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ABSTRACT
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The purpose of this mixed methods study was to explore the perceptions and experiences of university administrators on stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning and implementation of internationalization at Mid-Western University (MWU), a public four-year university located in a Midwest state in the United States of America. It has been argued that there is a gap between the study of internationalization planning and implementation of those plans on college campuses (Childress, 2009). This study sought to fill this gap in the literature. A mixed methods study was utilized as a comprehensive way of studying the perceptions (Quantitative variable) and experiences (Qualitative variable) of participants at the subject university.

The researcher surveyed 80 university administrators to examine their perceptions of internationalization planning and implementation at MWU. The researcher then utilized nested and extreme case sampling to interview six administrators (three with low perceptions and three with high perceptions) to explore their experiences at MWU with internationalization.

A correlational study was performed to measure the relationship between internationalization planning and implementation practices at MWU. A strong positive correlation was found between internationalization planning and implementation practices \( r = .69 \). Also, many administrators on campus did not have knowledge or experience with internationalization planning practices on campus. A view that human and financial resources for internationalization efforts were limited was prevalent among administrators.
The researcher provided steps toward the development of comprehensive stakeholder involvement in planning and implementation processes to bring about the internationalization of MWU.

Keywords: Internationalization; Higher Education; Change; Stakeholder Involvement; Kotter's Change Model; Internationalization Planning; Mixed Methods
This work is dedicated to my beloved parents, father Rickie Lamont Scott and mother Mary Elizabeth Ratliff Scott for their dedication and passion for my personal and academic wellbeing. “Mommy”, you have been the voice in my head saying, you can do this, you have been blessed with gifts to complete this part of your life’s journey. Your love, patience, consul, and money have made this a reality, thanks. Rickie, the first time I told you I wanted to embark on this journey, you said to me, “make sure I get a copy of the degree, so I can put it on my wall”, your absolute belief in my ability to be successful has been a buoy to me when I questioned my own abilities. Rest in peace my friend!
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To the Rat Pack:
Lucia Ratliff, the perfect eternal companion for me, thank you. You are truly, the only reason I can say this degree is complete. Your kindness, patience, and love for the kids and I have been an example of sacrifice, and I am forever grateful, now it’s your turn!
B. M. R. aka M.M.M- Thanks for telling me I am not that bad of a dad even though I am gone a lot.
D.D.R. aka P.P- Your passion for life and no nonsense is a great example for me, thanks!
A.M.R. aka T.G- Your soft spoken nature and sweet spirit reminds me to be reverent, thank you buddy!
L.E.R. aka M.B- keep and the hugs and squeezes coming, I love them and you!

To colleagues and friends:
Dr. Reinhart, thanks for making room on your very full life plate for me and my work. I will always be more flexible and willing to serve because of your great example. Your insight and editorials into this process have been rigorous and kind. You have guided me through one of the most engaged academic experiences of my life, and I want to thank you.
Dr. May, your example of professionalism, and sincere care for my family makes you an eternal friend to us. I will never go to a grocery store again and not think, “Who can I help?” thank you for that blessing.
Dr. Ingle, thanks for the guidance through the course work and preliminary exams, and the introduction to the professorate.
I want to give a special thanks go to my committee members professor Patricia K. Kubow, associate professor Judy Zimmerman, and Dr. Rosemary Max for your fierce
support, important suggestions and remarks in this dissertation process. I know you are all involved in other ventures in life, but you still took the time to give me critical and insightful feedback, thanks friends!

Grooveshark.com, without you, the late night writing would have been impossible, thanks!

G and Phatz, thanks for all the love and FIFA 2010-2013.

E.B., Thanks for always reminding me I am still just the second smartest kid in the family.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background of the Problem</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internationalization</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose of the Study</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kotter’s Change Model</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual Model of Internationalization Planning and Processes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance of the Study</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitions of Terms</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delimitations and Limitations</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delimitations</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization of the Remaining Chapters</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>LITERATURE REVIEW</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purposes of Public Higher Education</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Education</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of change readiness at Mid-Western University .......................... 60
Quantitative Participants ........................................................................... 62
Qualitative Participants ............................................................................ 63

Instrumentation .......................................................................................... 64
Institutional Fingerprint Measure ................................................................. 64
Self-Developed Items .................................................................................. 66
Internationalization Planning and Implementation Survey (IPI) .................. 70
Qualitative Instrument ................................................................................. 71

Procedures .................................................................................................... 72

Research Questions ..................................................................................... 74
Quantitative .................................................................................................. 74
Qualitative .................................................................................................... 75

Data Analyses ............................................................................................... 75
Quantitative Strand ....................................................................................... 75
Qualitative Strand ......................................................................................... 80
Meta-Inference ............................................................................................... 80
Bracketing .................................................................................................... 81
Assumptions ................................................................................................. 84

CHAPTER IV. SURVEY RESULTS .................................................................. 85
Introduction .................................................................................................. 85
Descriptive Findings .................................................................................... 85
Demographics ............................................................................................... 85
Internationalization Planning Subscale .................................................. 87
Institutionalization of Internationalization Subscale................................................ . 88
Administrative Component Subscale........................................................................ 89
Internationalization of the Curriculum Subscale....................................................... 90
International Student and Scholars Subscale....................................................... ...... 91
Study Abroad Subscale............................................................................................. 92
Knowledge and Experience Items........................................................................ ..... 93
Values Items............................................................................................................... 94
Inferential Results....................................................................................................... 95
  Research Question #1............................................................................................. 95
  Research Question #2............................................................................................. 98
  Research Question #3............................................................................................. 99
  Research Question #4............................................................................................. 101
Qualitative Survey Results.......................................................................................... 102
  Planning Themes.................................................................................................... 103
  Implementation Themes......................................................................................... 103
Summary..................................................................................................................... 104
CHAPTER V. QUALITATIVE RESULTS...................................................................... 106
Results of Interviews................................................................................................. 106
  Participant’s Profile and Analysis........................................................................... 106
    Greg: Low perceptions of internationalization at MWU ..................................... 107
    Understanding of internationalization................................................................. 107
    Overall level of internationalization at MWU ..................................................... 107
    Six subscales of internationalization..................................................................... 108
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Low perceptions of internationalization at MWU</th>
<th>Understanding of internationalization</th>
<th>Overall level of internationalization at MWU</th>
<th>Six subscales of internationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Emergent Themes**

- Understanding internationalization
- Overall level of internationalization
CHAPTER VI. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction............................................................................................................... 131
Quantitative Questions.................................................................................... ........... 133
Qualitative Questions......................................................................................... 133
Meta-Inference of Results and Discussions.......................................................... ..... 133

Relationship between Stakeholder Involvement in Planning and
Internationalization........................................................................................................... 133
Differences in Perceptions of Stakeholder Involvement.......................................................... 135
Faculty Involvement in Internationalization Planning..................................................... 138
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tables</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Selected Literature Support for Internationalization Planning and Implementation Survey</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 IPI Scoring Scale</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Research Questions, Variables, and Data Analysis</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Demographics: Gender, Age, and Race and Ethnicity</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Demographics: Employment Classification, Education, and Years of Service</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Descriptive Statistics for Internationalization Planning</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Descriptive Statistics for Institutionalization of Internationalization</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Descriptive Statistics for Administrative Component</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Descriptive Statistics for Internationalization of the Curriculum</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Descriptive Statistics for International Student and Scholars</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Descriptive Statistics for Study Abroad</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Descriptive Statistics for Knowledge and Experience Questions</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Descriptive Statistics for Values Questions</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Descriptive of Subscale for Relationship between Internationalization Planning, Internationalization Measurement, and the Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Correlation Coefficients of Internationalization Measurement Subscales w/ Overall Stakeholder Involvement in Internationalization Planning</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Descriptive of Internationalization Planning Subscale in Relation to Overall Internationalization Measurement</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics for Stakeholder Involvement in Internationalization Planning and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ANOVA Results for Stakeholder Involvement in Internationalization Planning by Administrative Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics for Internationalization Measure, Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus, and Administrative Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ANOVA Results for Internationalization Measurement and Administrative Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Response Rates for Write-in Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Summary of Results by Research Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Summary of Demographic Background of the Interviewees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Overall Themes from Interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figures</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Internationalization Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sequential explanatory mixed methods design</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Globalization

