent [abroad]. And so that, sort of engendered this on campus." She went on to note that the decision to engage faculty in the study abroad programming was a top down decision and carried out by the director of the International Center. However, according to her, "it wasn't top down that 'you will do this.' It was to excite people about our internationalization." The International Center itself the director of the International Center were two crucial resources that were essential in the institutionalization of internationalization on the PECU campus.

Financial support. The financial support for institutionalizing the study abroad programs initially came from two main sources at PECU: the revenue from the International Center and the discretionary funds within the President's Office. The International Center was initially responsible for funding the financial aid and tuition for students who studied abroad. According to Lisa this was an extremely important factor that contributed to the growth of study abroad enrollment. She claimed: "The other thing which has allowed us to grow is the fact that we did have the International Center because there is no way we could afford as an institution to send 300 students and eat those tuition costs."

Robert remarked:

> The key to getting a large number of [PECU] students studying abroad is our policy that they take all of our financial aid with them. That financial aid is picked up by the [International Center]. And that's how this has been made to work. So the Center, last year, was devoting upwards of $2 million of its financial aid budget to [PECU] students which really enabled them to, you know, to go off and do this and take their aid with them.

This financial arrangement helped convince students that they could afford to participate in study abroad programs. This model is still in effect, but the financial feasibility of it is a slippery slope. Robert explained how recent changes have affected this financial arrangement. He summarized:

> What we provide for them overseas is tuition and housing. They're responsible for their own meals, they're responsible for their travel, and obviously their incidental expenses. And when we started in the mid-1990s, it was less expensive—on average, it was less expensive for us to pay for a student overseas than it was here on campus. And so this, we were able to cover our losses pretty much because we weren't paying as much overseas. That all has changed. And now you know we're actually spending money for, practically, every student that goes. And that is the money that the International Center picks up. Financially, it is a budget item for the Center. It's now calculated, I think, as a percentage of tuition that we anticipate receiving and it's treated as an expense.

In the mid 1990s, the International Center not only helped to fund study abroad programs, it also helped fund faculty trips abroad. According to Robert there was some travel money in the Center's budget that he strategically used to send faculty overseas in an effort to get their buy in and support of study abroad programs. He provided an example of how sending faculty abroad was a useful allocation of the funds when he recalled:

> I went to the head of Biology department, which was a key undergraduate program here because we had a master's degree in physical therapy and you had to practically qualify as a doctor to get into it. So we had a lot of students coming

here to do Biology and Chemistry so they could get into physical therapy and I
asked him if he would go for a week on a visit to three Scottish universities that
we worked with just to see how Biology is taught in Scotland and what they're
doing and whether all these things we were saying about the quality of Scottish
biology were really true. I felt they were, but I wanted him to go. So he went. And
he came back. And he said, "You know, they're doing the same things we are."
And it changed his perspective a bit and people in his department understood from
the fact that he had gone and come back with this recognition that, you know, we
were serious about encouraging people to do things out around the world.

This use of funds worked to the benefit of PECU and the International Center because it

showed proof that the administration was willing to invest in the crucial piece of

scaffolding required in moving an initiative forward—faculty support.

Faculty support. The third main resource that acted as scaffolding to help the

internationalization process progress at PECU was faculty support of the study abroad

programs. According to Robert, "the campus culture here is one in which good ideas are

expected to come from the faculty." Gaining faculty support was not an easy task.

Historically, as was noted earlier, the International Center did not send PECU students

abroad and that was just part of the culture on campus. Faculty members were used to this

model and therefore did not encourage students to participate in study abroad programs.

Roger, a faculty member, alluded that study abroad was seen as an extracurricular activity

and that international education was not at the forefront of some faculty members' minds.

This attitude in thinking about study abroad as an outside activity rather than an

important part of education shifted in the late 1980s when the President of PECU began

emphasizing the internationalization of campus as a necessary requirement in order to

keep PECU alive in the competitive market of higher education. Robert remembered:

> We were trying to make a number of efforts in a variety of different directions to get more students and none of them really seem to be working. And the president and I talked about the fact that the one thing we did have that was going well was the [International Center], which was successfully serving students from other campuses.

This conversation culminated in a faculty retreat in 1993 at which "eight or ten key faculty members and some administrators [were] there for day-long conversation on how we were going to jump start the idea of making this place an international institution." Robert was present at this retreat and admitted that he used the retreat, "primarily, as an opportunity to talk to people about the advantages to study abroad." It was at this retreat when a faculty member came up with the now legendary idea of sending students to London during Spring Break to help get them interested in traveling abroad. The key was that a faculty member initiated this idea and the other faculty members who were present helped to formulate how the program would look in action. It is important to note the component built into this program that has contributed to its success according to the faculty and administrators who participated in this study is the fact that PECU faculty and staff were able to participate in the program. This participation helped others on campus to buy in to the idea of study abroad. Robert summarized this phenomenon:

> By participating in this program, faculty members who had not traveled, faculty members whose last overseas trip was to serve in the military in Vietnam, began to realize that there were things going on overseas. They understood the role of our London staff better than ever and came to see what we were doing for students from other campuses and how those benefits could accrue to students who are here. And I think that is one element that was significant in making internationalization and softening the fact, if you will, and preparing them for internationalization.

The scaffolding in terms of structure, resources, and constituent buy-in were essential for the internationalization process at PECU. After conversations with the research participants, it became clear that this type of structure had to exist before the campus was ready to move forward.

The Story of Study Abroad—Three Phases at PECU

The internationalization process in terms of study abroad programming began with the Preview program in the early 1990s at PECU and has had three distinct phases. This section is a summary of each of these phases as recounted by several faculty and administrators who participated in this study. The decision to launch the internationalization initiative was strategic and seemingly well thought-out. According to Steve: "We wanted to do three things: send more students abroad, make study abroad a part of the culture of the institution, and the third, [was] we had to make sure the faculty and the staff and everybody knew what was going on." However, the initial event that marked the beginning of the initiative in terms of study abroad programming commenced in an ad-hoc, non-defined way.

According to the PECU internationalization story as retold by several of the individuals whom I interviewed, the beginning of the big push for study abroad programming came from an off-the-cuff comment that a faculty member made during a strategic planning retreat at the President's house. The story goes:

> [One of the professors] simply said, "you know what we ought to do is throw all our kids on an airplane and take them to England" [and] by the time lunch was over, that was becoming a plan. And so we created what we named London Preview.

The faculty member sparked this idea, but the President supported it and logistics were put in place to make it happen. The London Preview study abroad program was the "beginning of the surge" of international programming at PECU.

Preview program. This program remains the cornerstone of international experiences at PECU. Donald, who was primarily responsible for coordinating logistics for the Preview program, summarized how the program was initially run and what the experience did for PECU students:

> We did this with freshmen with the idea that this was a good time in their lives to get them thinking internationally. If they went to England, they all had to get passports and then for the next three years, they would be hanging around campus with these passports and we could go to them and say, "Hey, you know, you could study abroad somewhere else." It started out as a not for credit trip of discovery and exploration. Just to find out what a major foreign city is like, what it is like to fly there and come back. What it's like to be in a country where you can drink legally and this, I'm sure, was a big draw for a lot of kids. And just you know to have free time during spring break in another country but also to have a series of structured activities that introduced the students to London and to England. And so we put a program together that included looking around London, in those in early years. We took them to university campuses just to see what British universities were like, which was a definite low point in the program. Nobody enjoyed it. Depending on when our spring break falls, students were either in classes or in session, or not in the U.K. It just turned out not to be a predictable kind of thing. But they got a boat ride down the Thames River. They got a tour of the Houses of Parliament. They went to two museums or cultural things in London and then there is a day out of London where they can choose one of three excursions to go on. So they could get to Stonehenge or they could get down to Dover. They can get up to Stratford. Kids came back and thought it was really neat thing.

The idea to send students to London for a Spring Break program that was highly subsidized by the university was conjured up by a faculty member and supported by faculty members and the President. In a strategic decision meant to gain more support for

the program, faculty and staff were invited to participate in the Preview programs. Roger, a faculty member, summarized:

> Faculty and staff were asked to go quasi-chaperone—very limited responsibilities in my view on the part of the faculty and the staff. Our London people were taking care all of the stuff on the ground and people here in [the International Center] were taking care of all preliminary stuff. So faculty and staff would meet with their group of students twice, typically, no more than three times, generally twice before the trip and frequently once after the trip.

Including the faculty, staff, and administration in the experience of the Preview program resulted in an entire group of individuals, outside of the international education arena, that became proponents of study abroad programs. According to one of the administrators, most faculty and staff who were invited to participate, took advantage of the opportunity, enjoyed their time abroad, and then came back as advocates for the program. While this advocacy was certainly helpful in terms of selling the program in the earlier years, the additional effect that participation in the Preview program had on faculty and staff, was deeper and more long-standing than just a surface-level appreciation for the study abroad experience.

In many of the interviews, the participants noted that the Preview program was instrumental in creating a culture of study abroad on the PECU campus. Lisa, an administrator, commented:

> It has permeated everyone on campus. I mean most of the full-time faculty now and full-time staff have been participating in the Preview. You know, it really creates a special bonding. And as much as we kind of think, ho-hum, ho-hum, you know, Preview—yeah, they have done that. I think it does set us apart, the bonds that you create when you're overseas in that small environment with those students on a week-long intensive program, it does make a difference. It's different when you come back and you see them on campus. You just interact

with them very differently and you can have different kinds of conversations, lots of bonds are created overseas.

Roger, a faculty member who participated in the Preview program, enthusiastically recounted about how he was able to interact with other faculty and staff members, including a maintenance worker who participated as a student. When asked about his participation in the Preview program, Roger responded:

Suddenly, you have people from faculty and staff who never have interacted much and I joked a number of years earlier that, you know, I would regard it as a success when I was walking across the campus and saw a student stopping to talk to maintenance crew person and I saw it. Actually, the maintenance crew person was in my group but he was in as a student. He never took more than two courses. He took the two courses I'm convinced so he can go. He was in his 30s. He is married, couple of kids but he was fully engaged in the activities while he was there. And suddenly, the students knew who this person was and I think that's been a real benefit. . . . You [get to] know somebody better who works in the library or on the grounds crew or in security or whatever office it happens to be and staff have greater interaction with faculty that way. I think it reflects why, institutionally, a part of why we were able to make it work so well.

Robert proudly reflected:

Some of them have gone four or five times and almost every member of the staff from people in the mail room and the grounds crew, and you know, the campus cops, right up to the president have gone and accompanied the students and led small groups in London. So, the result of that has been, you know looking back on it now, 15 years later, I can say it is the single event, the single experience that binds the employees of this institution together. They have all gone to London and they've interacted with students in that way which for almost all of them is very different from the way they interact with students on campus.

This statement is powerful and echoes a sentiment that I heard many times while I was on campus. The initial Preview program helped to cultivate the openness to the idea of study abroad on the PECU campus and since its inception 15 years ago, the Preview program has changed and has expanded in terms of locations.

The program is now also offered in Spain and Scotland. Students who choose to participate in either of these two new locations can now earn academic credit and according to Roger, "that's been within just the last 2 years. So that's a fundamental shift in the thinking, I think, institutionally about the value of these [Preview programs] and how they can be of real value." After the launch of the Preview program in 1993, the number of international programs offered at PECU and student participation in the programs increased exponentially and "there were an intentional series of events and an intentional focus, and at that time it was very much on internationalization . . . we went from two or three students studying abroad a semester to 50% of our students having credits abroad [upon] graduation." This intentionality of focus on study abroad was an additional piece of the scaffolding that helped move campus internationalization forward. The Preview program, as noted above, was the starting point for the surge of other international programs offered at PECU. Its permanence and importance as part of the fabric of PECU is evident not only in the conversations I had with the research participants, but also permeates the literature I gathered while on campus and the PECU web site.

There are now a variety of ways for international education formats offered to PECU students although the cornerstone of these formats has always been the 1-week Preview program. Ten years after the start of the Preview program, the second phase of study abroad programming began in earnest because of a need to solve, ironically, an on-campus housing problem.

First year semester abroad experience. This program was created as a knee-jerk reaction to the fact that in 2003, there was not enough housing for all of the students who had committed to attending PECU that fall. Three of the individuals who participated in this study admitted that this program was not the most well thought-out program in the beginning. Donald summed it up by saying:

> I mean the brutal truth of it was, we had a housing problem . . . and one summer, and I'm not an expert on enrollment management, but we had just a whole slew of people accept us that we hadn't quite expected. And so we were sitting around with about 60 extra students and nobody had any idea where to put them. And we were renting apartments and buying apartment buildings and you know whatever we were doing with housing and housing has also been a challenge here. And I mean, I think even at times renting motel rooms . . . so finally somebody said, "We have the program in London."

Similar to how the Preview program began, the First Year Semester Abroad Experience developed out of a specific need on campus (over-enrollment and lack of housing space) and it also was put together in lightning speed and therefore had some challenges just as the Preview program during its early years. As Robert recounted, "it wasn't the most horribly successful thing we've done. We didn't have a lot of lead-time. We made the decision in May and [the students] went in August." Donald, who was involved as an on-site coordinator during that first fall in 2003 revealed, "it felt like we were making up something new every single day. You know, it would be Thursday, wow, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, I thought we solved all the problems and it would be something new to deal with. So we were really flying by the seat of our pants." During the first go-round with this program, nothing was set in stone and flexibility and creative thinking on the part of the PECU faculty and administration was essential. This program was created

because of a lack of housing space on campus, "not because we're nice, decent, noble, humanitarian people," as Donald stated. The decision to continue this opportunity as a viable option for first year students came after the initial housing crisis was solved and the administration realized that this could be a very unique opportunity for students.