Globalization can be defined as the interweaving of markets, technology, information systems and telecommunications systems to enable humans to reach each other faster, deeper, and cheaper than ever before (Friedman, 2005). Based on this understanding, an argument can be made for the need to develop greater homogenization of fundamental economic, political, cultural, and social components of life in order to develop this needed collaboration (Friedman, 2005). Globalization intensifies the need for and management of knowledge, ideas, and learning. Even though global forces are mediated through the local context, these forces shape local cultures, politics, and economies (Stromquist, 2007). Those local entities that remain largely unable to act effectively within the globalizing contexts are disadvantaged as never before. Kubow and Fossum (2007) suggest that the process of globalization is being used by those with power to negatively and positively influence the political and practical landscapes of education. Higher education is changing as a result of these positive and negative impacts of globalization. Institutions are utilizing the process of internationalization as a way to enhance the positive and limit the negative impacts of globalization. Internationalization is defined as any systematic effort aimed at helping higher education become more responsive to the demands of globalization (Keber, 2009). The international dimension of higher education is becoming increasingly important, diverse, and yet misunderstood. Therefore, it is important to examine internationalization in light of the changes and challenges that globalization places on higher education. Those who support globalization in higher education argue that the interconnected
nature of the world will lead to truth finding and resolution to social, economic, and cultural world issues (Altbach, 2007). Some researchers (de Wit, 1997; Foskett & Maringe, 2010; Knight, 2004) argue that such collaboration would prevent higher education from maintaining its individual identity. Birnbaum (1991) suggests that higher education institutions are naturally independent entities, and that extensive collaboration is not a likely outcome. As a result, globalization has been viewed as a negative force on higher education (Knight, 1997). According to Knight (1994), in order to account for the impact of globalization, higher education institutions are utilizing the process of internationalization to enhance the positive and limit the negative impacts of globalization on the academy.

**Internationalization**

Internationalization efforts are used to provide students and scholars with an environment where they understand the world and its issues more comprehensively in order to find creative ways to engage and solve those issues. Some suggest that internationalization has not been fully implemented in U.S higher education (Bryant & Sheehan, 2004; Olson, 2005; Ortiz, 2006). Welch (2002) argues that international dimensions of higher education are more difficult to achieve than Knight’s definition might suggest because of the transformational possibilities of internationalization of higher education; efforts have to be orchestrated collaboratively and come to be valued as an organizational change process. Green, Luu, and Burris (2008) suggest that internationalization is the conscious effort to integrate and infuse international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the ethos and outcomes of postsecondary education. In this definition, one can infer that the internationalization transformational prospect lies in a unique integration between the curricular and co-curricular components of higher education. This integration allows
students and scholars to create and implement learning outcomes to solve issues that universally impact the world (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008). Further definitions of internationalization will be explored in Chapter II of this study.

The benefits of internationalization should lead to a curriculum that promotes resolution of global economic and cultural problems (American Council of Education, 2002). Also, those involved in internationalization should develop an appreciation for an increasingly connected society, and the ideas, values, and cultures of those who inhabit the world (ACE, 2005). Skills to engage in a global economy should be developed in graduates of internationalized institutions (ACE, 2005). In contrast, it has been suggested that the lack of internationalization in U.S. higher education institutions will likely lead to decreases in the areas of international exchanges of students and scholars, international student and scholar satisfaction, internationalized curriculum, and domestic students studying abroad at U.S. institutions (American Council on Education, 2005; Hser, 2005; Kerber, 2009). Altbach (2007) further argues that the lack of internationalization planning and implementation of these plans in higher education leads to under-funded and under-supported initiatives that have negatively impacted globally oriented teaching and learning activities. Frequently, higher education leaders involved in internationalization activities at U.S. higher education institutions have not engaged in collaborative conversations about vision, goals, and strategies for campus-wide internationalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Childress, 2009; Knight, 2004). This lack of internationalization leadership at universities has been cited as a reason for its failing (Pandit, 2009). Childress (2009) argues the limited involvement of stakeholders in planning and implementation of internationalization plans has limited its impact in higher education. Stakeholder involvement is limited in organizations for many reasons. Engagement in change
initiatives can be time consuming, and may affect other core responsibilities of stakeholders (Demers, 2007). Also, change is an uncomfortable process, and stakeholders may limit engagement in order to avoid the uncomfortable feelings associated with change (Calabrese, 2002). Administrators with views that all change initiatives should be developed and implemented from a top down approach can limit stakeholder engagement (Burke, 2011).

Minimal human and financial resources are other major reasons for failed internationalization efforts (Hawawini, 2011). As a result, internationalization efforts are disjointed (NASULGC, 2004). The nature of these initiatives is negatively impacting the quality of teaching and learning for both students and scholars (ACE, 2002). The international dimension of higher education is becoming increasingly important, diverse, and yet misunderstood. Understanding the complexity of the internationalization of higher education is vital to combating the negative aspects of its previously fragmented implementation.

An examination of internationalization, in light of the changes and challenges that globalization places on American higher education is important. American universities have been transformed over the last decade under the pressure of rising operating costs and falling government support (Thelin, 2004). The lack of resources has forced universities to increase recruitment efforts to make up financial shortfalls through revenue generated by tuition dollars (Ehrenberg, 2012). The focus on financial resources has limited tactics to improving human resources and educational outcomes. As such, faculty development and learning outcomes have taken the back seat in U.S. higher education in order for institutions to dedicate resources to revenue generating initiatives (Thelin, 2004). American higher education has seen steady declines in traditional faculty teaching positions and globally competitive learning outcomes for students (Ehrenberg, 2012). American higher education is losing its global position as a higher
education academic elite because of the current fiscal focus (Giger, 1996). The comprehensive capacity of internationalization can impact the development of faculty and learning outcomes.

**Rationale**

Higher education is viewed as a public good and as such has seen an increase in enrollment (Duderstadt, 2009). This increase in enrollment has placed strains on the resources available for the day-to-day operations of institutions (Wiley, 2006). Public higher education institutions have found it difficult to balance educational responsibilities to students and scholars with the financial pressure of operating. The educational impact of this situation has been a diminishing of public higher education’s global competitive capacities in recent years (Ehrenberg, 2012). It is on this basis that advocates for public higher education have argued for a plan to invigorate public higher education with educational and organizational outcomes in order to become more competitive in the global higher education market. Researchers (Altbach & Knight, 2004; Hser, 2009; Kreber, 2009) suggest internationalization is a step in the right direction to assist public institutions in these efforts.

Internationalization as a practice provides specific policies and programs for institutions to cope with existing societal demands (Altbach, 2004). Internationalization practices allow public institutions to develop strengths in organizational culture and curriculum to meet and exceed global market demands. This development is based on a principle of collaboration between universities including resource exchanges (McCabe, 2001). As institutional curriculum and cultures are developed to focus on global components students and scholars are developing knowledge and skills to interact and improve society (ACE, 2005). Through collaborative conversations, internationalization provides creative ways for public higher education to meet some of society’s social, political, and cultural needs (Altbach, 2004). Internationalization of
public higher education can help institutions design plans to provide substantial access to higher education in some context (Altbach & Knight, 2004). In these ways public higher education can not only benefit from internationalization practices, but should aggressively seek out these practices to navigate current challenges.