This program was met with some resistance from faculty and administrators who question the practice of "taking students that aren't even PECU students yet . . . [and letting them spend their] first semester is away." Joseph addressed some of the challenges of this program and wondered about its return on investment. He remarked:

> And I don't know what the stats are or the retention or anything like that. But I suspect that for all of the resources that we put in, we aren't getting what we should back from them what we should back from them. So, that's a big one. It's been challenging for other people that deal with it, both in terms of, kind of, keeping everyone in line over there and flying back and forth and making sure their requirements are in place. That's been a challenge.

According to Donald, who now oversees this program:

> The biggest challenge I think we've had actually is bringing the fall students back. Because they get over there and you know they're in London, and Scotland, and now Ireland and they're traveling throughout Europe, you know, many of them take 3- to 6-, or 7-weekend trips to various places. When they come back [to campus] it just can't compete with London. And so, you know interestingly, they get very adapted. They find those . . . flights on Ryanair that will take them to Amsterdam . . . you know, they get here [but then they come back here and] complain that they can't find the train station which is a 20-minute walk away. Well because they're spoiled. They're accustomed to having the tube right next door or a bus.

This challenge appears to also be an issue for the Office of Student Affairs, although for a slightly different reason that arises with students who participate in the Spring rather than in their first Fall semester. When asked about this program and if there were any issues related to its implementation structure, Susan remarked:

> Actually, I have more trouble with the Spring [participants] because they're here for three and a half months knowing that they're gonna leave. And they leave— you know, when they're done their exams, they leave in December and they're not coming back 'til the end of August. That one I have much greater difficulty with developmentally because they are less likely to adapt and connect for that three and a half months knowing that they're going to leave.

Despite these frustrations and challenges, the first year experience program continues today because as Robert noted, "it was seen as something that was attractive to a certain group of kids and so they continued doing it" and also because it has now become a powerful recruitment tool for PECU. According to Donald, "part of our narrative now is that this is a good institution to think of as your launch pad. You know you're here between your two or three or sometimes more study abroad adventures." He continued: "One of the things that parents tell me consistently is that 'after [my daughter] found out that she could go abroad her first semester it was [PECU] and everybody else was a safety school,' which we love from a recruiting point of view." The number of participants in this program has increased and this program remains as another cornerstone program at PECU. According to Donald, students who participate in this first year program are "leavening the loaf . . . they are influencing other students and that it just becomes another reason why it's just normal for undergraduates here to go abroad." This notion that everyone at PECU can study abroad multiple times beginning with the first year has been a strategic focal point for student recruitment and has helped make PECU unique from its competitors. Another key phase within the institutionalization of study abroad programming at PECU was the major restructuring of the undergraduate curriculum.

Restructuring of the curriculum. With the two major study abroad programs

(Preview and First Year Experience) in place, PECU faculty and administrators began to

look for ways to infuse the study abroad opportunities into the curriculum which was the

third phase of the institutionalizing study abroad at PECU. A mandate was sent to all

academic departments requiring that they advertise to students how at least one study

abroad experience could be incorporated into each major's course of study. Nancy

commented on this process when she recalled:

> One of the things I think we've done the best [is require departments to
> incorporate study abroad into each major]. And once we got that, I think that was
> a real breakthrough. So, that people realized that, you know, you can take a
> Psychology course in England and it's just as good. And you're not gonna be
> behind when you come back.

Charles summarized what this meant for students. He asserted:

> This was a web-based environment where students can go in and when they are
> looking at their major, they just click the icon . . . and up will come sample
> curricula that they can use to complete courses for their major as well as general
> education courses while they're studying abroad. So we'll show them a possible
> way in which they can study abroad in their freshman year, their sophomore year,
> their junior year, their senior year and which courses they would take in order to
> be able to stay on track to complete your major. We've basically made it possible
> for students to study in our other locations around the world . . . and take courses
> in those locations that count towards major requirements.

The exercise of having to find a way within each department for students to study abroad

led to another creative program called the "Majors Abroad Program." The idea behind

this program is that by spending one year abroad studying at one of PECU's partner

universities, PECU students can obtain a major in certain department that would not be

able to be completed on campus at PECU. Roger, a faculty member who was traveling

overseas conducting some site evaluations, came up with this idea. He recalled:

> [In the] Fall of 2005, I went to Australia and evaluated our internship program.
> And so as I was looking at the internship program, you know, in Australia, I was
> also visiting a number of institutions in Sydney, in Brisbane, and Melbourne [and]
> as I was talking with these individuals about having US students involved in their
> programs, I started to think why couldn't we say to a student who is interested in
> sports management we don't offer on this campus in the US but if you went, if
> you did one year abroad at a school like Queens, they have a strong sports
> management program. We make sure in your first two years, you have the
> prerequisite types of courses, you spend a year there [and you earn a degree in
> Sports Management, something we do not offer on campus at PECU].

This idea took flight because of the willingness of the administration to think creatively

and strategically about how this type of program may enhance the internationalization

process and the uniqueness of PECU. This is another example of the entrepreneurial spirit

that exists at PECU.

The incorporation of study abroad into the standard undergraduate curriculum

within each department, the Majors Abroad Program, and the two premier study abroad

programs in place set the ball in motion for the discussion to restructure curriculum based

on the strengths of the institution. According to Jane, a faculty member heavily involved

in the creation of the new curriculum, "we have . . . very well respected study abroad

programs. We've got lots of students going abroad. But in some ways, we haven't really

capitalized on that curricularly or co-curricularly." In the fall 2008, a new undergraduate

curriculum was introduced at PECU and it is global in focus and in practice.

Everyone I met on campus spoke to me about this new curriculum and conveyed

their particular take on it. Charles remarked that the new curriculum

> Has a number of elements associated with students studying in other locations. In
> fact, as a requirement, they need to study intensively in a culture different from
> their own . . . either by going abroad or it could be by going to doing a significant
> project in a local community or perhaps going to another school from the United

States that has a larger mix of students from other cultures. It enhances our focus on global education because it really helps students understand that global doesn't just mean somewhere over there. That, you know, we're part of the globe as well as other countries are and that there are all kinds of issues in the United States associated with the globalization of the world. So, I think it makes for a good education.

Steve, one of the two faculty members who spearheaded this new curriculum change, remarked that, "It's a complete shift in the way which we're looking at. . . . We're trying to get our students to look at their place in the world." Jane added that an additional shift in focus with this new curriculum is in "really trying to make experiences that students have all their way through study abroad or domestic study away or through local service experiences to make sure that we're finding ways for those to be really connected to the work that they are doing [on] campus."

The way in which this idea of connection is infused in the curriculum is through a reflective component that is tied in to the required cross-cultural experience that all students must complete. PECU professors guide students through this cross-cultural experience by asking students to document their experiences and then reflect on these experiences and how they tie into their individual lives and what that means on a bigger scale. The cross-cultural experiences that students can choose from are: study abroad program, domestic study abroad at a university in the U.S., or an on-campus course that requires students to engage in a community within the city that is culturally different from what they are used to. Jane commented on the intentionality that went in to the planning of this aspect of the new curriculum. She stated: "We made [this aspect] an intellectual practice and not an area of inquiry because the areas of inquiry, you know, are things like

self and society where you're learning about something. We really want [this element of the curriculum] to help students think and analyze in different ways."

The decision to incorporate this new piece within the curriculum that forces students to look at the world around them, either in an international or in a domestic setting, came out of the understanding that in order to understand domestic issues, one has to understand the larger, global context. This was a complex issue that in a sense divided the faculty in terms of how they saw international education. Steve summarized:

> We can't really talk about poverty in this country without understanding the global context in which it occurs. At the same time we can't talk about it anywhere else without looking at it here. So keeping the US over here and talking about multi-culture and the international stuff over there is a false dichotomy and it's misleading. Because then what would happen is that these two compete with each other. So, we set about to change this institution. It was not easy to get everyone to accept this new way of looking at things, but we've finally prevailed with the new curriculum.

Jane expressed her aspiration for this new curriculum and how she hopes it will impact students and how it will continue to set PECU apart in the future. She stated: "I think—if we can figure out ways that students feel connected to internationalization or global learning. When they are in [this city] as well as when they're somewhere else, then I think we've really internationalized at the whole other level, you know." The development of this curriculum as alluded to above opened discussions among some faculty members at PECU about the differences between internationalization and multiculturalism. These were issues that had to be wrestled with as this new curriculum was taking shape. As the third phase of the institutionalization of study abroad programming at PECU, the curriculum restructuring appeared to be the most contentious.

The faculty members who participated in this study were open and honest about the questions that arose when the new curriculum was being created. According to one, Nancy, who was vocal about this issue, a divide formed within the faculty. She recounted:

> The most recent history is those of us who taught multiculturalism, that would be me, I was not the international side, I was in the multicultural side of the house, started to just get annoyed on some level. A bunch of us started to meet and say we're having some real issue with this. And also about this time, people started talking about this divide. I call it "binary oppositional categories," that's from gender studies. So you got men and women and they become opposed to each other so we started getting internationalization-multiculturalism opposed to each other.

John, a faculty member, also spoke of this issue as a competition. He stated:

> There is some friction around here. Mostly between the multiculturalism and the internationalization, I mean it gets framed as a competition like a war and all of that stuff when it really need not be, and ultimately the goals are kind of the same, at least they are more similar than not.

Jane had similar sentiments and said, "I think multicultural folks on campus feel like multiculturalism has been the sort of stepsister of internationalization." The recognition of this divide between the faculty and administrators was important to the establishment of the new curriculum. Realizing that the two ideas can be intertwined enhanced the curriculum by including a "domestic study abroad" experience as an option for students and by incorporating the reflection piece by which students can wrestle with the two ideas. Susan commented on this divide on campus and noted the importance of intertwining the two ideas. She said:

> I think the tension is that if we don't get a handle in terms of the United States in diversity, that it really won't matter for well-versed and international cultures if we don't understand—if we don't have a better handle on, how race, ethnicity, history, demographics play on the day-to-day stuff that we deal with, it really doesn't matter if I understand the three cultures in Spain. However, I might

understand the three cultures in Spain better because I've understood them in [my own city].

The end result, the passage of the new curriculum, was made possible through a lot of hard work and consensus building but also because as Jane put it, people began to understand that through the new curriculum there "are some really potentially exciting opportunities to both internationalize how we talk about multiculturalism and also multiculturalize how we talk about internationalization." The history of study abroad at PECU and the various phases that study abroad programming has gone through is useful to understanding how PECU has moved from the idea of study abroad to the successful practice of and infusion of it into the fabric of PECU as an institution. Learning how constituents were prepared for the infusion of study abroad programming throughout campus is also essential for understanding the move from policy to practice.

Telling the Story—Notifying Constituents

The importance of campus internationalization was given credence on the PECU campus in the late 1980s and it was a message that was sent from the President to the faculty, staff, and students. That message, coupled with the fact that PECU was struggling as an institution in the late 1980s, led to a discussion among faculty leaders about how to increase student enrollment and at the same time maximize the resource of the International Center. As detailed above, this discussion led to the creation of the staple Preview program. Once the decision was made to create and move forward with this program and the programs that followed it, there was a methodical way that the branding of internationalization was portrayed to constituents. The primary ways in which the story

was told were through generating faculty buy in and producing creative marketing campaigns.

   Generating faculty buy-in. None of the ideas detailed in this chapter would have been possible without the support and blessing of the PECU faculty. The faculty had to feel a part of the process in order for them to be supportive of these initiatives and the idea of campus internationalization in general. It was very apparent in my conversations with the individuals who were instrumental in creating the change on campus that the involvement of faculty was one of their main concerns. Responses from these individuals included statements such as: "it's getting them involved with us in what we're doing that allows us to be successful" and "making [internationalization] part of the strategic plan, the key element strategic plan that really has jumped the level of involvement of faculty and staff way up." Charles spoke about how involving faculty in the planning process for how this initiative would take shape on campus was very important to its forward progress. He said, "we've really worked on getting faculty to understand and agree that this is the central thing that we do." As mentioned earlier, faculty members were instrumental in creating what has become the flagship program at PECU, the Preview program. According to Robert:

> Right from the beginning, [the Preview program] has been a faculty initiative and it has been something that the faculty has understood that it is responsible for. And it's, you know, that helped to distinguish [PECU] as a place that says it's international and actually does something to back that up.

The success of the Preview program helped to gain faculty support for the study abroad programming initiatives that followed it such as the first year semester abroad program

and the intentional incorporation of study abroad into the new curriculum. The accolades the PECU was given for the internationalization work were another thing that helped faculty find the value in the process and encouraged them to buy in to the activities surrounding the initiative. According to Robert:

> I mean they see that the internationalization is legitimate exercise that campuses all around the country are participating [in]. The Paul Simon Award helped in that regard as well. You know, it was [a faculty member] who wrote the submission. I guess I helped a bit on that, but I wanted it to come from the academic side of the university not from the [International Center].

Having members of the faculty work on a committee focusing on distributing the message of internationalization across campus has been beneficial. Charles summarized how this committee has involved faculty members. He remarked:

> We have a planning council composed of faculty. The faculty council, some staff members, deans are on the planning council, and it's the planning council's job to work with the rest of the community to develop the action plan each year. And so they solicit and try to get information from people about what they think are the best ways that we could advance strategic play in these areas. From that [we] developed a priority list with what we think are the most important elements that need to be in place for the upcoming year. And then somebody is assigned responsibility for making sure that whatever it is happens. And then the idea every year we take a look, how well we've done.

One area that is still a work in progress at PECU is the creation of faculty-led study abroad programs. The International Center operates almost all of the study abroad programs and there are very few faculty members who participate in leading their own students abroad. According to some faculty members there was some encouragement for faculty to create courses abroad but not many faculty members have engaged in the opportunity. Roger, a faculty member, spoke about his experience with creating a faculty-

led study abroad course and detailed how the various models that PECU has for these types of programs. He said:

> The more typical model is that the course begins halfway through the fall semester, for seven weeks, meeting a couple of hours each week. And that is preliminary preparation, but there is content attached to it. So I designed one of these for Ireland, for example, which we didn't run, but there were readings that dealt with history of Ireland. I wasn't trying to do it as a business-oriented course but I was trying to do it broader based so they have a culture history literature type of focus. And so the plan was we would meet in the fall semester. We would travel in January, between the two semesters. Then in the spring, the first seven weeks of the spring semester, then meet again in the spring semester for debriefing activities, discussion activities, and some kind of a paper project, I mean, could be exams, whatever but typically they're papers. That was the prevailing model. Since then we've done more of them where it is only contained in the spring and they use spring break for the travel (set-up is first half of the semester), travel during spring break, debriefing, etc. during the second half of the semester. We've also done them though where the course starts in the spring, the travel takes place right after graduation, and then you have a few weeks of debriefing in the summer.

These types of programs have not been as popular as the semester abroad programs and Roger recalls that some of his colleagues took up issue with the time that was spent abroad and how it was spent, although this has shifted in more recent years. He recalled, "some people earlier on thought it would just be tourism if we just did these one-week types of activities. I know the thinking on that has changed." John noted that PECU is trying to offer faculty more options and therefore they are trying to standardize the model so that any faculty member could participate and travel either during Christmas break, Spring break or during the summer. He stated:

> So the idea is that they would take five or six class sessions on campus before they go then they would travel for anywhere from 10 days to two weeks or something and then they would meet, upon return, a couple of times. So with that formula, they can actually go at any window and we're trying to take advantage of

that. And we're also trying to build in some online programming. And that we'd kind of broaden the appeal.

Some of the participants offered their perspective on why these faculty-led programs have not been more popular and why it has been difficult to find faculty who are interested in creating and leading these types of programs. Brian, a faculty member, claimed, "They had a lot of paperwork to fill out and they were obstacles instead of help. They were a fence preventing me, rather than helping me get this together." John commented that the existence of the large International Center has hindered the creation of faculty-led programs although this may be changing as the International Center is working towards becoming more collaborative with the main PECU campus. He noted:

> I think development [of faculty-led programs] is the downside of having this kind of big unit attached to us. So the faculty didn't do a whole lot. What they did was, kind of, isolated and not coordinated and I think that's changing. And as part of it, we're starting to utilize [the International Center's] resources to help us out 'cause [*sic*] they got a lot over there. . . . There's a lot of stuff of good stuff going on here but it is kind of, from my perspective, it's very much kind of midstream in its evolution.

Robert commented on how the participation in faculty-led programs and the creation of faculty-led programs are evolving. He summarized:

> Last year, I think [we] did six of those and there's talk about increasing that number. Small groups of students go on these things. You get between 8 and 15, usually. It's beginning to take on some very interesting characteristics. Some people are expanding well beyond the, kind of, traditional destinations. We've had groups go to England, Italy, and France but they've also gone to Russia, they've gone to Latin America. And people who do service learning are getting involved in this too.

Recently, an Associate Dean position was restructured on campus. This individual described the new charge of this position as being "organized around developing the infrastructure on campus to enable faculty to do short term programming."

There is support on campus for the short-term, faculty-led programs and the research participants were all fairly positive about the faculty-led opportunities, but it was clear that more work still needs to be done in this area before these types of programs become a fully-integrated piece of the internationalization initiative at PECU. Just as the faculty members were key and continue to be key in advancing the internationalization initiative on campus, the marketing campaign that sold PECU as an international institution was crucial to its success both on and off of campus.

Marketing internationalization. Telling the story of PECU's internationalization initiative in regard to study abroad programming was important as it helped gain support on campus and helped gain interest in PECU from off-campus. The administration has put a lot of resources into the marketing campaign that has helped bring the PECU internationalization initiative recognition. Charles summarized how creative and constant marketing (both print marketing and personal selling) has shaped the success of internationalization initiatives for PECU. He stated:

> It's key to our brand so we spend a lot of time working on developing the brand promise—the PECU promise which focuses on global as one of the key elements of the brand of PECU. All of our materials have been revamped. Our magazine has been revamped to include repeated examples of how we are internationalizing the campus. So we've started an internal PR campaign if you will, as well as an external PR campaign in order to really enhance people's awareness that this is what we do and that we do it very well. So whenever I talk to prospective students [and] their families, I spend a lot of time talking about our international focus and how that's embedded within the life of the university.

This infusion of international focus within PECU is strikingly apparent when one looks at the PECU web site. The home page of the web site is dominated by colorful and enticing pictures of international locations with catchy phrases that draw the viewer in to the various international opportunities available at PECU. The accolades from various ranking agencies proclaim on the home page that PECU is "#1 in Nation in Open Doors Study Abroad Rate" and that PECU ranks "in 3 *U.S. News* Categories: Best in the North, Study Abroad, Great Price." A main fixture on the PECU home page is a banner at the top of the page that proclaims that PECU offers "More than 100 Programs Around the World." "Study Abroad" is also a main tab that visitors can navigate to directly from the home page. Once one navigates away from the home page and moves to the "About [PECU]" page there is a short segment about the history of PECU, but the majority of the page falls under the heading, "[PECU] is Recognized as a Leader in Study Abroad and International Education." Following this heading there are 13 bullet points that detail the variety of international experiences available to PECU students. The bottom of the "About [PECU]" page describes the campus and the demographics of the study body and faculty expertise. The web site is clearly a vehicle that helps brand PECU as a leader international education with particular emphasis on study abroad programming; however, the printed literature the PECU produces also helps with this effort.

The printed materials that I reviewed were laden with international pictures and references to studying abroad even though many of the materials were not specific study abroad brochures. The accessibility to study abroad is mentioned in all the literature at least once, if not multiple times. The words "explore" and "exploring" were on half of the

pages in the admissions brochure evoking the idea of travel. Some of the information and images that are featured in the printed material, primarily used off-campus, began as part of the on-campus marketing campaign. Charles told the story of how this was accomplished. He stated:

> [We have a] campaign called the "Promise Campaign" and so it was designed to do stories or small vignettes of students and faculty who are living out the global promise part of our strategic plan. And so, every three weeks or so, a new set of these posters would go up around campus. And . . . they'd be tacked up in various places . . . with nice pictures showing a student or whatever and then there will be a small story about that student below the poster and [a web site link that would] send you to an online environment where you could read more about the student. And some of these stories then became part of our magazine—articles in our magazine. They were featured in our bulletin that goes out weekly electronically, etcetera. So that's basically what we did. And then we used a lot of that material in our external marketing process as well.

This marketing campaign has been essential and is ongoing. Everywhere I looked on campus there was some aspect of the marketing of internationalization apparent and PECU is working hard to insure that the message is not only broadcast on campus but also broadcast out to the general public.

In addition to the PECU marketing campaign, the International Center also has its own marketing campaign that is strictly focused on advertising study abroad opportunities for PECU and non-PECU students. The tag line for the International Center is "dream, explore, learn, reflect, contribute." Each of these elements relates back to the work that PECU is doing to insure that students are not only learning but also reflecting and contributing while they are abroad and when they are on campus. As described above, the International Center always existed and operated independently from the rest of PECU. However, there is more collaboration now between the two units especially in terms of

marketing as PECU embraces the International Center as a true resource that needs to be advertised for the role that it plays in advancing the internationalization of PECU as an institution. PECU has been able to creatively tell their story through the use of print and internet-based material. However, another way in which they were able to market themselves as being a leader in campus internationalization was through their involvement with professional organizations.

Involvement in professional organizations. About one-third of the research participants in this study mentioned their involvement with the American Council on Education (ACE). ACE developed a project called Promising Practices in an effort to highlight campus internationalization efforts in higher education. PECU was selected in 1999 as one of eight institutions to participate in this project. The project helped PECU to document their internationalization efforts and enabled them to take a critical look at where they were and where they wanted to go in terms of their internationalization initiative. Robert summarized:

> [PECU] has participated in ACE lab programs and other internationalization efforts. We go to their meetings. They've come here and reviewed us and it's all been very helpful. What they do is bring together clusters of campuses that are interested in internationalization and we talk to each other. And that kind of cross-[pollination], that sort of fertilization has a big impact. And we take administrators and faculty members to these meetings and they come back charged up.

About PECU's participation in this program, Robert commented, "it was our involvement in that exercise that really convinced a number of the faculty that this thing was significant." He went on to describe how participation in this project helped create other opportunities on campus for individuals to help move the internationalization initiative

forward. He said that having to provide data for the Promising Practices project "gave us an opportunity to create an international committee of faculty and staff and students who helped put that report together and then, sort of, stayed together working on things." PECU was also involved in NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

In 2006, PECU was nominated for and won the prestigious Senator Paul Simon Award for Campus Internationalization awarded by NAFSA. This award allowed the PECU story to be told to the thousands of other NAFSA members and their affiliated institutions. According to Robert, this award was helpful in gaining support and respect from campus constituents. He stated, "I think it was very helpful with our trustees, with our faculty to see that we got this award, we got this recognition for doing what we have been doing." This award along with the Promising Practices project recognition increased PECU's notoriety in terms of international education and has helped them to remain seen as a leader within the international arena. The accolades that PECU has received for their work in terms of campus internationalization and especially their leadership in terms of study abroad programming have helped position the university nationally. It is important to explore both the inhibitive and facilitative factors that have contributed to the fact that PECU is deemed as a successful institution in terms of study abroad programming today. The following section aims to explore these factors in order to offer a more well-rounded and deeper level of understanding and appreciation for how PECU moved from policy to practice.

Moving from Policy to Practice: Inhibitive and Facilitative Factors

The process of moving from policy to practice in terms of institutionalizing study abroad programs on the PECU campus was challenging and there are still challenges to the process today. Research participants spoke candidly about what they viewed as some of the inhibitors to the process. Several inhibitors seemed to permeate multiple conversations. The inhibitive factors related to study abroad programming were: fear from faculty about what study abroad programming might mean for student enrollment at PECU, difficulty telling the PECU story to on-campus and off-campus constituents, lack of resources (for faculty and students), discrepancy between the resources used for study abroad programming versus the resources used for on-campus internationalization initiatives, and motivations for the advancement of study abroad programming.

Fear from faculty. According to a couple of the participants, faculty members were leery of allowing PECU students to participate in the International Center study abroad programs. Robert claimed that there was a "legitimate fear on the part of the faculty that if a significant number of students went overseas, there wouldn't be enough left here [since student enrollment was low to begin with]." This type of mindset was difficult to break because the International Center had historically not enrolled PECU students in its programs and also because of the reality of very low enrollment on campus during the late 1980s.

Difficulty telling the story. Telling PECU's story and documenting it as a unique campus for international education provided a challenge for PECU. PECU's location and the competition of other, more well-known institutions within the vicinity were certainly

inhibitive factors to the internationalization process. Robert discussed this struggle when

he said:

> One of the hardest things for us to do—to have done over the last 15 years, is
> convince the local public, people in [this] area, people right here in [this suburb],
> that there's anything special going on at this institution. Telling our story, right
> here in our region, has been a very hard thing for us to do and it's largely because
> of the competition from other colleges and universities.

Discrepancies in resources. Universities always strive to obtain more resources

and this held true at PECU as well according to the research participants. The resources

that were mentioned specifically were in regard to money and physical space. In regard to

the lack of monetary resources for international projects for faculty, Brian summarized

the struggle. He remarked:

> There is faculty development money. There is travel money. There's not a lot of
> money any one place, but if they talked to each other, projects might happen. But
> the problem is that money for international projects is not centralized. There are
> too many different players here. There is no central way to develop such a project.

Lisa also noted this issue when she said:

> We don't have those, kind of, huge pots year after year after year and I think that's
> what we need. So you know if the faculty wants to take students overseas or wants
> to do this kind of research undertaking, there's really a very little money for
> somebody to do that. So that's an impediment.

The tension between multiculturalism and internationalization was referred to again in

terms of the distribution of monetary resources. Lisa noted:

> It's about time that we did give equal credence to the multicultural aspect as well
> as the international aspect. So there [are] some faculty and administrators,
> probably who are feeling, you know, well we've got this Office of International
> Services and the [International Center], but for multicultural affairs, we've got an
> Associate Dean. So there's an imbalance in the resources.

It appears that currently, the international aspects have much more resources put towards them than do the multicultural aspects. This imbalance most likely contributes to the tension between the two areas.

There is a perception that resources for faculty are apparently scarce as is funding for students. Lisa commented on the lack of financial resources for students. She remarked:

> You know, if we had more money to spread around, then more . . . I haven't done a study but I would like to do a study of first-generation college students and the students who get Pell Grants. I mean, you know, that disproportionately, they're not gonna be in the same category as some of the other students who have opportunities to go abroad. So if more money is pumped in, I would love to see it go to students who just are challenged financially and can't go abroad even for a short-term program.

In addition to the lack of financial resources for faculty and students there appears to be some discontent regarding how the existing resources are divided up on campus. Lisa remarked that the shift in thinking of study abroad as always being international towards the more domestic version that is offered as part of the new curriculum when she said, "You know, this focus on global connections, global meaning, you can stay in the States or go outside, it is terrific. But I still . . . I know that faculty is starting to question now the amount of resources that are put forward for international." Recently, the tension between the definitions of multicultural and international has flared up due to the discrepancy in monetary resources. Steve, when asked about challenges related to this tension remarked, "Giving up the notion of internationalization as unitary focus for [PECU] for a more complex emphasis on global connections has been a tough battle."