To improve the global learning experiences of students and scholars, higher education institutions need to find an organized and purposeful approach to internationalizing (ACE, 2002). Limited understanding of internationalization has restricted institutions’ capacity to develop internationalization strategic action plans (Childress, 2009). This lack of planning has led to underuse of internationalization, which in turn leads to higher education institutions lacking in the many benefits of internationalization (ACE, 2002). Knight (2004) asserts that internationalization efforts can assist institutions in effectively reforming teaching and learning in an effort to achieve global understanding and practices. Planned internationalization efforts can lead to increases in an internationalized curriculum and student and scholar exchange at institutions (Olson, 2005). Qiang (2003) concludes that, “internationalization must be entrenched (emphasis added) in the culture, policy, planning and organizational process of the institution so that it can be both successful and sustainable” (p. 4). Childress (2009) suggests that higher education institutions view internationalization plans as a way to have a written commitment to internationalization. Collaborative internationalization plans provide a venue for stakeholders’ participation in internationalization planning and implementation (Childress, 2009; Olson, 2005). Stakeholders are those individuals who have vested interests or responsibilities in an organization (Knight, 1997). All of the aforementioned internationalization factors play a crucial role in increasing global awareness and understanding in the academy.
Childress (2009) asserts there is limited research that explores the relationship between the planning process and actual internationalization on campuses. The literature on the internationalization of U.S. higher education phenomena has traditionally been based on qualitative research methods. The objective of the proposed study is to utilize mixed methods of research in order to verify the findings of the existing literature, and explore the experiences of those involved in internationalization. The current body of literature is in need of further confirmatory and explanatory research to provide a holistic perspective on the internationalization planning and implementation processes (Childress, 2009). The framework used to explore this topic was Kotter’s change model. Therefore, this study will contribute empirical data to the exploration of the phenomena of internationalization planning and implementation.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the mixed methods study was to explore the perceptions and experiences of university administrators on stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning and implementation of internationalization at Mid-Western University (MWU), a public four-year university located in a Midwest state in the United States of America. This sequential mixed methods study was conducted utilizing two strands of research. A mixed methods study was utilized as a comprehensive way of studying the perceptions (Quantitative variable) and experiences (Qualitative variable) of participants at the subject university. This approach provided the researcher with a methodology to study a complex issue, and limited the weaknesses each of the individual methods had on their own. The first strand employed a quantitative component to quantify the perceptions the subject university’s administrators had about internationalization planning and implementation. The researcher surveyed administrators
from the subject institution on their knowledge of the participation level of stakeholders in the internationalization planning process.

Multiple independent variables were examined in relationship to the level of internationalization at MWU. The first set of independent variables measured the degree of stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning, and it has six quantitative subscales: (1) students; (2) faculty; (3) staff; (4) administration; (5) senior administrative leadership; (6) external constituents (Childress, 2009). The second independent variable assessed the variance of perceptions of internationalization among the administrative classifications (Senior Administrator, Academic Administrator, Professional Administrator, and Administrative Staff). The administrators were also asked to assess the effectiveness of the implementation of the internationalization efforts on their campus, which is the third independent variable.

The dependent variable of the study was the degree of implementation of internationalization efforts, and has five subscales: (1) Institutionalization of Internationalization; (2) Administrative Components; (3) Internationalized Curriculum; (4) International Students and Scholars; (5) Study Abroad. Subscale scores were calculated by determining the mean of the respective subscale items. In addition, an overall level was calculated based on the sum of the subscale means. The second strand of the study was qualitative in nature. The researcher interviewed administrators with low and high perceptions of internationalization based on their survey responses at the subject university. These interviews were conducted to examine the experiences of the participants regarding internationalization. Following separate analysis of both strands, the researcher developed a meta-inference to integrate both strands’ findings. This study fulfilled several research goals. First, a practical goal of this study provides international educators with strategies to better engage in the planning and implementation processes. In the
second goal, the researcher contributes to the limited research on the relationship between stakeholders’ involvement in planning and implementation of internationalization processes (Childress, 2009). Third, a personal goal for the researcher was to allow for a better understanding of the internationalization phenomena as a whole, including internationalization planning and implementation. The researcher’s motivation for this study was to assist in the development of an environment in U.S. higher education where students and scholars can develop the understanding and skills to improve society.

Research Questions

Quantitative

1. Is there a relationship between the perceived level of overall stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning and perceived level of internationalization at MWU?
2. Does specific stakeholder (Students, Senior Administrators, Faculty, Staff, Administrators, Alumni, and/or External Constituents) involvement in internationalization planning predict the level of internationalization at MWU?
3. Are there differences in the perceived level of overall and specific stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning based on administrative classification?
4. Are there differences in the perceived overall level of internationalization on campus based on administrative classification?

Qualitative

5. What are the experiences of administrators with low perceptions of the overall level of internationalization at MWU?
6. What are the experiences of administrators with high perceptions of the overall level of internationalization at MWU?

**Theoretical Framework**

This study was framed by John Kotter’s (1995) change model and the researcher’s conceptual model of Internationalization Planning and Process.

**Kotter’s Change Model**

Internationalization of higher education has become a popular strategy universities are using to prepare graduates to function in a greater globally interdependent society (Knight 2003; Qiang 2003). Graduates are required to have a variety of international components in their curriculum in order to develop new competencies to function effectively in a flattening world. Freidman (2006) suggests that a flattened world is a world where there is less difference in the knowledge, economic, and technological capacities among countries. So, graduates need to have skills and a knowledge base that will help them navigate this growingly similar and challenging society. The traditional approach of liberal learning in higher education is being challenged by this phenomenon of internationalization (Gumport, 2000). Learning for individual growth is now taking a back seat to skill and knowledge development in order to find answers to global issues (Altbach, 2004). As such, internationalization is viewed as a systemic change in higher education throughout the world (Agnew & VanBalkom, 2009). Some (Agnew & VanBalkom, 2009; Vaira, 2004) have suggest that because of the comprehensive impact internationalization can have on an institution, change has to be explored when considering the internationalization of higher education. Weick and Quinn (1999) explain that change is organizational events that occur because of the failure to create continuously adaptive organizations. Kezar (2001) suggests,
“Change is based on leaders, change agents, and others who see the necessity for change,” (pp. 33). Change leaders use facts and rational thought to accomplish their purposes (Burke, 2011). Successful change leaders create guiding coalitions to promote and sustain change initiatives (Calabrese, 2002). Effective change leaders will be able to communicate these rational thoughts to their constituencies leading to the development of a culture and practice to sustain a change initiative (Kezar, 2001). The use of organizational members and rational practices to promote change is core to the work of Kotter’s (1995) change model and the framework used in this study.

Dr. John Kotter, professor emeritus at Harvard University, for decades has studied how organizations try to redesign themselves into better competitors. The goals of these design efforts are always linked to finding ways to meet the changing demand of an increasingly diverse and sophisticated clientele. He has examined the efforts of those that have succeeded and failed in changing their organizations to become more competitive. In his book, Leading Change, Kotter writes about the strategies and practices of the few organizations that have successfully implemented comprehensive change initiatives (Kotter, 1996). His research is foundational for understanding recent change theories or practices in organizations (By, 2005). The rational and structured approach Kotter takes in exploring organizational changes allows it to be utilized in multiple disciplines including the study of higher education (Simpson, Marcdante, Duthie, Sheehan, Holloway, & Towne, 2000). Kotter suggests that the greatest lesson from his work on the change process is that change takes effort and a considerable amount of time (Kotter, 1998).

The foundation of Kotter’s model is shared responsibility in which leaders promote a shared reality and responsibility for change initiatives. Kotter explains that strong leaders find creative ways of linking organizational problems to constituents for resolution, leading to a
solution of major organizational challenges. This suggests that leaders and organizational members are integral in successful change processes. Kotter’s model also illustrates the interconnected nature of change, which makes the model ideal for the traditionally loosely coupled higher education system. Weick (1991) asserts that understanding higher education organizations as a loose coupling of players, rewards, and structures can better explain how these organizations adapt to needed change.

John Kotter (1996) created an 8-step change model explaining vital components to the change process. The steps are: create a sense of urgency, build a guiding coalition, develop a vision for change, communicate the vision, empower broad-based action, generate short-term wins, consolidate change and produce more change. He maintains that the change process should be relentlessly and rapidly followed until the vision is realized and permeates through the organizational culture.

Institutionalizing new approaches leads to full organizational acclamation to the new changed end state. It has been argued by researchers (Burke, 2007; Demers, 2010; Kezar, 2001) that U.S. higher education institutions are complex and rational organizations needing purposeful and regimented steps to implement any change. Kotter’s model provides a structured and rational approach to organizational change. Since internationalization is viewed as a change initiative for many higher education institutions, exploring change literature and Kotter’s model are significant to exploring the phenomena, and developing best practices around internationalization (Vaira, 2004).

**Conceptual Model of Internationalization Planning and Processes**

Based on the framework described above, this study proposes a conceptual framework to
better understand internationalization in a U.S. higher education context, as displayed in Figure 1. First, the stakeholders’ involvement in internationalization planning is crucial to the successful development of specific organizational plans. Second, the type and quality of internationalization efforts, designed by comprehensive stakeholders, plays a significant role in the internationalization of college campuses. Third, planning and implementation of internationalization are not only linked, but stakeholder participation in planning will predict the overall level of internationalization on campuses. Overall, the researcher argues that the higher the perception and experience of administrators in the internationalization process, the more likely the internationalization initiatives will have been comprehensively implemented and have had a positive impact on the college campus.