Monetary resources were not the only type of resources mentioned. Some faculty and administrators mentioned the need for a centralized space for international programs. Currently the various offices that deal with the international aspects of PECU are spread across campus and the International Center is physically located off-campus. Lisa pondered:

> I just wonder about, you know, our interactions and whether it wouldn't be better for us to have a physical place. We've talked about that. Like the previous president wanted to build an international house here on campus, but we suffered from the fact that we are so close to D.C. and there's an international house in [the city center].

The physical separation of the International Center from the main PECU campus has been a challenge. While efforts are being made to create more collaboration between the International Center and the main campus and increase the dialogue between the two, the physical distance, while not far, speaks perhaps louder than words.

Motivations. The question of motivation for study abroad programming exists in the literature and was mentioned during the interviews by some of the research participants as an inhibitive factor to the process. The conversation focused mainly on if the strong push for study abroad programming at PECU is based on the motivation to do what is best for students or the motivation to maintain a positive marketing tactic. Susan, when reminiscing about how the Preview program began, remarked:

> [We were] really committed to trying to think about how we were gonna [*sic*] enhance the experience for our students and get to a position where they value the international resources that we had. And it wasn't about marketing—it wasn't about making money, it wasn't—it was really about the students at that point in time...we needed initiatives to help position us in a market place that was different. Now, one could argue that there was a subtext to the Preview discussion that we needed to be able to be in the market place to provide international

experiences towards students, but it really was about the student at that point in time and it was a central theme and I think . . . that's one of the reasons why it latched on.

The discussion that ended up producing the Preview program was held during a time when the university was suffering financially and also in terms of student enrollment. PECU needed to make itself unique, which is why Susan alluded to the subtext that may have been involved. Since that time, other types of study abroad programming have been introduced on campus. As described earlier the first year experience program was created also because of a need on campus—lack of housing. Since this program met a critical need of the university, it moved forward fairly easily as was evident in my conversations with the research participants. However, Lisa alluded to the question of whether this movement will be able to continue based on changing needs of the university. She commented:

> We're now at the stage, I think, where we really need to do some long hard thinking and [one administrator has] called for a retreat in January where we'll sit down because as she has said recently [the first year semester abroad experience program] was born out of a need because we have no housing. Well, you could say we are up that point again this semester but is that gonna continue? And I think Enrollment Management would be fearful if we pulled the plug on it—what would that mean? I mean, we'd still have awesome study abroad opportunities but would it give us enough of an edge to really sustain us? I don't know.

As the participation in study abroad programs continued to grow and PECU began receiving accolades for these creative and unique programs, the study abroad opportunities available to students became a mainstay in the marketing and recruiting materials for the campus. Lisa noted, "I mean it's everywhere, you can't escape study abroad." Susan commented on this issue saying:

Now I think sometimes, we're so caught up on what are all the things we're doing for our students internationally that it's marketing. It's not a ploy in the sense that it's not genuine—it's very genuine—but how we end up spinning it is considerably different than "this is going to actually affect your life" versus "you'll come here versus someplace else" because we have [these international opportunities]. . . . I don't think anyone has any ill will about the students. They don't want the programs to be poorly done, they don't want them to not be quality. But I think what moves the motor, sometimes, is more about the image or just having another notch in our belt, another program.

In another conversation, the idea of having "another notch in our belt" was noted

as it relates to students. When speaking about how students are starting to view the

international experiences as "notches," Lisa said, "I think we have to just come to some

common agreement with what we're gonna [*sic*] do with this, kind of, 'study abroad

mania' as I call it." She commented on the trend that she is noticing with the

undergraduate students with whom she works. She remarked:

The most common question I am getting from first year students is, "How many times can I study abroad?" You know, so we call them serial study abroad students, I don't like that term, but I had a student in this morning and she wasn't [part of the first year experience group], but she came here expressly because she could study abroad. So she came in as a first year, she wants to go abroad for her sophomore year the entire year, and then she was quite frank and admitted to me, she doesn't like it here so she is thinking about transferring to [another university]. So there is a student who cognizably has come here thinking that she can study abroad, her quote was at least five semesters out of eight.

Lisa then begged the question, "Philosophically, how does that wash with an institution,

what is [a PECU] degree, what does it mean?" This is a question that is being addressed

on campus in light of a possibly larger issue that, according to one administrator, "some

of the [students who participate in the first year semester abroad experience] just use it as

a pass-through before they go on to other things." This issue of potentially losing students

after they get their fill of study abroad options appears to be a discussion point among

faculty and administrators. It is causing individuals on campus to think about how the study abroad options might be negatively affecting campus. It also calls to mind reasons why students may be leaving PECU. Some feel strongly that the study abroad options are crucial to the retention of students, others do not buy that argument. Susan spoke to these discussions and said:

> We don't lose students because they don't have international options. That's not why they leave. It might be why they stay, and there could be other reasons why they would come, but don't tell me that students that choose to leave are leaving because there is not a sophomore study abroad program. They're leaving because of money and their sense of their campus and they're going to [other universities]. . . . They're not leaving, they're not leaving because they can't figure out how to study abroad. And so on the one hand, I say I applaud the efforts to create new options, just don't try to sell that to me as part of the retention initiative. It may be part of the attraction initiative, but it's not the retention of the students who aren't covered.

These issues are current struggles on the PECU campus and therefore important to be considered when thinking about how PECU has moved study abroad programming from policy to practice.

In addition to the inhibitive factors that, at times, hindered the process of institutionalizing study abroad programming, there are three main factors that faculty and administrators still feel are inhibiting PECU from becoming a wholly internationalized campus. These factors are: low international student enrollment, lack of scholarship money for international students, and lack of foreign language study programs at PECU.

Low international student enrollment. Robert candidly noted:

> The area that we are probably least, doing least well in, as far as institution internationalization is foreign students. There are a number of programs that international students should be attracted to come and do here, but we are a

private institution, the tuition is high and until recently there wasn't a lot of scholarship support for international students.

Nancy echoed a similar view:

The big, huge hole in all this is the dearth of international students on this campus. That's the big hole. Scholarships, support, that's the missing link. That's the one that we keep failing at. So international students, language study, which are so critical to internationalization effort, are the ones we're struggling with.

Jane commented:

I think there is a real interest from lots of corners to not have all of our internationalization efforts be focused on study abroad. That's been a huge strength but that, you know, we need to really think about what it would take to have more international students.

Lisa commented about the discrepancy in terms of on-campus marketing. She said, "[There are posters about studying abroad], but there's no posters about international students coming in. You know, they just aren't." In regard to foreign language study, Jane noted, "we don't have a lot of students who want to study abroad in places where other languages are spoken. We have a pretty English oriented operation."

The International Center offers programs in countries; however, more than half of them are English-speaking countries. According to Jane, "[there are students] who study the language, but then [during] their study abroad [experience] have no connection to their language." There was definitely consensus about that fact that these three main areas —lack of international students, lack of scholarship money for international students, and lack of foreign language study—are the next pieces of the internationalization process that PECU must address in terms of being able to continue to be a leader in international

education. Just as it is necessary to recognize the factors that have been inhibitive to this process it is necessary to understand the factors that have been proponents in this process.

Despite the challenges, there have been things in place at PECU that have helped propel the internationalization initiative forward. The facilitative factors that have helped PECU move from policy to practice are: openness and flexibility to new ideas, creative programming, engagement and involvement of faculty, and support from the top of the organization. These factors have helped PECU tackle the inhibitors and have enabled the internationalization initiative, especially the institutionalization of study abroad programming, to be successful.

Openness and flexibility to new ideas. When faculty and administrators reflected about how new ideas were received at PECU, they all for the most part said that ideas just take flight at PECU because of the willingness and openness and flexibility to new ideas. Susan was reminiscing about proposing a new program told the story of how she was expecting to be stopped at some point; however, as she stated, "but darned it, every time I talked to somebody, they [would] say, 'That's a good idea. You know who else you should talk to?'" This spirit of experimenting with new ideas is evident in the history of how the cornerstone study abroad programs at PECU were started. Creativity is a large part of what has allowed PECU to be successful.

Creative programming. Being creative and utilizing the resources available such as the International Center has allowed programs such as the Preview program and the first year semester abroad experience program to be logistically sound. Thinking outside of the box and capitalizing on the existing resources enabled the creation of the new and

innovative study abroad programs that have put PECU in the spotlight of international

education. The Preview program, first year semester abroad experience program and the

Majors Abroad program all rely on the connections that the International Center has

abroad. These connections helped to ease the logistical process of creating and

implementing these programs because faculty and administrators did not have to start

from scratch in order to get a program up and running. By plugging in to existing

programs and utilizing facilities such as housing and classroom space at the International

Center's overseas sites, programs could be constructed quickly and then augmented to fit

the certain niche that they were meant to fill.

Engagement and involvement of faculty. A very creative suggestion from a faculty

member led to the creation and implementation of the premier PECU study abroad

program that provided the impetus for future programming. The engagement of the

faculty in the creation and implementation process of the internationalization initiative is

a critical component that enabled PECU to move forward from policy to practice. Several

research participants stated that this was certainly a key facilitative factor. Brian, when

asked about how the process of internationalization has been able to progress at PECU,

noted:

> I think the thing they did well was to get faculty involved and give faculty
> ownership over the programs. You know, that's not just me, that's lots and lots of
> people became involved and interested. And once the faculty had ownership of it,
> it wasn't a top-down program, then it moved,—it happened quickly.

While many of the research participants spoke about the need to keep faculty

involved in the internationalization process, John, who also has an administrative role on

campus, offered a unique perspective on how the initiative was able to move through

campus. He spoke about applying a conflict resolution model in meetings to help move

the initiative forward. The example he provided related to how the new general education

curriculum initiative was mediated on campus. He said:

> There was a team of three faculty that came together, of which I was one, that decided that the process for doing it could—we could apply a mediation model and pull it off. And so, I was a member of the team, more as a part of, kind of, being a conflict resolution person than any of the content. So there—the other two were really involved on the content. I more designed the process, whereby, it was open-ended, transparent, all of the things that you do. We went to all of the departments and it was a process that really worked.

Nancy, who also wears an administrative hat, echoes the sentiment of the John quoted

above. Nancy spoke about how the involvement of the faculty and willingness to

negotiate conflict was instrumental in the passing of the new curriculum. She recounted:

> There were a team of five faculty in May who spent the whole fall working with the faculty as a whole, going to department meetings, sending drafts, having people react to drafts, having meetings with one faculty member who had a resistance to something, changing something, balancing these, open meetings, you know. So, there was a huge effort to get everybody involved in the process. So that by the time it came to the floor of the faculty, everybody had seen it a hundred times and already had plenty of time to object to it. It had been written and rewritten and rewritten. There had been negotiations and battles and hundreds of emails so by the time it got to the faculty, but it was an intentional effort by six people. You know, we spent from August until February working with everybody so when it got the floor of the faculty, then it went through . . . the one thing we kept saying is we'll change things if it's not working. And that's one of the things, I think, helped it. It was a transparent, flexible process and we promised to be transparent and flexible as it was implemented and we have been.

Support from the top. Faculty support was not the only type of support needed in

order for the internationalization initiative to be successful. PECU has done a good job at

engaging its Board of Trustees meaning that there is support for the institutionalization of

study abroad programs from the very top of the organization. According to Charles:

> [The Board of Trustees is] definitely on board with the idea of this as our niche
> and, you know, it's a way that [PECU] is able to distinguish itself. Very few
> schools in the country have something, you know, that's this distinctive about the
> school. So it's really an opportunity for us to take advantage of that. And they see
> that and they're fully supportive of our work to accomplish it.

Due to these facilitative factors, study abroad programming has become part of the

culture of the institution. The enculturation of the study abroad programs has allowed

PECU to move from policy to active practice. Two faculty members used the same phrase

to describe the internationalization through study abroad programs at PECU. They

mentioned that it is simply part of PECU's "fabric." Donald elaborated on how this

enculturation is helping PECU think about the future. He said:

> It has seemed increasingly natural since then to ask ourselves, to question every
> time we create a new program or a graduate program or anything else, how does
> this fold into this, kind of, self-declared university mission of globalization-
> internationalization or something. So now we have the MBA program where there
> is a study abroad component etcetera. Now it's just kind of an ingrained habit.
> People think in these terms. And the students think in these terms. I mean the vast
> majority, you know, it's part of the narrative when we're recruiting them, it's open
> houses, all those kinds of things. So we just, sort of, expect them to go, they kind
> of expect to go and happily, I guess, that's a sort of a self-fulfilling prophecy.

The notion of the self-fulfilling prophecy seems fitting for PECU and the journey that the

campus has been through as it has moved from policy to practice in their campus

internationalization initiatives through the institutionalization of their study abroad

programs.

Summary of Findings

The findings in this study provide context for helping understand how PECU was able to move from policy to practice with regard to its internationalization efforts. The research participants provided answers to questions relating to scaffolding, the role of faculty and administration and the process for preparing campus for the institutionalization of study abroad programs. Their answers helped to determine what factors inhibited the process as well as what factors were helpful in supporting the process. PECU is a unique institution; however much can be learned from analyzing the way in which the internationalization initiative was proceduralized from an administrative standpoint.

Robert, one of the key administrators who helped lead the internationalization process, commented on how he thought the process worked. He candidly said with a smile, "I'd be lying to you if I didn't tell you that we made it up as we went along because that's exactly what we did. What we did was try to get the, you know, try to get goal in mind." The goal was to internationalize campus through study abroad programming and PECU has succeeded in this goal as recognized by NAFSA and ACE for their internationalization efforts.