![Figure 1. Internationalization Conceptual Framework](image)

In light of Kotter’s work, the researcher proposes a conceptual model that presents the impact of stakeholder involvement on internationalization in U.S. higher education (Childress,
Kotter (1995) argues that the individuals involved in the planning and implementation of change efforts are the major factor in the success of the change. This model consists of three components. Component (A) represents the universities’ ability to involve an array of stakeholders (Students, Senior Administrators, Faculty, Staff, Administrators, Alumni, and External Constituents) in the development of internationalization plans to account for globalization in very institutionally specific ways. Component (B) embodies the outcomes (Institutionalization of Internationalization, Administrative Components, Internationalized Curriculum, International Students and Scholars, Study Abroad) that institutions experience due to internationalization on their campuses (Paige & Mestenhauser, 1999; Rodenberg 2011). The final component of this model, (C) suggests that stakeholder involvement in planning and implementation of internationalization are vital to predicting the Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus. This prediction is not suggesting causation, but rather it is directional in nature; with increased stakeholder involvement, an increase in the Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus will exist.

Figure 1 is a unique conceptual model as it has combined elements from internationalization and change literature (Agnew & VanBalkom, 2009; Altbach, 2004; Knight, 1997a, 1997b; Vaira, 2004). Also, the model suggests that stakeholder involvement in planning and implementation is related to the degree in which the university is internationalized. This model adds to the body of literature on the topic as it accounts for the planning and implementation phases of internationalization.

**Significance of the Study**

By using mixed methods to measure the relationship between stakeholder involvement and implementation of internationalization plans, the researcher intends to provide U.S. higher
education leaders with results that will inform internationalization practices. The data can be utilized to assist higher education leaders in formulating rational arguments for planning internationalization efforts. This study provides concrete information on the role of stakeholders in internationalization planning and implementation. This information would be vital in deciding which stakeholders are critical to the success of the effective implementation of internationalization plans. As this data is discovered, institutions may be able to find appropriate ways to plan and implement internationalization efforts that will deepen the internationalization of the curriculum. As a result, students and scholars will be able to explore the world in an interdisciplinary method geared at solving global issues. With these results, institutions may be able to decide how to best approach developing a framework for internationalization efforts.

**Definition of Terms**

The following are key terms and will be utilized consistently throughout the study.

*Academic Administrator* — faculty members who have administrative roles at the university.

*Administrators* — individuals who perform or manage administrative functions at the university.

*Administrative Components* — internationalization efforts that affect the administrative dimensions of the institution.

*Administrative Staff* — staff that provide administrative functions to support university administrators.

*Alumni* — a graduate of a college or university.

*An international dimension of higher education* — implies “a perspective, activity, or programme, which introduces or integrates an international/intercultural/global outlook into the major functions of a university or college” (Knight, 1999, p. 8).

*External Constituents* — individuals outside of the institution who collaborate with institutions...
for personal, institutional, or societal good.

*Globalization*— is “the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, or ideas across borders. Globalization affects each country in a different way due to a nation’s individual history, traditions, culture, and priorities.” (Knight, 1999, pp. 14).

*International Education*— educational approach to education that prepares participants to be active and engaged in an interconnected world.

*International Education Exchange* — the international movement of scholars and students.

*Internationalization of the Curriculum* — the process of integrating international and global dimensions and perspectives into the formal (structure, content, and materials) and operational (teaching and learning methods, grouping of students, place, and time) aspects of the curriculum (van der Wende, 2007).

*Internationalization of Higher Education* — the response to the impact of globalization, the process of adaptation (effect) to the changes caused by globalization, the re-orientation needed to cope with globalization. Internationalization and the definition of internationalization are context and content-specific (Knight, 2004).

*Institutionalization of Internationalization*— internationalization efforts that permeate all components of the university.

*Internationalization Planning* — plans that are higher education institutions’ written commitments to internationalization (Childress, 2009).

*International Scholar*— instructors and researchers who travel to a country different from their own for the purpose of research, service, and teaching in a tertiary environment.

*International Students* — those students who travel to a country different from their own for the purpose of higher education study.
International Student and Scholar— the role international students and scholars play in internationalization on campuses.

Professional Administrators — administrative staff with managerial roles to govern university operations.

Scholars/Faculty— university professionals who are engaged in research, teaching, and learning in the academy.

Senior Administrator — University managers with chief administrative responsibilities for university operations.

Stakeholder— person or group that has a direct or indirect interest in an organization.

Students— someone who attends an educational institution seeking academic pursuits.

Study Abroad— students and scholars pursuing academic and experiential learning in foreign countries.

Delimitations and Limitations

Delimitations

This mixed methods study explored the perceptions and experiences of university administrators regarding stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning and implementation at Mid-Western University (MWU). University stakeholders’ have had increased interest in internationalization efforts on their campus in the recent past. MWU has recently had presidential addresses, external consultants, and university conversations all exploring effective planning and implementation practices for internationalization on campus. All of these factors made MWU a rich research environment for exploring perceptions and experience with planning and implementation of internationalization at MWU. As a result of the researchers’ previous
experience with the subject institution there was increased access to survey and interview participants. The participants were restricted to administrators at MWU, so the findings do not reflect the perceptions of any other group on their campus. Researchers (Childress, 2009; Knight 1997a) suggest that university administrators are central to successful internationalization planning and implementation. They are core because of the administrative responsibilities they possess, and as a result can influence all phases of any change initiative in higher education, including internationalization.

Limitations

A limitation of the study was the necessity to develop an instrument that can assess both the level of stakeholder involvement in planning and the level of internationalization on a campus utilizing one survey. The length of the developed instrument, the Internationalization Planning and Implementation (IPI) survey, may have been a deterrent to participants’ completion. Out of the 576 administrators invited to participate in the study only 80 completed the survey leading to a response rate of only 14%. It is also important to note that all data collected was self-reported, so the researcher relied on the participant’s honest and truthful perceptions and experiences with internationalization for both strands of the study. The researcher only examined one institution. There are over 5,000 institutions of higher learning in the U.S. so it was not feasible for the researcher to connect with each one individually. The researcher limited the participants to institutional leaders who should have knowledge of participants in the planning process, and can assess the current level of internationalization on their campus. After piloting the instrument it was suggested that many non-international education administrators on campus will have limited knowledge and may be uncomfortable
with completing the survey because of their lack of knowledge and experience with the topic of internationalization. While exploring the institutionalization of a change initiative it was important that all administrators even those with limited knowledge and experience be involved in this campus wide examination of internationalization.

**Organization of the Remaining Chapters**

This study is organized into six chapters. Chapter II reviews the literature on internationalization planning and implementation. Chapter III explores the methodology of the research, data collection, data analysis, and procedures used in this study. Chapter IV presents the results and analysis of the quantitative data in the study. The results and analysis of the qualitative data in the study is gathered in chapter V. In conclusion, Chapter VI summarizes the findings and conclusions of both strands of the study.
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between levels of stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning and implementation of those plans in U.S. higher education. Another question that will be explored is whether there are vital stakeholders in the planning process for increased implementation of plans. Finally, this study will explore the relationships between institutional characteristics and level of internationalization implementation. This literature review provides a context for the proposed study and the foundation for exploring the aforementioned research questions. The literature utilized in this review was selected because of its direct connection to internationalization planning on U.S. college campuses. The vast majority of the literature explored in this review is based on U.S. studies. The author purposely chose this body of literature because the proposed study will be based on a U.S. institution. Also, traditionally, U.S. higher education internationalization efforts are institutional specific activities; whereas, in many international contexts the process has been performed at a state level due to cultural, economic, and social circumstances. While there is a wide range of literature on internationalization in a variety of industries, it is important to focus on literature specific to this phenomenon in the higher education industry because of the unique organizational oddities in higher education.