This chapter provided details from the perspective of research participants as to how PECU moved from policy to practice. The following chapter will discuss the meaning of these findings in the larger context of campus internationalization, the limitations of this particular case study, and implications for further research.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Introduction

Within higher education today there has been a call to educators to help better

prepare students for an increasingly global society. Since the late 1980s administrators on

college and university campuses have begun to undertake the task of campus

internationalization through a variety of initiatives and projects. There are, no doubt, an

endless amount of possibilities in terms of how campuses can become more international,

yet many administrators initially begin with the creation of or expansion of study abroad

programs as a way to help students become more globally competent. This chapter aims

to review the purpose of and address the limitations of this particular case study,

summarize the relationship of the findings of this study to the conceptual framework,

detail the Stage-Factor Model for Comprehensive Campus Internationalization that

developed from this research, provide recommendations for campus administrators who

are seeking to institutionalize study abroad programs as part of a campus-wide

internationalization initiative pose additional questions that arose from this study and

provide implications for further research.

Purpose of the Study

This case study provides an in-depth look at how PECU approached the idea of

campus internationalization through the institutionalization of study abroad programs and

how it moved administratively from policy to practice. The specific unit of analysis for

this case study was PECU's study abroad programming and how these opportunities were

institutionalized on campus as part of the overarching campus-wide internationalization initiative. This case study serves two main purposes. The first is that this study provides a detailed account of the administrative process of institutionalizing study abroad programs on the PECU campus. The documentation of this institution's 20-year internationalization process provides insight about the process of moving from policy to practice within institutions of higher education. The second purpose of this case study is to provide administrators on other campuses with tangible ideas about how to institutionalize study abroad programs as part of a campus internationalization initiative.

<div align="center">Limitations</div>

As with any research study, this particular case study bears some limitations. It is important to review them here before discussing the significance of this study. I currently work in the field of international education and believe in study abroad programming as a way to further campus internationalization efforts. I may be predisposed to highlight the positive aspects of internationalization initiatives, although I tried to safeguard against this through my interview questions. Since this study was aimed at understanding how the internationalization initiative was implemented from an administrative standpoint using the institutionalization of study abroad programs as the main focus point, this study did not include the perspective of students and that is also a limitation.

Again, it is important to note that this study is a single case study in which the $n = 1$; therefore the results of the study cannot be generalized to all campuses with internationalization initiatives. PECU's demographics are also unique in that it is a small, private school with a large International Center and, therefore, the results of the study

may not be transferable to much larger, public schools with fewer resources for international efforts. In order to establish a high level of validity in this study, two main strategies, triangulation and member checks, suggested by Merriam (2002), were employed.

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

This significance of this study is found in the analysis of how PECU moved from policy to practice as it institutionalized study abroad programming as part of its overall comprehensive campus internationalization initiative. The documentation of the process of moving from policy to practice (using study abroad programs as the main unit of analysis) is meant to be useful for administrators on other campuses who are charged with their university's internationalization process. This study provides tangible ideas that other universities might seek to replicate in their own way and serves as a limited, yet useful, shortened version of a best practices guide for the institutionalization of study abroad programming as a part of campus internationalization. PECU can be seen as an exemplary case of success from which there is great value to be gained. Study abroad programs are often the most tangible piece of campus internationalization initiatives and therefore other campuses can look to PECU as a model for how to utilize study abroad programs to advance the comprehensive internationalization initiative.

<div align="center">Relation of Findings to Conceptual Framework</div>

The information gathered from interviews, observation, and document analysis provided a story of how PECU institutionalized study abroad programs as part of an overall comprehensive internationalization initiative. The themes within the story are, for

the most part, consistent with the literature on campus internationalization initiatives. Some of the themes in PECU's story are practical applications of Ellingboe's (1998) conceptual model of six factors that must be present in order to achieve the goal of successful campus-wide internationalization. Interestingly, PECU's story does not contain all of the factors, yet each factor was discussed by research participants and noted to be important to the advancement of internationalization on PECU's campus.

There are clearly six factors that Ellingboe (1998) determined necessary for campus internationalization initiatives to exist and to do well on university and college campuses. What is unclear, however, is whether or not there is a particular ranked order within this list of factors. In looking at various articles detailing Ellingboe's work, there does not appear to be a required order. Taylor (2004) listed the factors in an order different from Paige (2003) and both Taylor's and Paige's order differs from Ellingboe's original list.

In researching the story of internationalization at PECU, I believe that Ellingboe's (1998) factors may have an implicit ranking within them. I have also re-named some of the factors and added three new factors to the list (Factor 3, Factor 4, and Factor 9). My new ordering of Ellingboe's factors, including the new factors that I have added is as follows:

1. College leadership

2. Faculty and administrative involvement from the very beginning

3. Entrepreneurial and creative spirit among faculty and administrators

4. Resources—Money, International Center and established locations abroad

5. Creation of study abroad programming that is affordable and accessible

6. Increased presence and intentional integration of international students and scholars on campus

7. Internationalized curriculum

8. Internationalized co-curricular units on campus

9. Ethnically diverse U.S. student population on campus

PECU incorporated most of these factors into their efforts and did so in a creative, innovative way. If one thinks of construction as a metaphor for moving from policy to practice, one can see various pieces of framework incorporated within the story of the institutionalization of PECU's study abroad programs. The framework set up at PECU is consistent with the recommendations for establishing and sustaining change within organizations (Harris, 2007; Kotter & Cohen, 2002; Lewis, 2000; Olson, 2005; Van Loon, 2001). In addition, this updated set of factors can be woven into Knight's (as cited in Taylor, 2004) stage theory. Knight used stage terminology to define the process of campus internationalization. The stages that Knight detailed are: awareness, commitment, planning, operationalising, review, and reinforcement (as cited in Taylor, 2004, p. 150). In an effort to be more transparent about what actually takes place in each stage, I have condensed the six stages into four stages and have renamed them as: Foundation, Implementation, Assessment, and Maintenance.

As a word of caution, my use of the word ranking when referring to Ellingboe's (1998) list does not imply that the initial factors have more importance the others on the list. What I mean by ranking in this discussion is that factors one through four are

precursors for how well factors five through nine will be able to be carried out. If factors one through four are not present, there is no conceivable way that factors four through nine will be able to be implemented. The initial four factors are the absolutely essential elements that must be present at the beginning of an internationalization initiative. Factors five through nine are essentially byproducts that are a result of a combination of the first three critically important factors. The last five factors should be the criteria for determining the success of a comprehensive campus internationalization initiative.

Therefore, to gain a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon of comprehensive campus internationalization, one should look at Ellingboe's list and Knight's stages *together* as a model worthy of replication. I have named this new model the Stage-Factor Model for Comprehensive Campus Internationalization. This new model offers an enhanced understanding of not only the specifics of who and what must be in place, but through the stages it also provides structure and parameters as well as suggestions for best practices to help guide the process (see Figure 1).

	Stage One: FOUNDATION	Stage Two: IMPLEMENTATION	Stage Three: ASSESSMENT	Stage Four: MAINTENANCE
Factors	College Leadership Faculty/Administrator Involvement	Entrepreneurial and Creative Spirit Resources Affordable/Accessible Programs Internationalized Curriculum	Internationalized Co-Curricular Units Integration of Students and Scholars Ethnically Diverse U.S. Student Body	Enhancement Improvement
Best Practices	Presidential Initiative Know the Needs Create a Niche Generate Faculty Buy-In	Capitalize on Strengths Utilize Overseas Resources Create Unifying Program Restructure Curriculum Creative Marketing and Funding	Coordination with Student Affairs Collaboration with Admissions Office Foster Relationships Overseas Market the Campus Community Local Community Outreach Scholarships	What is working? What is not working? Define Next Steps Recommit

Figure 1. Stage-factor model for comprehensive campus internationalization.

Stage-Factor Model for Comprehensive Campus Internationalization

Based on the information from research at PECU, I suggest that elements of

Knight's (2004) work and elements of Ellingboe's (1998) work be combined and

expanded upon in what I call the Stage-Factor Model for Comprehensive Campus

Internationalization. Viewing campus internationalization initiatives as a set of stages

only is not comprehensive enough. Defining campus internationalization as a series of

factors is also shortsighted. The Stage-Factor Model attempts to bring these two views

together to give credence to the fact that comprehensive campus internationalization is

indeed a process and that there are specific factors that should be addressed as a campus

moves through the process. The model indicates that there is an order by which a campus

should undertake an internationalization initiative and the model allows for the cycle to

repeat as a continuous quality improvement cycle as well.

Stages at PECU

During its 60-year history of internationalization, PECU moved through the first

two stages of the model during the last 20 years and learned many lessons from the

journey. This section situates PECU into the Stage-Factor Model by discussing the factors

present at PECU during each of the stages and the following section will highlight best

practices learned.

Foundation

In order for PECU to move from policy to practice the key constituents there had

to first be a foundation set in order to help sustain the initiative. A strong foundation is

the crucial element in the construction of the initiative because it is what allows

everything else to be held together. Once the foundation is in place then various levels are implemented in a methodical order before the building process is complete. The foundation is comprised of a combination of two of Ellingboe's (1998) six factors. Foundation in terms of support for the initiative at PECU involved college leadership and involvement of faculty in international opportunities. The internationalization initiative was put forth from the President's office in 1988 with backing from the Board of Trustees in a strategic attempt to reposition PECU and create a unique niche for PECU in light of issues that PECU was facing at the time such as low enrollment and competition from other more well known universities. Although the original push for the initiative was by the President, faculty members were asked to participate in the process of developing how the initiative would play out on the university's campus. The idea of capitalizing on the strength of PECU's study abroad programs was started from the top-down and after the idea went through this layer of leadership, leaders within the faculty ranks were brought into the discussion because the President and upper-level administrators realized that they would not be able to carry out the initiative all on their own.

Faculty buy-in and faculty involvement in international activities is the second part of the foundation that was put in place at PECU at the beginning of the campus internationalization initiative. During a retreat in 1993 sponsored by the President, faculty leaders were invited to brainstorm about how to begin the internationalization of PECU. After reviewing the campus' strengths, it was agreed that the focus should be on capitalizing on the already successful study abroad programs that were being run by a unit of PECU, the International Center, and make them available to PECU students. In one

afternoon, so the story goes, the faculty members decided how this could be done and created what has come to be known as the Preview program. Once the leaders within the faculty ranks bought in, the initiative moved forward. This was a very important point driven home by many of the research participants. It is this Preview program that ignited the exponential growth of PECU students in study abroad programs. Up until that point in 1993, only a handful of PECU students participated in study abroad programs and now fifteen years later, PECU ranks number one among U.S institutions in terms of undergraduate study abroad participation (Institute of International Education, 2008). Once the foundation was in place, PECU could begin to create and implement other levels of internationalization.

Implementation

These other levels of internationalization, according to Ellingboe (1998), include weaving the internationalization initiative throughout different areas on campus through curriculum changes and the inclusion of international students and faculty. I found that at PECU also included within these levels was the creation of additional creative study abroad programs. Each level that was put into place helped PECU construct a more internationalized campus. Some of these levels such as new innovative study abroad programs and curriculum changes have already been completed, however the inclusion of international students and faculty is a level that PECU is still working on.

The second level that PECU added to the foundation was the creation and implementation of additional innovative study abroad programs. These included, of course, the Preview program, which has become the flagship program for PECU. This

Preview program has expanded into other cities and participation continues to grow. The first year semester abroad program, which developed out of a housing crisis on campus, was the second innovative study abroad program PECU created. This program was not originally intended to be longstanding; however, once it was seen as a unique addition to the program offerings and that it was an attractive recruiting tool for the university, the program remained and has become another signature program. The Majors Abroad Program is a third unique study abroad option that is offered at PECU. This program allows students to earn a degree not offered at PECU by studying abroad in a PECU program for one year. This was a creative solution that allowed PECU to offer a number of additional degrees, therefore increasing the attractiveness of PECU to prospective students, without having to hire more faculty on-campus or create new departments. These three major study programs have helped PECU earn recognition as being a true leader in terms of internationalization.

The new undergraduate curriculum that was initiated in Fall 2008 is another level that PECU has added to help in the construction of a truly internationalized campus. This curriculum expanded on the already existing international aspects available as part of the undergraduate academic experience to include multicultural, domestic-based experiences. Now all students are ensured to have a global experience of some sort whether that be abroad or in a city or community that is different from where they have grown up. The restructuring of the curriculum and its subsequent approval by the faculty was a process that involved maintaining the scaffolding that was in place at PECU, primarily faculty involvement. Faculty were involved in this process during the entire time and therefore

the new curriculum was approved almost seamlessly by an overwhelming majority of the faculty. While the innovative study abroad programs and the creation of a new undergraduate curriculum are completed layers of internationalization, the existence and inclusion of international students and scholars is still a work in process at PECU.

Assessment

PECU does not have a large presence of international students or international faculty on campus. The research participants woefully admitted that this was a huge missing link for them in terms of overall campus internationalization and believe that in order to continue to further their internationalization efforts, PECU must engage again in recruiting and retaining both international students and faculty. There were a variety of reasons given for why there are not more international students and faculty on campus, but clearly, PECU has put its resources into study abroad programming for outgoing students and needs to balance this discrepancy. How they are going to do that remains in question. No one addressed the homogeneity of the PECU domestic student population. During my analysis of data I determined that I needed to search for the demographic information about PECU's student population. Surprisingly, or perhaps not surprisingly upon further reflection, I was unable to find the demographic information displayed in any of PECU's online or printed material and had to refer to an outside web site (Peterson's) in order to get this type of information. It is true that one hides what one does not want others to see. This is certainly an area in need of improvement at PECU and the third stage of Assessment is a perfect opportunity for PECU to make these factors a

priority. Clearly the administration is aware of these issues and they now need to move into being committed to make change.

The majority of participants mentioned that the collaboration with the International Center will be a key factor in terms of further progression of internationalization on campus in the future. Several participants reiterated the need for the campus to continue to find ways for international to intersect with multicultural so that the discussion does not have be about one or the other, but both together. The discussions that are happening now on the PECU campus in terms of how international and multicultural can be viewed as being one in the same are reminiscent of Skelly's (in press) research on global citizenship.

Perhaps PECU has not come full circle; however, the faculty and administrators and certainly making strides in the right direction. Addressing the disparities in international student enrollment and homogeneity of the U.S. student population as well as finding ways for the various units on campus to collaborate will help PECU begin another chapter in their story as the campus moves forward towards being a truly internationalized campus—and the cycle discussed in the Stage-Factor Model will begin all over again.

Best Practices and Recommendations for Administrators

After learning from the research participants about the process of campus internationalization at PECU, I have developed some recommendations for university administrators who are being tasked with internationalization efforts. These recommendations stem from my observations during my time at PECU and the analysis

of the participant interviews. Each set of best practices is framed to fit within the Stage-Factor Model where they would be most appropriate.

Stage One: Foundation

Presidential initiative. The PECU President's backing of the internationalization initiative provided a huge amount of inertia to engage administrators and faculty in the process. Had it not been for the President's passion to increase international education and utilize the International Center as a means to doing so, change might have been very hard on the PECU campus. Clearly if the President declares an initiative, it will move forward and faculty and administrator will buy in, some only because they have to. If, however, the internationalization initiative is not a priority of the President, administrators will have to really work hard to gain support for the initiative because most often times, the President is the keeper of the resources that will be needed for an internationalization initiative to succeed. Additionally, faculty and administrators may not get on board unless there is an initiative from the President's office.

I suggest that there may be an "if, then" scenario that administrators consider based on the level of interest and support that the President has towards an internationalization initiative. If there are faculty members who buy in to the idea either because of or without a Presidential mandate but there are no resources available, administrators should seek to collaborate with colleagues on other campuses to share resources or connect with providers to use them as resources. If there are resources to be used but no faculty buy-in or no Presidential mandate, administrators should utilize the resources to engage the faculty. Offering faculty grants to travel internationally or

stipends for participation in international education or curriculum workshops is a great way to utilize resources. Allowing faculty to conduct site visits so that they see first hand what is happening overseas is also another productive and often well-spent way to create faculty buy-in.

Know the needs of your community and create a niche. PECU administrators were incredibly adept at being able to read the marketplace around them and create a niche for the campus. Understanding what the community and in particular, your potential students, desire in terms of higher education is crucial. PECU was able to reinvent itself based on the demand of the market. These days, when competition for students is even more intense, it is essential that administrators remain ahead of the curve in assessing what potential college students might be looking for in a collegiate experience. Tapping the high school students as they begin to look at colleges and working closely with college admissions offices may provide insight into what the next generation of students is looking for in terms of programming on college campuses. From anecdotal evidence, it appears that college students today are coming to college more interested in studying abroad and the question for them is not *if* they will go abroad, but *when* and *how often.* The next generation of college students is also more technologically savvy and desire more instantaneous access to information and opportunities. Creating technological components within study abroad programs such as blogs, chat rooms, Facebook applications, and the like will certainly have student appeal.

Involve all constituents, especially faculty. Getting buy-in and support from faculty is something that should not be overlooked. On some campuses the relationship

between faculty and administrators is better than on other campuses, but regardless, without the faculty support, an initiative will not move forward within higher education institutions. This is reiterated over and over in the literature as well as in the data collected during this research study. Faculty should not only be involved in the behind the scenes processes, but they should be invited and encouraged to participate in programs. There are many ways that faculty can become involved in the programs but the intentionality that PECU used in having faculty interact with students overseas is a great model to follow. This interaction allows for faculty to see students in a different light and vice versa which, according the data collected in this study, appears to have lasting affects long after everyone returns back to the U.S.

Another important group to consider involving in the process and in the programs are the staff members around campus who are critical to the success of the initiative. For example, PECU administrators encouraged individuals from all over campus to participate in the Preview program. Once people from the various departments on campus participated and came back to campus they became another group that helped spread the word about the experience and advantage of being overseas. If the realization that a campus needs to undertake an internationalization initiative comes from the college leadership and faculty and administrators are involved from the beginning, sending the message to the campus community will go more smoothly.

Of course, one cannot expect that all faculty members or administrators will buy-in to the need for an internationalization initiative but having some faculty members and administrators who do is essential as they can help to serve as liaisons with their

colleagues who may need a bit more convincing before buying in to the idea. These are the individuals who will undoubtedly be tasked with the nuts and bolts of the construction of the initiative throughout campus. Therefore, they should be involved from the very beginning and given responsibility and oversight of the process, rather than being asked simply to participate or comment on the process. Involving all constituents is vital. Although it takes more time to get buy-in and support from various constituents it is a worthwhile investment, as it tends to lead to more sustained and lasting change.

Stage Two: Implementation

The implementation stage is the main stage in which real change occurs. During this stage, programs are created and integrated into campus life and the following are best practices that should be considered during this stage.

Capitalize on your strengths. Recognizing and utilizing the strengths of your campus is an extremely important step as the strengths of your campus will help determine the focus and direction of the internationalization initiative. PECU has a remarkable asset in its International Center and very few campuses have anything of this magnitude. For the majority of campuses that do not have a large independent International Center, administrators should look to the various study abroad offices as a source of strength for an internationalization initiative. Study abroad offices vary in size and scope but they are often the only conduit on campus for international education. Based on the success of the PECU International Center and the study abroad programs, administrators at PECU determined that study abroad programming was going to initially be the main focus of their internationalization efforts.

PECU's International Center was originally only working with non-PECU students until a change in leadership and the forward thinking of the senior administrators allowed the International Center to be viewed as a resource available for PECU students as well as non-PECU students alike. This shift in perspective catapulted PECU administrators into a position of being able to create unique, well-founded study abroad experiences for their students.

Utilize overseas resources. Without the resources that the International Center had abroad, the Preview program and the first year semester abroad experience program would not have been an option. Administrators turned to the resources available through the International Center when PECU was in crisis first in terms of student enrollment and second when the crisis of the on-campus housing shortage hit. These two programs were developed and launched within a matter of months and that certainly would not have been possible without PECU administrators being able to rely on the strength of and resources of the International Center abroad. The Majors Abroad Program would also not have been created so easily if the International Center had not had such strong university partnerships overseas. The recognition of the PECU International Center was a key turning point in the internationalization process at PECU.

Since most campuses do not have a large study abroad provider attached to them, administrators should look to the existing study abroad and international student offices as resources. There are many campuses today that are moving toward a model of a "one-stop shop" for all things international by having a central location for internationally-related areas on campus to be within the same space. Administrators should look to these

one-stop shops to determine how to capitalize on already existing programs on campus and how to increase and expand these opportunities for students. Administrators should also canvas the campus to develop a faculty and staff international expertise database. This exercise alone can be a great resource in terms of knowing the constituents on your campus who have an interest in or knowledge of a certain part of the world.

Entrepreneurial and creative spirit. Time and time again throughout their story of internationalization, the administrators at PECU appeared to be both flexible and creative in their thinking in terms of programming. The ability to think outside the box and find ways to make things happen is an incredible strength that serves higher education administrators well. Oftentimes in higher education institutions, especially those that have been around for many years, ways of doing things and ways of thinking become engrained. A response that is often heard when something new is proposed is "that's not the way we do it here." Breaking out of this mentality is essential in order for an initiative to move forward. Within the story it became clear that the individuals on campus who were most directly related to the creation of study abroad programming exuded a sense of creativity and the ability to think outside of the box. Oftentimes in academia things become very protracted and set in stone. In order to advance an internationalization initiative, one must think broadly and creatively in order to develop unique and successful programs that meet the goals of the university's initiative. This was one of the key elements that faculty and administrators truly embraced at PECU and one of the key reasons that the study abroad programming became so successfully institutionalized on the PECU campus.

Creative marketing and funding. Creative thinking in terms of how to develop, market, and fund a new initiative is an essential element as well. PECU was able to develop creative financing strategies that allowed the Preview program to be very inexpensive and therefore attractive to students and parents. This creative financing was an option available to PECU administrators again because of the existence of the International Center. The way in which the programs were packaged and marketed was also creative and spoke to the desires of the students. The fact that PECU can offer majors in departments that do not even exist on the PECU campus is an incredible demonstration of creative thinking. A faculty member thought about how to increase the marketability of PECU's course offerings and suggested what now has become known as the Majors Abroad Program. Ideas take flight at PECU primarily because of support from administrators, but also because of creative and flexible thinking, which can be difficult to advocate in an environment of fiscal challenge.

Creation of a unifying program. There is no doubt that the highly subsidized Preview Program has been the event that has bonded the entire PECU campus together. Everyone I spoke to referred to it and they all had similar stories to tell about its impact on themselves and on the way it impacts the campus. This single, unifying program has done wonders for the university and can be used as an example of how one, solid program that all campus constituents can be a part of can help to smooth the way for a comprehensive internationalization initiative. I believe the buy-in for the institutionalization of study abroad programming at PECU was facilitated because so

many individuals had participated in the Preview Program and bought into it and the power of international experiences.

The creation of study abroad programming that is affordable and accessible to all students becomes possible when the leadership of the university is open to ideas and creative about how to develop programs. There are so many ways in which a study abroad program can be developed and so many variations of financial models within study abroad programs. PECU's extremely varied menu of study abroad options became a reality because faculty and administrators first asked the question "Why not?" rather than "Why?" or "How?" Based on the leadership they received from the top of the university, the faculty and administrators were on board with why study abroad programming was so important. They were first tasked with developing unique programs and thinking in terms of the big picture before they were tasked with ironing out the minutia that comes with the logistics behind a successful study abroad program. According to the research participants in this study, the faculty and administrators always added a creative touch even when having to conquer the mundane details.

Restructure curriculum. An internationalized curriculum is a reflection of the faculty's commitment to international education. The restructuring of the curriculum was a long process that PECU completed in the Fall of 2008. This new curriculum is a standardized statement about PECU's commitment to educate its students about international issues whether they study abroad overseas or whether they choose to study away from PECU in a domestic, yet multi-culturally foreign environment. The curriculum overhaul was a relatively smooth process and the research participants noted that this was

because of elements within factors one through three: college leadership, early involvement of faculty and administrators, and a creative and entrepreneurial spirit. Since Fall 2008 is the first semester that the new curriculum has been in place, it seems appropriate that PECU administrators assess how well it is meeting the desired goals and how well students are responding to it.

Stage Three: Assessment

PECU clearly recognizes the lack of international students and scholars on campus yet it is also important to recognize and address the lack of ethic diversity among the U.S. student population on campus. PECU faculty and administrators spoke about the need to exponentially increase the number of international students and faculty but this factor has clearly not been made a priority. Currently, according to the research participants and personal observation, PECU's internationalization efforts and resources have been disproportionately appropriated to study abroad programming and to the internationalization of the curriculum. The third stage of Assessment is the time for administrators and faculty to come together and have a discussion about how to enhance the factors that are already well-established and address the factors that are need of improvement, specifically the low number of international students and scholars and the issue of homogeneity among the domestic population on campus. Some suggestions for how to accomplish these areas of concern are explained below.

Coordination and collaboration across campus. Collaborating with campus constituents is beneficial in many ways. In an effort to increase international student enrollment, the Office of Admissions may wish to reach out to various units on campus

for assistance. For example, the Office of Admissions could collaborate with the International Center and share some resources when Admissions Officers are recruiting abroad. If an international program is already successfully operating overseas in a particular destination, perhaps the Office of Admissions can capitalize on the International Center's existing knowledge of the area and local customs to gain an advantage over other admissions personnel who might be have such savvy knowledge. Additionally, if the Office of Admissions is striving to visit various international locations each year but do not have the personnel or resources to conduct the visits, the Office may think about training the on-site personnel who work abroad for the International Center to answer general questions about the university and utilize these individuals as additional representatives of the Office of Admissions.

Foster relationships overseas. Another way that to increase the enrollment of international students is to remember to foster relationships overseas. This can be done by utilizing alumni as well as entities sponsored by the United States Department of State such as EducationUSA that provide education advising abroad. In most countries outside of the United States, collectivist societies are common and relationships are the key to building strong trust. International students and their families need to really trust that they will be well taken care of when they arrive on campus in the United States. This trust cannot just be expected it must be earned. This may mean that it may take several years before an international student sees the value in coming to PECU in particular so it is advisable when recruiting at high schools overseas to not only talk with the Seniors, but also to talk to the Freshman as well. Making a point to visit perspective student groups as

often as possible is helpful as well. For example, if a faculty member takes a group of U.S. students abroad to take a course for 3 weeks, during that visit, the faculty member should connect with high school students to talk about the university. This additional, more casual visit can be done in addition the regularly scheduled undergraduate admissions college fairs. A consistent message about the university's welcoming community and systems of support will go a long way in building the kind of trust required for a 17- or 18-year-old international student to choose to enroll in a small, private, East Coast university so very far from home.

Local community outreach and scholarships. Scholarship money will undoubtedly attract more international students to enroll at PECU; however, scholarships can also be used to attract a more diverse U.S student population to campus. Engaging in local community outreach to excite perhaps first generation students about the opportunities at PECU is something that should be done in earnest. The community surrounding PECU has changed during the past 10 years since the U.S. Census and perhaps the advertising tactics of the University need to be altered to fit the new demographic makeup of the surrounding population. Inviting first generation students and their parents to campus to visit and making the different ethnic groups in the neighboring community feel important is vital to being able to provide a flow of ethnic diversity onto campus.