Topics addressed include: the purposes of higher education, globalization and internationalization, change in higher education, strategic planning, and implementation of internationalization efforts and plans. This chapter will close with a summary of the primary findings.
Purposes of Public Higher Education

U.S. public higher education’s original identity, like most of the world, was based on the British undergraduate colleges and German research universities (Eckel & King, 2004). Historically, the political values of the U.S. government, which included freedom of expression, states and individual rights, and religious freedom, informed the identity development of U.S. public higher education (Geiger, 1996). Higher education developed a core role in American society when it began to establish and maintain a range of institutions to protect these entities from the government and individual control. Public higher education began to educate citizens through a variety of methods focused on research and teaching. The goal of this learning was to promote an understanding of “truth” and individual development (Strauss, 2003). In order to account for the growing demand of its services a variety of types of institutions were developed. The 20th century brought about economic and social changes in the U.S. which placed higher education into the role of the primary gateway to the middle-class. Groups that had been traditionally excluded from this inroad now had access to learning and training. This access as well as economic changes provided great challenges for public higher education, the greatest challenge being to redefine its role in society as a venue for economic and social change in the country. As a part of the changing landscape of public higher education, the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 was legislated. This legislation provided the U.S. Public higher education system with more higher education institutions to meet the growing demand (Geiger, 1996). These institutions focused more on agricultural, commercial, and industrial training dedicated to enhancing the U.S. economy (Thelin, 2004).

Since then, public higher education has seen a substantial increase in enrollments over the last 20 years (Wiley, 2006). Between 1995 and 2005, total enrollment at public 4-year
institutions grew by more than 1 million students (Hemelt & Marcotte, 2011). Some view public higher education’s major purpose as educating and developing a learned citizenry (Barnett, 2004). Those of this opinion are known as educational traditionalists. Vocationalists assert that public higher education should train citizens to interact with society for economic development of the students and the public. Also, parents and their children believe that post-secondary education is a prerequisite for obtaining a quality job in the future (Wiley, 2006). For the purposes of brevity and focus of the review of literature, the topics of liberal and vocational education will be explored as two of the core positions in redefining the purpose of public higher education in the U.S.

**Liberal Education**

Researchers (Barnett, 2004; Carr, 2009; Winch, 2002) argue that there are two major camps in defining the purpose of public higher education. First, the traditionalists assert that public higher education’s major purpose is to provide a liberal education and promote the discovery of “Truth” through research and teaching. From this perspective, liberal education should have three main characteristics: (1) this education should involve an introduction into forms of knowledge and understanding to attain truth; (2) the exploration should also be comprehensive enough to avoid narrow vocational emphases; and (3) the experience should provide learners an understanding of meaningful connections between knowledge, explanation, and truth (Carr, 2002). The goal is to create a well-rounded engaged citizen. Traditionalists believe that higher education has lost its bearings over time, and is too focused on training its participants to engage in the world of work (Carr, 2002). While higher education has responded to the appeals of the information economy, accountability, and efficiency, it has lost its “truth seeking” identity (Barnett, 2004). Traditionalists suggest this is an issue because higher
education has traditionally been one of the few venues that provides space for discursive expressions of opposition to many of these economic, political, social, and cultural driving forces that are now dictating their identities. Strauss (2003) asserts that knowledge and understanding of the liberal learner is in danger of being eliminated by the seemingly more alluring and forceful professional or vocational oriented education.

**Vocational Education**

Those in support of a vocationally oriented learning experience in public higher education suggest that the university is changing and what worked in the early days of the academy may be outdated (Barnett, 2004). They argue that formal education and training is extremely vital to learning, but they contend that learning takes place in a variety of settings. These settings involve a broad range of emotional and cognitive experiences that occur throughout life, taking place in the formal university setting, as well as outside of the university. Vocationalists understand that knowledge and learning are central to all forms of education, and that just focusing on “Truth” is one-sided in the paradigm of learning. They suggest that higher education has to adapt to the user centered attitude of its modern day learners (Winch, 2002). As a result of globalization, the knowledge economy has become a reality in higher education (Barnett, 2004). Learners are seeking this knowledge to receive social and economic benefits along with traditional learning (Domask, 2007). Saltmarsh (2011) argues that society as a whole needs to have a higher education system that is job market oriented in order to maintain a healthy economy. This perspective on higher education is not just focused on the individual development, but also societal needs. Federal, state, and local entities are developing quality measures and other procedures to both monitor and set benchmarks for universal academic standards. A challenge has been to measure learning outcomes, while more tangible outcomes
like job placement rates are more accessible. Vocationalists assert that to remain an essential venue of learning in the country, higher education has to find ways to meet the growing demands of society (Winch, 2002). The issue of Globalization has only broadened the complexity of these arguments. To account for the challenges of globalization, institutions have sought to explore internationalization efforts.

**Globalization and Internationalization**

Globalization is generally thought about in the world in an economic context (Porter & Vidovich, 2000). Kubow and Fossum (2007) argued that globalization influences economic, informational, and cultural aspects of education, which do not always account for a local context. As such, the changes made in curriculum and pedagogy do not always reflect the values and beliefs specific to the cultures in which the changes are made. The result is a dichotomy between local and global educational contexts (Kubow & Fossum, 2007). The great challenge for education is to find ways to account for the local context while maintaining a desire to solve global issues. Globalization has transformed the way the world views and values higher education. The recent financial crisis throughout the world has placed fiscal strains on higher education relevance in society. As such, higher education has had to become more aware of the social, educational, and economic global concerns. McCabe (2001) explains that one of the greatest challenges to improving the international dimensions of higher education is the lack of consistently agreed upon definitions of globalization and internationalization, which has led to a misunderstanding of the benefits and drawbacks of globalization. Stromquist (2002) suggests that globalization is the way in which the world develops social and economic unity. Kugler (2006) explained that the development of an increasingly integrated global economy, trade, capital, and labor markets are globalization. Like these definitions, many are seen as too focused
on economic components since the world is more complex than just one industry (Altbach & Knight, 2007). A popular definition is that of Thomas Friedman (2005), who defines globalization as the interweaving of markets, technology, information systems, and telecommunications systems in a way that is shrinking the world, and enabling humans to reach around the world farther, faster, deeper, and cheaper than ever before. For the purpose of this study the author will utilize Friedman’s definition because of its universal applicability.

Globalization promotes productivity, collaboration, and economic development throughout the world (Kugler, 2006). Friedman also asserts that globalization provides increased productivity and standard of living. This progress is accomplished by the sharing of technology, information, and resources through social, economic, and human venues. The foundation of all of these benefits is that people need to be willing to work together to improve and resolve societal needs (de Vijlder, 2001). While there are obvious benefits of globalization, Walker (2009) asserts that the drawbacks of globalization are frequently overlooked. Walker’s (2009) major concern with globalization of higher education is that business and government will seek to streamline and commercialize the university to meet the new global economy’s needs. The highly diverse nature of globalization may prevent poor citizens from participating in this new economy because they lack the resources to be trained to participate. Also, cultural intermingling that promotes sharing of traditional behaviors may actually cause them to fade as cultural and social boundaries are disappearing (Friedman, 2005). The most cited argument against globalization is that industrialized countries will continue to maintain economic power, while poor nations will fall further behind because of the lack of technology and resources to collaborate with richer nations. For better or for worse, globalization is a reality, and as Altbach
and Knight (2004) explain, society has decided that higher education has a responsibility to train adults to participate in the new global economy.

Researchers (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Childress, 2009; Knight, 2004; McCabe, 2001) have argued that globalization is already changing higher education in the U.S. These authors explain that with the increased stream of information, higher education has an increased responsibility to assist global citizens in critically examining and thinking through this new stream of information. This increase of information has brought to the forefront economic, social, and cultural issues that need immediate global attention. Universities have to find ways to account for all of these global issues.

Defining Internationalization

Internationalization in the business world is the process of planning and implementing products and services to be adapted to local context (Johanson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 1975). In educational context the term has a different meaning. In higher education, institutions are utilizing the process of internationalization as a means of enhancing the positive and limiting the negative impacts of globalization (Qiang, 2003). Knight (1997) writes:

Globalization is the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, ideas . . . across borders. Globalization affects each country in a different way due to a nation’s individual history, traditions, culture and priorities. Internationalization of higher education is one of the ways a country responds to the impact of globalization yet, at the same time respects the individuality of the nation (p. 23).

According to Kerber (2009), traditional internationalization refers to “any systematic, sustained effort aimed at making higher education (more) responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy and labour markets” (p. 2). Friedman
(2005) argues for an increase in globally aware and savvy workers. Higher education is the venue for training this globally astute workforce (Altbach, 2007).

Internationalization efforts are an institution’s response to the effects of globalization. Taking an even broader lens on internationalization, Knight (2004) argues that internationalization of higher education refers to “the process of integrating an international intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution” (p. 2). The term *process* is used to convey that internationalization is an ongoing and continuing effort. International, intercultural, and global dimensions are used together to reflect the wideness of internationalization efforts. The concept of integration is specifically used to denote the process of infusing or embedding the international and intercultural dimension into policies and programs (Knight, 2004). Purpose, function, and delivery are included to make it clear that teaching, research, and service are integral to internationalization efforts on college campuses. Delivery refers to offering education courses and programs either domestically or in other countries. Qiang (2003) supports the idea of integration inherent in Knight’s definition, concluding that “internationalization must be entrenched (emphasis added) in the culture, policy, planning and organizational process of the institution so that it can be both successful and sustainable” (p. 4). Because of the transformational possibilities of internationalization, the efforts must be designed collaboratively and be valued as an organizational change process. Ninnes and Hellstén (2000) argue that the dichotomist approaches between globalization and internationalization is false, and that internationalization and globalization are entangled with, rather than distinct from each other. They suggest that the goals of both processes are to engage individuals in activities and conversations to improve a globalized world.
The Benefits of Internationalization in Higher Education

Internationalization, within the context of higher education in the U.S., is an organized approach by higher education to account for the opportunities in a globalized society while seeking to limit the negative impacts of these opportunities and challenges (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008; Kerber, 2009). Internationalization is key to developing a globally aware workforce including students and scholars (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Childress, 2009; Knight, 2004). Researchers (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008; Green & Olson, 2003,) argue that the types of internationalization efforts have a dramatic effect on the overall level of internationalization on campuses. Some of these efforts are described as the internationalization of the curriculum, international student and scholar recruiting, study abroad, and training of students, staff, and faculty to work with diverse people (Hser, 2005). As a result of these experiences, recruitment and retention of students and scholars can be improved on campuses (Knight, & de Wit, 1999).

The rationale driving internationalization has four components: social/cultural, political, academic, and economic (Knight, 2004). Researchers (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Childress, 2009; Knight, 1994, 1997a, 2004) who have written on these four aspects have stressed the nation’s lack of readiness at a time when our effectiveness depends on a globally competent citizenry. In 2002, the American Council on Education created a report on the focus of the aforementioned four groups (social/cultural, political, academic, and economic). They suggested that U.S. higher education internationalization efforts should (1) produce international experts with the knowledge to address national (economic, cultural, and educational) needs; (2) strengthen the U.S.’s ability to solve global problems, and (3) develop a globally competent citizenry and workforce. The ACE report outlines strategies for achieving these objectives and calls for a partnership among educational institutions, the federal government, state and local governments,
and the private sector. U.S. colleges should use traditional internationalization to provide international and cross-cultural perspectives for their students and to enhance universities’ learning and teaching purposes. Internationalization initiatives include study-abroad experiences, curriculum enrichment, international studies, strengthened foreign-language instruction, and sponsorship of foreign students and scholars to study on U.S. campuses (Altbach & Knight, 2007). Traditional internationalization is rarely a profit-making venture even though it may enhance the competitiveness, prestige, and partnerships of the colleges (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) convened a task force on International Education (2004). This task force designed a rationale for internationalization in terms of students, higher education institutions, communities, and the nation and explained the impact of internationalization upon each. For students to succeed in the world they must have knowledge of the world, its people, politics, and cultures. The taskforce felt that, more importantly, students must develop the skills to understand, analyze, and evaluate that knowledge (NASULGC, 2004). Internationalization provides college campuses with environments that prepare students to live and function productively in economically, socially, and culturally diverse environments. If internationalized students are able to move comfortably in many different cultures, they will have a greater capacity to solve global issues. The NASULGC (2004) report explained that attracting the best research minds and encouraging collaborative scholarship not only benefits our national competitiveness, but it also strengthens U.S. college campuses.

Internationalization fosters faculty scholarship, enhances research, and improves the perceptions of institutions. In reference to how internationalization can develop stronger
communities, NASULGC (2004) suggests that U.S. educators share their models for working on local challenges with colleagues around the world. When educators engage with colleagues, these partnerships can lead to added benefits for the institutions and communities involved. The report also explains how “internationalization connects local communities to the world,” helping the local communities gain access to economic, social, and cultural resources (NASULGC, 2004). In a post-9/11 world, political relationships, demographic pressures, changes in technologies and global interdependence are changing our perceptions on the world, and the world’s view on the U.S. Individuals who have foreign language expertise, an understanding of diverse cultures, and the ability to think critically within a global context are going to be key in improving and developing worldwide relationships (NASULGC, 2004). The case for internationalization is compelling when viewed from a globalization perspective. The complexity of internationalization is not whether to internationalize, but rather how campuses will develop strategies and tactics for internationalizing. Universities have a variety of stakeholders, and will likely have different goals and rationales for internationalizing. Some will be more focused on academic, economic, foreign, or social goals. These rationales may be complementary or contradictory, so without collaborative discussions involving all stakeholders, their diverse rationales may inadvertently cause them to work at cross-purposes (Olson, 2005).

**The Change Process in Higher Education**

Traditional higher education institutions are now facing major organizational changes as a result of globalization (Agnew & VanBalkom, 2009). These changes are challenging the organizational and structural forms of higher education requiring organizational nimbleness that has not existed in U.S. higher education (Kezar, 2002). Higher education institutions are lagging behind in change readiness to meet the growing demands of an interconnected society (McRoy &
Gibbs, 2009). Studying the change in higher education is a way to minimize the occurrence of conflict between existing and emerging institutional priorities, structures and processes (Agen & VanBalkom, 2009). External and internal factors that disrupt the existing organizational environment challenge the structures of that environment (Burke 2011; Demers, 2007). This organizational conflict limits progress and successful change efforts (Bartell 2003). Organizational dissidence limits the possibility of effective internationalization (Agnew & VanBalkom, 2009).

Agnew and VanBalkom (2009) sought to measure the readiness for internationalization change at two U.S. higher education institutions. Their study involved primarily qualitative methods of data collection. The authors performed the following analysis on two institutions of higher education. Institution A was a public university, while institution B was a private university. Both of the institutions had high research activity, which includes institutions that awarded at least 20 research doctoral degrees during the update year (excluding doctoral-level degrees that qualify recipients for entry into professional practice, such as the JD, MD, PharmD, DPT, etc.) (Carnegie Foundation, 2011). At the micro level, the methodology called for focus groups with faculty members and other university staff.

Individuals, both internal and external to the institution, were interviewed to construct meaning from the symbolic expressions of the organizational culture. This process included formal statements of mission and values as well as more subtle content and patterns of communication, budget allocations, celebrations, stories of achievements, and heroes.

Agnew and VanBalkom (2009) found institution A created a false dichotomy in adopting the belief of an ‘either/or’ choice of engaging in international efforts. This false dichotomy was further illustrated by this institution’s espoused mission of serving the local community and by a
lack of resources to support international activities. Institution B’s Jesuit mission of faith, leadership and service fostered a sense of identity promoting internal alignment of values between the espoused values (mission) and service, acting as a strong driver for internationalization. Institution B had a strong and externally oriented culture, sharing the same values, beliefs and attitudes. Institution A had a weak and internally oriented culture, experiencing discrepancies in values, beliefs and attitudes. This finding revealed misalignment in institution A’s mission. This misalignment, or cultural disconnect, resulted in falling short of meeting its own goals related to internationalization. Institution A’s university leadership considered it unlikely that urban students with many local issues would care about global problems. Institution A focused their resources on local issues. Institution B’s senior leadership understood that not all students desired the study-abroad experience. This knowledge resulted in an emerging internationalization policy calling for different international experiences which served different purposes to meet the diverse needs of students. The authors explained one of the key insights gained from the study was that senior administrators needed to connect the constituent needs to the organizational values, belief, and practices in order to have an organizational structure ready for implementing internationalization efforts.