Stage Four: Maintenance

The fourth stage in the Stage-Factor Model is Maintenance. This is the stage in which PECU takes a step back to review the progress of the initiative and determine how to continue to move forward; this can be done by asking two important questions: *What is*

working and what is not working? Both questions need to be asked. Applauding what has been successful is important to morale and to fostering a strong sense of community on campus. However, administrators should not be shortsighted and need to look for areas in need of improvement in order to help move the process from policy to successful practice forward. Asking the question of what is not working is crucial and needs to be something that is constantly done at this stage. Where are the areas that are in most need of improvement? What are we preaching that we are not practicing? Answering these types of questions will aid administrators in being able to shape a plan for what to tackle next. Once the areas of improvement have been established, it is time for the administrators to work with the campus community to recommit to the next round in the process. It is in this fourth stage when administrators have the opportunity to really evaluate the cycle and determine the direction that the University needs to move toward in order to stay ahead of the curve and in order to continue to improve its internationalization process so that it will be truly a comprehensively internationalized campus. The repetitive nature of the Stage-Factor Model allows for constant quality improvement, which is a vital component to the longevity and success of an initiative such as campus internationalization.

The findings of this case study confirm why PECU is recognized as a leader in campus internationalization in terms of the types of study abroad programs that are available to students. The answers to the original research questions posed in this study are found within PECU's unique and compelling story. PECU moved from policy to practice in terms of institutionalizing its study abroad programs and advancing its campus internationalization initiative from senior administrative support, by capitalizing on its

strengths and resources, involving faculty in the process, and by creative and flexible thinking. I was only vaguely familiar with PECU when I started this research study; however, based on the information I obtained during data collection, more questions arose and I formed some ideas and suggestions for university administrators tasked with campus internationalization efforts.

<div align="center">Additional Questions</div>

The overall research question was aimed at determining how study abroad programming as part of the campus internationalization initiative at PECU became institutionalized, or part of practice, from an administrative standpoint. This question was answered and participants all seemed to have similar answers to the research questions. From my interviews with the research participants it appeared that they were all on the same page in terms of PECU's storybook movement from policy to practice. They even mentioned the same points of tension such as the struggle between international and multicultural as well as the lack of international students on campus. As I pondered the data and tried to make sense of the story, the following questions arose:

1. Has internationalization been woven so deeply into the fabric of PECU's culture that this story is just second nature or is this the rehearsed rhetoric that PECU has come to know in order to survive the fierce competition within higher education institutions?

2. How much different would this story have looked without the PECU International Center? Would any of this have been possible without this enormous resource?

3. What about assessment of the initiative? What is the impact of PECU's

internationalization efforts within study abroad programs and curriculum on

students?

These questions were generated from the answers that research participants provided.

They are important to think about because of the issues that have been raised nationwide

about the ethical culture of study abroad programs, especially ones run by large providers

such as the PECU International Center. The individuals who participated in this study

were genuine champions of students and of the academic experience and by no means do

these questions suggest anything else. They are simply stated here in an attempt to

balance the usually very positively focused conversation on study abroad programming by

bringing the shadow-side of study abroad programming that is alluded to in the literature

to the foreground (Egan, 1994; Schemo, 2007b).

Implications for Future Research

This particular case study focused on how upper-level administration and the

faculty moved a policy into practice on a private, east coast campus. Out of this case

study there are many lessons to be learned; these lessons validated and enhanced the

existing literature on campus internationalization initiatives and how they can be

successfully implemented on university campuses. As with most studies, there are

implications for future areas of research. As higher education institutions are called to

educate students to become global citizens in this world, there are a variety of additional

questions that are worthwhile researching in relation to this movement toward

comprehensive campus internationalization. The following areas of inquiry may be useful in exploring in future research agendas.

Middle-Managers and Their Role in the Process

This case study focused on senior-level administrators and faculty and therefore the middle-managers, such as lower-level administrators and staff members who are often tasked with carrying out the implementation logistics of these programs, are not given a voice in this study. Specific research questions related to middle-managers are:

1. What is the role of the middle-manager in the institutionalization of a campus-wide initiative?

2. How can middle-managers be better prepared to help lead change on campus?

Students

Again, because this study focused on the administrative process, the student voice is absent. It would be very interesting to further research this question and get the student perspective in terms of how PECU (or any campus) is doing in terms of its internationalization initiative. Specific research questions might be:

1. Is the leadership of the university practicing what it preaches in terms of campus-wide internationalization?

2. From the student perspective, how can higher education institutions better prepare students for an international experience?

3. Does participation in a multicultural, domestic experience (such as the new PECU curriculum provides) foster an equivalent type of development in students as participation in study abroad programs?

Motivations

Based on the literature and on the responses from some of the research participants, it appears that the issue of motivation for internationalization is an issue worth exploring. Additionally, the motivations for students to participate in study abroad programs should be explored. Questions related to this issue might be:

1. Is the study abroad programming available at universities an attraction factor or a retention factor?

2. What role does marketing play in creating a culture of study abroad on campus?

3. How can university administrators help move students beyond the idea of study abroad as a commodity?

Reflections

This process of investigating the institutionalization of study abroad programming at PECU was truly invigorating. I was inspired and intrigued by the PECU story. As an advocate for campus internationalization and a true believer in the power of study abroad programs and the impact that they can have on a student's life, I am thrilled that higher education institutions are engaging in internationalization efforts. This research has particular importance to my current administrative role in the University of San Diego (USD) International Center. At USD, the awareness and commitment to internationalization has been established and I have worked to insure that faculty and administrators are involved in the creation of study abroad programs and a more internationalized curriculum. Currently USD is working through the planning and

operationalizing stage by implementing some policies and procedures for how to institutionalize study abroad programming. While there has been recognition that USD needs to increase the amount of international students and scholars on campus, the International Center has played a major role in more intentionally integrating these individuals into campus life. There is a dedicated staff within the International Center who works on programming with the international students and scholars. This team is making progress toward the end goal of increasing the number of international students and scholars on campus and is also implementing new and creative ways to engage them into the USD community.

This research was a practical and personal project for me. I plan to implement some of the lessons learned from this research as USD continues to works its way through the planning and operationalizing stage of comprehensive campus internationalization. Initially I had thought that PECU was very similar to USD; however, after conducting this research I have noticed that there are more differences between the campuses than I had first realized especially in terms of the structure of the International Center on each campus. While I understand the differences between the two campuses, there are some ideas from PECU that I would like to explore at USD such as the Preview program and the Majors Abroad program. In addition to these unique and creative ideas, I also learned that USD is perhaps much more advanced in this initiative than our campus realizes. USD has made great strides in the last couple of years and I am looking forward to utilizing some of the lessons from this research to help move USD even further along in the journey towards comprehensive campus internationalization.

Growing up in a multicultural household I can say that I was engaged in international education my entire life. Due to the nature of my parents' work and their volunteer efforts, our home was always open to international visitors and I understood at a young age that the world is comprised of much more than my own neighborhood. I was certainly fortunate to have this type of education growing up and my good fortune continued into high school when I was able to first travel to Europe with one of my classes and then into college when I truly encountered formative change by participating in a semester abroad program in the Dominican Republic. That experience truly changed me and humbled me to my core.

My path has led me to work in international education and I have held a variety of roles so far in my career. I continue to learn something new about a place in the world every day. As an administrator I can now look back at my experiences abroad and recognize the foresight and the logistical plans that had to be in place in order for those experiences to have been as wonderful as they were. It is a surreal experience to be researching a topic so close to my heart for a doctoral dissertation but I know that it was my international experiences in life and the structured international programs I have been blessed to participate in that have led me to this point.

As the dawn of a new Presidency that promises change is upon the United States, and the need to understand the world and its citizens is so extremely urgent in this time of war, genocide and conflict, it is imperative that higher education institutions continue to offer students the opportunity to learn to be global citizens. Study abroad programs are one way to accomplish this imperative and they are just one small piece of campus

internationalization initiatives. The comprehensive nature of these initiatives is what should be expanded upon in the future within higher education. The idea of creating global citizens should be woven throughout the fabric of university campuses and may take on a variety of forms. The important thing to consider is that all students must be exposed to ideas, concepts, people, places and experiences that are completely different than what they have previously encountered. Moving from policy and rhetoric to actual practice of campus internationalization is essential for the betterment of the college student experience.

REFERENCES

Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3-4), 290-305.

American Council on Education. (1995). *Educating Americans for a world in flux: Ten ground rules for internationalizing higher education*. Washington, DC: Author.

American Council on Education. (2000). *Preliminary status report 2000: Internationalization of U.S. higher education*. Washington, DC: Author.

American Council on Education. (2006). *University presidents' summit on international education*. Washington, DC: David Ward.

American Council on Education. (2008). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: 2008 edition*. Washington, DC: Author.

Argyris, C. (1976). Leadership, learning, and changing the status quo. *Organizational Dynamics, 4*(3), 29-43.

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bolen, M. (2001). Consumerism and U.S. study abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 5*, 182-200.

Cash, R. W. (1993, May). *Assessment of study abroad programs using surveys of student participants*. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Chicago, IL.

Chan, W. Y., & Dimmock, C. (2008). The internationalization of universities: Globalist, internationalist and translocalist models. *Journal of Research in International Education, 7*(2), 184-204.

Christie, R. A., & Ragans, S. W. (1999). Beyond borders: A model for student and staff development. *New Directions for Student Services, 86*, 79-87.

Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program. (2005). *Global competence and national needs: One million Americans studying abroad*. Retrieved December 22, 2007, from http://www.nafsa.org/_/Document/_/lincoln_commission_report.pdf

Committee on Foreign Affairs. (2007, May 9). *Senator Paul Simon study abroad foundation act of 2007*. Retrieved December 22, 2007, from http://frwebgate.access. gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=110_cong_reports&docid=f:hr138.110.pdf

Donmoyer, R. (1990). Generalizability and the single-case study. In E. Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate* (pp. 175-200). New York: Teachers College Press.

Douglas, C., & Jones-Rikkers, C. G. (2001). Study abroad programs and American student worldmindedness: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Teaching in International Business, 13*(1), 55-66.

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

Egan, G. (1944). *Working the shadow side: A guide to positive behind-the-scenes management*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ellingboe, B. J. (1998). Divisional strategies to internationalize a campus portrait: Results, resistance, and recommendations from a case study at US universities. In J. A. Mestenhauser & B. J. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus* (pp. 198-228). Phoenix: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

Engle, L., & Engle, J. (2003). Study abroad levels: Toward a classification of program types. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 9*, 1-20.

Erikson, E. (1980). *Identity and the life cycle*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Fernandez, E. (2006). *Developing a global perspective during a study-term abroad*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.

Fitz, J. (1994). Implementation research and education policy: Practice and prospects. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 42*(1), 53-69.

Forum on Education Abroad. (2007, May). *The standards of good practice for education abroad*. Retrieved June 5, 2007, from http://www.forumea.org/standards-standards.cfm

Forum on Education Abroad. (2008). *Code of ethics for education abroad*. Retrieved February 1, 2008, from http://www.forumea.org/standards-index.cfm

The future of international education. (2004, September). *Recruitment and Retention, 18*(9), 3-4.

Gacel-Ávila, J. (2005). The internationalisation of higher education: A paradigm for global citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 9*(2), 121-136.

Gillespie, S. H. (2002). The practice of international education in the context of globalization: A critique. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 6*(3), 262-267.

Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Golay, P. (2006). *The effects of study abroad on the development of global-mindedness among students enrolled in international programs at Florida State University.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University.

Harris, M. S. (2007). From policy design to campus: Implementation of a tuition decentralization policy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 15*(16), 1-20.

Hendel, D. D., Horn, A. S., & 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.

Hopkins, J. R. (1999). Studying abroad as a form of experiential education. *Liberal Education, 85*(3), 36-42.

Ingraham, E. C., & Peterson, D. L. (2004). Assessing the impact of study abroad on student learning at Michigan State University. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10*, 83-100.

Institute of International Education. (2007, November). *Americans studying abroad.* Washington, DC: Deborah Gardner & Sharon Whiterell.

Institute of International Education (2008, November). *U.S. study abroad up 8%, continuing decade-long growth.* Washington, DC: Deborah Gardner & Sharon Whiterell.

Kauffmann, N. L., Martin, J. N., Weaver, H. D., & Weaver, J. (1992). *Students abroad, strangers at home: Education for a global society.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self.* Boston: Harvard University Press.

Kitsantas, A. (2004). Studying abroad: The role of college students' development of cross-cultural skills and global understanding. *College Students Journal, 38,* 441-453.

Kitsantas, A., & Meyers, J. (2002). *Studying abroad: Does it enhance college student cross-cultural awareness?* Educational Resources Information Center (ED 456 648).

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

Kotter, J. P., & Cohen, D. S. (2002). *The heart of change: Real-life stories of how people change their organizations.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Lambert, S., Nolan, R., Peterson, N., & Price, D. (2007). Critical skills and knowledge for senior campus international leaders: Findings of a delphi study of college and university senior international officers. *Report of the Task Force on Skills and Competencies of the NAFSA International Education Leadership Knowledge Community* (pp. 1-7). Washington, DC: NAFSA.

Laubscher, M. R. (1994). *Encounters with difference: Student perceptions of the role of out-of-class experiences in education abroad.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Lewis, L. K. (2000). Communicating change: Four cases of quality programs. *The Journal of Business Communication, 37*(2), 128-155.

Lewis, T. L., & Niesenbaum, R. A. (2005). The benefits of short-term study abroad. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 51*(39), B20.

Maher, M. J. (2003). Individual beliefs and cultural immersion in service-learning: Examination of a reflection process. *The Journal of Experiential Education, 26*(2), 88-96.

Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? *Educational Researcher, 17*(2), 13-17.

Mattoon, M.A. (1981). *Jungian psychology in perspective.* New York: The Free Press.

McLeod, M., & Wainwright, P. (2009). Researching the study abroad experience. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 13*(1), 66-71.

McMurtie, B. F. (2005). Study-abroad numbers rise. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 52*(13), A45.

Medina López Portillo, A. (2004). Intercultural learning assessment: The link between program duration and the development of intercultural sensitivity. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10,* 179-199.

Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Millington, T. V. (2002) International education is not a commodity. *Transitions Abroad Magazine, 25*(5), n.p.

Montrose, L. (2004). International study and experiential learning: The academic context. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10,* 1-15.

Myers-Lipton, S. J. (1996). Effect of service-learning on college students' attitudes toward international understanding. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(6), 659-668.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators.(2008a). *NAFSA's contribution to internationalization of higher education.* Internationalization Task Force. Washington, DC: Author.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2008b). *Strengthening study abroad: Recommendations for effective institutional management for presidents, senior administrators, and study abroad professionals.* Task Force on Institutional Management of Study Abroad. Washington, DC: Author.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2007). *Digest of education statistics* (NCES No. 2007067). Washington, DC: Thomas D. Snyder.

Olson, C. (2005). Comprehensive internationalization—From principles to practice. *The Journal of Public Affairs, 8,* 51-74.

Paige, R. M. (2003). The American case: The University of Minnesota. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 7,* 52-63.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Perry, W. G., Jr. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Piaget, J. (1975). *The development of thought: Equilibrium of cognitive structures.* New York: The Viking Press.

Pisano, R. H. (2007). *Transforming students through service in study abroad: A case study of an international service-learning program in Ecuador.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 8*(1), 5-23.

Pulaski, M. S. (1980). *Understanding Piaget.* New York: Harper & Row.

Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education,* 1(2), 248-270.

Rauner, J. S. (1995). *The impact of community service-learning on student development, as perceived by student leaders.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego.

Redden, E. (2007). Study abroad under scrutiny. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved September 10, 2008, from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2007/08/14/abroad

Rooney, M. (2002). Keeping the study in study abroad. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 49*(13), A63.

Ruther, N. L. (2002). *Barely there, powerfully present: Thirty years of U.S. policy on international higher education.* New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Sanders, I. T., & Ward, J. C. (1970). *Bridges to understanding.* Berkeley: The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

Schein, E.H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schemo, D. J. (2007a). In study abroad, gifts and money for universities. Retrieved January 5, 2009, from http://www.nytimes.com/2007/08/13/education/13abroad.html?_r=2&scp=1&sq=study%20abroad&st=cse&oref=slogin&oref=slogin

Schemo, D. J. (2007b). Study abroad is new focus of inquiry into perks. Retrieved January 5, 209, from http://www.nytimes.com/2007/08/16/education/16abroad.html?scp=3&sq=study%20abroad&st=cse

Schoorman, D. (2000). How is internationalization implemented? A framework for organizational practice. ERIC document No. 444-426.

Skelly, J. (in press). Fostering engagement: The role of international education in the development of global civil society. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship*. New York: Routledge.

Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 435-454). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Steffes, J. (2004). Creating powerful learning environments beyond the classroom. *Change, 36*(3), 46-50.

Taylor, J. (2004). Toward a strategy of internationalization: Lessons and practice from four universities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 8,* 149-170.

Tilstra,T., & Van Schiek, W. (1999). Coupling experiential education with practical service involvement. *The Journal of Experiential Education, 22*(1), 54-56.

Tonkin, H., & Quiroga, D. (2004). A qualitative approach to the assessment of international service-learning. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10*, 131-149

Trooboff, S., Cressey, W., & Monty, S. (2004). Does study abroad grading motivate students? *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10*, 201-217.

University of Delaware, University Archives. (1999) *UD Firsts*. Retrieved April 10, 2006, from http://www.udel.edu/Archives/Archives/firsts.html#FORSTUDY

U.S. Bureau of the Census (2000). *United States Census 2000 demographic profiles*. Retrieved January 5, 2009, from http://censtats.census.gov/data/PA/1604229808.pdf

Vande Berg, M. (2007). Intervening in the learning of U.S. students abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11,* 392-399.

Van Loon, R. (2001). Organizational change: A case study. *Innovative Higher Education, 25*(4), 285-301.

Weinberg, A. (2007, May). Quantity or quality in study abroad? *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved September 10, 2008, from http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2007/05/08/weinberg

Wilkinson, S. (1998). On the nature of immersion during study abroad: Some participant perspectives. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 4*, 121-138.

Wilson, A. (1993). Conversation partners: Helping students gain a global perspective through cross-cultural experiences. *Theory Into Practice, 32*(1), 21-26.

Woolf, M. (2007). Impossible things before breakfast: Myths in education abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3/4), 496-509.

Wortman, T. I. (2002). *Psychosocial effects of studying abroad: Openness to diversity.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Younes, M. N., & Asay, S. M. (2003). The world as a classroom: The impact of international study experiences on college students. *College Teaching, 51*(4), 141-147.

Appendix A
Email to Intended Telephone Interview Participants

Dear [*Participant Name*],

I hope that this email finds you well. Based on my correspondence with David Larsen I know that you were very involved in the internationalization initiative at your institution and David suggested that I contact you. As a current doctoral student at the University of San Diego, I am working on a dissertation entitled "Campus Internationalization Initiatives: From Policy to Practice". I am conducting an in-depth case study on your university as my research interest is in how your university has moved from a policy of internationalization to integrated practice of campus internationalization. I am particularly interested in the study abroad piece of the internationalization initiative.

I would like to invite you to participate in this research study by answering a brief set of questions (these questions are attached to this email). The purpose of these questions is to gain background information about the campus internationalization initiative at your institution and your role in it. Your answers as well as your decision to participate will be confidential; participation is completely voluntary and will not have any impact on your current place of employment. I hope you will be willing to answer these questions and help me with my dissertation research.

I will be visiting your campus during the week of October 26 – 31, 2008 and if you agree, I may ask you to meet with me in person to participate in an in-person interview. I anticipate that the interview will last approximately one hour and can take place on a day and time that are most convenient for you.

The information you provide will be very helpful and insightful to other administrators who are attempting to develop comprehensive internationalization programs. Please respond to this email or call me to let me know if you are willing and able to participate in this study. I have attached the consent form so that you can review more information related to this study. Please sign and return the consent form to me via fax (619-260-5924) or via email (kmendez@sandiego.edu). I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

Kira Mendez Espiritu
kmendez@sandiego.edu
619-260-8835

Appendix B
Questions for Campus Internationalization Initiative Study

Please answer questions and email the completed questionnaire to me at:
kmendez@sandiego.edu

Thank you for your participation!

1. Please briefly describe your position at the university.

2. Please describe the internationalization initiative and study abroad programming at Arcadia from your perspective.

3. What was your role in the initiative?

4. How were you chosen for this role?

5. Has the campus changed as a result of this initiative?

6. What factors do you feel facilitated and inhibited the implementation of the initiative?

7. Is there anyone else you think that I should speak with regarding the campus internationalization initiative?

Appendix C
Follow-Up Email to Intended In-Person Interview Participant

Dear [*Participant Name*],

I am writing to follow up with you regarding my request for your participation in my research study on campus internationalization initiatives. As I mentioned in my previous email (sent October 14), David Larsen suggested I contact you based on your role in the internationalization process. If you are willing and able to participate, I would greatly appreciate your time. I will be on the campus from October 23 through October 27 (mid-afternoon).

If you are interested in participating in this research project, please email me so that we can set up a convenient day and time for the interview. As detailed in my previous email the interview will last approximately one hour and will be conducted at a time and place convenient for you.

Your participation will greatly assist my research by providing key insights into the internationalization initiative process at the university. I look forward to hearing from you and hope to meet with you when I am in the area.

Kind regards,

Kira Mendez Espiritu
kmendez@sandiego.edu
619-260-8835

Appendix D
Interview Guide for In-Person Interviews

Thank you for agreeing to meet with me today. I really appreciate your willingness to participate in this research project. This interview will last approximately one hour and will be tape-recorded as I had mentioned to you in my initial email. My main goal for this interview is to get your perspective on how the internationalization initiative here on campus has come to fruition. This and additional information are contained in this consent form which I will ask you to review with me and, if you agree with the provisions outlined in the form, sign, before we begin the interview. REVIEW CONSENT FORM.

Grand Tour Question
1. Tell me about the internationalization initiative at your university.
   a. PROBE: What year did the internationalization initiative at your institution start?
   b. PROBE: What or who initiated the idea for the internationalization initiative? Board of Trustees, President? Ranking concerns?
   c. PROBE: Is this initiative a priority for the university leadership (rhetoric/financial/strategic plan/hiring decisions)?
   d. PROBE: Tell me about faculty involvement in the international initiative.
   e. PROBE: Has the curriculum been internationalized?
   f. PROBE: Tell me about the international opportunities for students (study/research/intern).
   g. PROBE: How are international students and scholars integrated into the campus?
   h. PROBE: How prominent is the international initiative portrayed across campus?

Specific questions related to informant
2. What was your role in the initiative?
3. How were you chosen for this role?
   a. PROBE: Your academic/research background? Your administrative position on campus?

Campus climate questions
4. How were campus constituents notified of the initiative?
5. What did you perceive the general reactions to the initiative to be?
   a. PROBE: Did the reaction vary among areas/departments?
   b. PROBE: Which areas/constituents were proponents? Which were inhibitors?
6. Tell me about the changed that happened on campus when you started the internationalization initiative.
   a. PROBE: Curriculum changes? Physical space? Hiring practices?

7. What evidence was collected to determine the impact of the internationalization initiative?
    a. PROBE: How was this evidence collected? Surveys? Interviews?
    b. PROBE: Whose support was important for the success of the initiative?
8. What did the evidence indicate about the internationalization initiative effort?
    a. PROBE: Were a list of measurable outcomes determined as part of the initiative? Did the evidence provide information that met or did not meet the intended measurable outcomes?
9. What factors facilitated and inhibited the implementation of the initiative?
    a. PROBE: Tell me about the resources (money, human, material) made available for starting the initiative.
    b. PROBE: Was there anything you needed but did not have access to?

Snowball Sampling
    10. Is there anyone else you think that I should speak with regarding the campus internationalization initiative?

Closing Conversation
Thank you for meeting with me today. It was very informative. My next step will be to transcribe this interview and begin to code the information and draft my analysis. If I have additional questions or need some more details, I hope it will be ok for me to contact you for a possible follow-up interview either over the telephone or in person. The follow-up interview will be no more than 30 minutes. Is there anything else you would like to add regarding the internationalization initiative on campus?

Appendix E
Research Participant Consent Form
Campus Internationalization Initiatives: From Policy to Practice

Kira Mendez Espiritu is a doctoral student in Leadership Studies at the School of Leadership and Education Sciences at the University of San Diego. You are invited to participate in a dissertation research project she is conducting for the purpose of exploring the campus internationalization initiative at your institution.

The study involves responding to some brief questions about your role with the internationalization initiative and one in-person interview that will go into more depth about the internationalization initiative on your campus. The initial set of questions will be sent via email and should be able to be answered in approximately 30 minutes. The purpose of the initial questions is to gain background information about the campus internationalization initiative at your institution and your role in it. The in-person interview will go into more depth and will also include some questions about the campus climate as well as factors that inhibited or enhanced the internationalization initiative. The in-person interview will last approximately one hour and will be conducted at a time and date convenient for you. I will be traveling to your campus to conduct in-person interviews. The interview can take place in a location convenient for you. In case any further explanation is required regarding any of your statements, you will be asked to provide an email address or telephone number for brief follow-up correspondence. If a follow-up interview is necessary, it will not last any longer than 30 minutes and will be conducted over the telephone. This follow-up interview will only be used to clarify points from the initial interview. Participation is entirely voluntary and you can refuse to answer any question and/or withdraw from the study at any time. Should you choose to withdraw from the study, no one will be upset with you and your information will be destroyed right away. If you decide to withdraw, nothing will change regarding your current employment or reputation with your previous employer. No one will know of your decision to either continue or terminate your participation in this study.

The information you give will be analyzed and will be kept confidential meaning that your real name will not appear on any of the study materials. All information you provide will remain confidential and locked in the researcher's office for a minimum of five years before being destroyed.

There is very minimal risk for mental anguish associated with this study and therefore no resources for outside counseling are deemed necessary. However, if you would like to talk to someone about your feelings, you can call the Philadelphia Office of mental Health at 1-215-685-5400. Remember, you can withdraw from this study at any time.

The benefit to your participation in this research study is that by sharing your experience of the internationalization initiative, you are helping to inform administrators and faculty at other campuses who are seeking to enhance the internationalization of their own campuses.

If you have any questions about this research, please contact Kira Mendez Espiritu at 619-772-5073 or via email at: kmendez@sandiego.edu. You may also contact Dr. Athena Perrakis at the University of San Diego at 619-260-8896 or via email at: athena@sandiego.edu.

I have read and understand this form, and consent to the research it describes to me. I have received a copy of this consent form for my records.

_____   _____
Signature of Participant   Date

_____   _____
Name of Participant (**Printed**)   Email Address of Participant

_____   _____
Signature of Principal Investigator   Date

Appendix F
Coding Checklist for Documents and Web Site

Main Categories:

Inhibitor
- -resources
- -fear
- -other schools in the area
- -motivation

Proponent
- -administrative support
- -resources
- -motivation

Constituent Role
- -President
- -Student Affairs
- -Faculty

Change Management
- -creating culture
- -communication

ITEM	INHIBITOR	PROPONENT	CONSTITUENT ROLE	CHANGE MGMT
Student Documents				
Parent Documents				
Faculty Documents				
Web Site				

Appendix G
Research Participants

Pseudonym	Role: Faculty/Administrator/Both
Brian	Faculty
Charles	Administrator
Donald	Both
Jane	Faculty
John	Both
Kelly	Administrator
Lisa	Administrator
Michael	Administrator
Nancy	Both
Robert	Administrator
Roger	Faculty
Steve	Both
Susan	Administrator