**Strategic Planning**

Internationalization requires planning that is strategic, constant, and collaborative in purpose (Childress, 2009). An overview of general strategic planning is needed to further explore the role that planning plays in internationalization of U.S. higher education. The strategic planning process provides a road map to lead an organization from where it is currently operating to a desired end state (Burke, 2010). The purpose of Strategic planning is varied and multilayered. Mintzberg (1992) argues the major purpose of planning is to solve major problems
in the organization. Kotter (1995) argues that having comprehensive stakeholder involvement in strategic planning is core to the process. He asserts that these stakeholders can provide comprehensive feedback and build consensus within the organization, promoting a sense of trust between management and staff. Mintzberg (1990) suggests that strategic planning should clearly define the purpose of the organization and create realistic goals to attain that purpose. Communicating those goals and the purpose to the organization’s constituents is key. Kotter (1995) explains that developing a guiding coalition to help discursively share these goals is critical to developing a sense of ownership of the plan (Kezar, 2001). Another important component of strategic planning is its ability to provide organizations with a base from which to measure and establish change. These changes are said to provide a clearer focus for the organization, thereby producing more efficiency and effectiveness. The role of planning is important to organizations in general, but since internationalization of higher education is very complex, exploring the intricacy of it is needed to better understand the process.

**Kotter’s change model.** As it has already been discussed, internationalization challenges the current paradigm of U.S. higher education (Gumport, 2000). In order to implement a change effort of this magnitude, a comprehensive but uncomplicated strategy has to be developed for effective implementation. The change model of John Kotter is broad in nature and simple, so it provides a direct approach to the complex characteristics of internationalization in higher education.

John Kotter (1995) in his book, *Leading Change*, identified several key barriers to change initiatives within an organization. These barriers include not establishing a great enough sense of urgency, not creating a powerful enough guiding coalition, lacking a vision, under communicating the vision, not removing obstacles to the new vision, not systematically planning
for and creating short-term wins, declaring victory too soon, and not anchoring changes in the organizational culture. Kotter then created an eight-step change process to navigate these barriers.

The first step in Kotter’s leader-centric model is to establish a sense of urgency. Kotter and Rathgeber (2006) assert that the most meaningful way to engage organizational members is by motivating them to take action. This engagement includes gathering data and support from external constituents to illustrate the need for change, and also creating open dialogue among organizational members to get them talking and thinking about the needed change. According to Kotter (2008) organizations frequently miss this first step in the change process leading to uninspired and unchanged organizations. As Schein (1985) also asserts, as constituents are engaged in a change idea they become an actable part of the organizational culture.

Forming a powerful, guiding coalition is the second step in Kotter’s Model. To pursue successful change, leaders need to identify the other visible leaders within the organization to collaborate around a change initiative (Kotter, 2007). These coalition members should be respected figures in organizational areas such as status, title, skill level, etc. (Kotter 1995). Davison and Martinsons (2002) suggest that decisions on the guiding coalition should depend on the type of changes and the organizational cultural. Leaders should organize a team that can be constructive with feedback, synergistic in nature, and trustworthy (Kotter, 1996).

The third step in the change model is creating a change vision. Kotter suggests (1995) leaders should work with the change team to establish a change strategy and vision. This team is integral in this phase of the model because they can provide insight on strategies for implementing the change vision. A key principle to this model is creating a concise vision that can be articulated in less than five minutes (Kotter, 1996). Galpin (1996) asserts that this step in
the change process is valuable because it provides all stakeholders with a road map for the proposed change.

Communicating the vision is the fourth step in Kotter’s model. After the vision has been collaboratively developed, communicating that vision clearly to the organization is a major priority for the leadership team. This discursive effort requires a sequential and purposeful approach by members of the guiding coalition to share the vision (Burke, 2011). The coalition members should share the vision often so that it becomes a part of organizational language (Kotter, 2007). Leaders should also be listening to organizational members for feedback on the vision. Kotter explained, “Two-way communication is always more powerful than one-way communication” (Kotter, 1996, p. 90). Leaders should be using this step as a way to set an example of behaviors to exemplify the needed change. This is also the time to connect the change vision to the day-to-day operations of the organization (Kotter, 1996). Sidorko (2008) argues that these four steps are the preparation phase for enacting the change initiative.

The fifth Step in Kotter’s model is empowering others to act on the vision. The execution of the change vision happens at this point. This step provides change leaders with the opportunity to find creative and motivated organizational members to operationalize the change vision. This is done by providing incentives for those who understand the vision to find ways to implement the vision in the everyday operations of the organization. This is an opportunity to acquire new change agents to add to the team and push the change initiative forward. Leaders also identify organizational members and systems that are obstacles in the way of the change vision, and find ways to limit these hindrances. The guiding coalition in this stage is seeking feedback from as many people as possible within the organization to assess the change vision and organizational receptivity.
The sixth step in Kotter’s model is to plan for and create short-term wins. Leaders should identify the change behaviors that are achievable, and promote those throughout the organization. This step is a way for leaders to create fast momentum changes by making smaller changes that are visible to the entire organization. Kotter (2007) said, “Without short-term wins, too many people give up or actively join the ranks of those people who have been resisting change” (p. 7). This step allows people to get a feel for success, and create an environment for sustainable change. Recognizing and rewarding change agents that contribute to improvements are vital to this step.

Kotter’s seventh step is to consolidate improvements and produce more change. Sustainable change requires persistence, patience, and assessment. Kotter (2007) urges organizations not to declare change victory too soon. He warns that until the change is truly embedded in the organizational culture, which can take five to ten years, leaders have to constantly work with coalition members to drive the efforts in the organization. This means the organization needs to cycle through steps three through six continually. Kotter is a proponent of establishing a reporting system on the important change vision targets. He suggests when change components are realized the organization needs to assess what worked and what did not.

The final and eighth step in the Kotter model is to anchor change in the organizational cultural. Kotter (2007) asserts organizational cultural change occurs when behaviors are connected to the social norms, values, and beliefs of the organization. There are two key factors in maintaining change; first, leaders have to show members of the organization that the new approaches, behaviors, and attitudes have improved the organization, and second, future leaders in the organization must embody the newly changed culture (Kotter, 2007). Creating policies, rewards, and dialogue that will reinforce the values of the change is important to this final step.
Peter Sidorko (2008) examines an organizational change process through Kotter’s change model in the library of an Australian university. A qualitative case study of the University of New Castle’s library organizational change initiative to better collaborate its efforts with the information technology, teaching and learning skills support, educational technology and class room service utilized John Kotter’s eight step approach. Sidorko (2008) found that the urgency for change was dictated by the Vice-Chancellor and provided tangible outcomes to assist in the change. Teams from all areas collaborated to find ways to integrate the needed changes in the libraries. Sidorko (2008) found that short term wins were overlooked because of failures in a virtual team idea that had been implemented. He also found that limited assessment on the integration of service changes prevented the organization from establishing indicators of success. The author concludes that the successful outcomes from the change processes owe credit to Kotter’s model for organizational change. The author explains that the library did not use all the steps of the model because of institution wide changes that took place. Sidroko (2008) argues Kotter does not account for factors that may interrupt the change initiative. As a result, like others (Appelbaum, Habashy, Malo, & Shafiq, 2012) he suggests that Kotter’s model is limited in its cyclical and rigid nature. Sidorko also asserts that because of the expansive nature of the model it is difficult to assess the effect all the components have on change initiatives. Although he does assert that it is useful in change initiatives under the watch of skillful leaders.

Challenges of Kotter’s model. All theories and models have strengths and weaknesses. Kotter’s model is no exception. As mentioned earlier, Appelbaum, Habashy, Malo, and Shafiq (2012) assert that Kotter’s model had some challenges. First, Appelbaum et al. (2012) explains Kotter’s model was a rigid approach to change. Based on literature they reviewed, it was found that change is usually not successful if the change process does not align with organizational
culture. They assert, “Where such prescriptions run counter to the organization’s culture, they will be either ignored or be ineffective” (Appelbaum, Habashy, Malo, & Shafiq, 2012, p. 775).

Second, some change initiatives do not require all the steps in the model. For example, changes that have fixed outcomes might not need Steps 7 and 8 in the model. Appelbaum et al. (2012) also argue that the model is not clear on how managers handle resistance to change and commitment to change. They suggest the model would be strengthened with some clear practices for managing different components of the model.

Sustained and effective change occurs over time through efforts to alter the structural and cultural framework that holds the institution together. These changes are not easily reached. A comprehensive and structured model like Kotter’s can assist organizations in change efforts. While some of the steps in this model will need to connect to very specific organizational contexts, the model provides a collaborative approach to change that gives organizations input that will allow them to personalize Kotter’s model (Graetz & Smith, 2010). In summary, Kotter’s model indicates the necessity of collaboration and communication for change to be consistent throughout an organization. This model is congruent with the findings of major internationalization literature (Childress, 2007; 2009; Hser, 2005; Knight, 1997). As a result, Kotter’s model aligns well with this study of internationalization.

**Internationalization Strategic Planning on U.S. College Campuses**

Strategic planning is core to any change effort. The complex nature of internationalization makes planning an important and vital component to these change initiatives. Researchers (Childress, 2009; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Edwards, 2007) have argued that collaboration is a focal point of effective internationalization efforts. Internationalization plans serve as a core method of actualizing these efforts. According to Childress (2009), “An
internationalization plan serves as (a) a roadmap for internationalization, (b) a vehicle to develop buy-in, (c) a mechanism for explaining the meaning and goals of internationalization, (d) a medium for interdisciplinary collaboration, and (e) a tool for fund-raising” (p. 289). The process used to develop these plans is instrumental in their future success. Childress (2009) asserts collaboration should be entrenched in internationalization efforts. First, she explains that support from top administration emerges as a critical factor in long term sustainability of internationalization plans. She also suggests campus wide taskforces are instrumental in the development of a plan since taskforces promote shared responsibility for internationalization efforts. In essence, these taskforces serve as organizational mechanisms that facilitate the involvement of the campus community throughout institutions in the development of internationalization plans. Childress (2009) explained of participants that “their provosts charged a taskforce, which was comprised of faculty, administrators, students, and in some cases trustees, with the explicit task of developing a distinct internationalization plan or developing an internationalization section of the institution’s strategic plan” (Childress, 2009, p. 298).

Stakeholder involvement is so important because with the input of stakeholders, personalized institutional plans can be developed.

Dewey and Duff (2009) assert that campus members have to collaborate to create campus-wide support for the success of internationalization initiatives. Kreber (2009) suggests that effective leaders understand the motivations of their stakeholders as they work to build coalitions and channel their energy into mutually supportive action toward internationalization. Childress (2009) found that non-collaborative efforts eventually required institutional support, so decentralized initiatives lost steam when confronted with institutional policies and procedures. Altbach and Knight (2007) suggest that around the world there are hundreds of examples of
failed educational internationalization efforts that were initiated from myopic perspectives. They explain that internationalization efforts have to be based on need for shared culture, economic, and social gain. Despite this research, internationalization efforts are failing across campuses. One reason might be that the lack of collaboration in U.S. higher education has led to a basic misunderstanding of internationalization.

**Stakeholder Involvement in Internationalization Planning**

Stakeholders are important to internationalization because they are able to help institutions customize the efforts on their individual campuses (Childress, 2009). Knight (1997) studied stakeholder perspective on internationalization of higher education to determine the views and priorities of stakeholder groups in the Canadian higher education system. The author selected educational, private sector, and government leaders to participate in the study. The educational leaders selected were system wide (e.g. Provincial) higher education administrators, not individual institutions. The private sector organizations were groups with investments and interactions in higher education. The government groups represented groups with international scope and involvement in higher education. In this quantitative study, Knight developed an open-ended and rank ordered item survey. The major themes of the survey were of importance in internationalization: elements, barriers, and facilitation of internationalization activities. The author distributed 61 surveys, and had a 66% response rate.

Knight reports three major findings in the study. First, respondents reported that higher education has to find creative ways to fund curricular and co-curricular changes in order to develop globally aware and prepared students. All sectors felt internationalization had to be a priority in order for Canada to be competitive economically. Second, all three groups ranked the following definition of internationalization as their top choice: “The process of integrating an
international, intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution” (Knight, 1997, p. 29). They felt that a clear definition of internationalization could lead to collaboration and a clear direction on internationalization efforts. Third, the second most common response to barriers in internationalization was the lack of collaboration. Leaders from all three sectors felt that with collaboration, perhaps institutions and industry might find ways to avoid competing for resources and instead maximize resources by partnering and playing on each other’s strengths. Results support the impact and holistic perspective that stakeholders have on the internationalization process.

**Administrator Involvement in Internationalization Planning**

To further explore the importance of stakeholders in internationalization, Childress (2009) explored the specific roles of stakeholders in internationalization planning. She argues that many researchers have conducted research on internationalization of U.S. higher education, but little has been done on the actual plans higher education institutions develop to change the international perspectives on their campuses. In collaboration with the Association of International Education Administrator (AIEA)-member institutions, Childress (2009) conducted a study of 31 U.S.-based, doctoral or masters granting colleges/universities and the plans that these institutions utilized to expand internationalization approaches on their campuses. The author solicited internationalization documentation from AIEA’s 194 members, and 31 institutions responded with the requested documents. She conducted qualitative interviews and document analysis research to assess the uniformity of plans that institutions are utilizing to internationalize their campuses, so that she might make some generalizations about the internationalization planning. Of the 31 organizations that responded to the author’s survey, 22 had some type of internationalization plan. Childress found three plan types prevalent in the
study: 1) plans that were part of an institution-wide strategic plan; 2) plans solely devoted to internationalization efforts on those campuses; and 3) plans that were connected to particular colleges or departmental internationalization efforts. She found that plans supported by senior administration emerged as a critical factor in the development of internationalization strategic plans. Key administrative support brought about funding, credibility with the campus community, and active participation in the development of the plan. Campus wide taskforces were instrumental in the development of all the internationalization plans. A taskforce promoted shared responsibility for internationalization efforts. Decentralized efforts eventually required institutional support, so college or department initiatives lost steam when confronted with institutional policies and procedures. Assigning individual departments to monitor plans was found to be the most effective way to assess the effectiveness of the Internationalization plans. This method provides comprehensive evaluation of internationalization efforts. Childress concluded that involving stakeholders in the creation of internationalization plans is the most effective way to internationalize a campus.

To demonstrate the importance of centralized and decentralized planning strategies, Jane Edwards (2007) performed a case study of Harvard and Yale University’s internationalization activities to demonstrate effective internationalization planning and implementation. Harvard and Yale Universities are private universities in the U.S. with an abundance of resources to dedicate to institutional initiatives like internationalization. According to Edwards (2007) both institutions were featured first and third respectively in the 2006 ranking of the World’s Most Global Universities, and both have unique ways of approaching internationalization planning and practices. These two factors led the author to select these two institutions for her case study research. The author qualitatively reviewed online literature for the two campuses and analyzed
Edwards (2007) argues based on literature (Merkx, 2003; NAFSA, 2003; van der Wende, 2007) there are two principal approaches to internationalization. First, internationalization efforts may stem from specific initiatives on a campus. For example, she found at Harvard that the president wanted every student to have an international experience before they graduated. Areas on campus that were invested in the initiative developed an exchange program to serve their student population. The second type of approach is when the international activities are created and implemented as a result of institutional internationalization planning. At Yale, the president of the university prepared a strategy for a planning process that led to the development of an internationalization plan. Edwards asserts that based on the culture of an institution either model might assist in the progress of internationalization efforts. She also suggests that both approaches have pros and cons.

Few positive benefits exist for the specific initiative-led approach to internationalization planning and practice. This approach provides support for individual initiatives, and also leads to buy-in at the unit level. It is derived from the faculty and students, who found that the curriculum had been transformed as a result of the internationalization initiatives. Edwards (2007) explains that administrators are also beneficiaries of this type of internationalization effort because they can engage in whatever local planning processes most impact their constituencies. Because Harvard did not have centralized coordination, little effort was done to maximize human or fiscal resources, which resulted in lost opportunities that could have led to relationship and partnership development that could have had positive institutional impacts.

The institutional approach provides a systematic way to target international opportunities. With competition for resources increasing, it allows institutions to focus on strategically vital
initiatives. If done properly the institutional approach provides the opportunity to account for its strengths and weaknesses so that a plan will be developed that plays to strengths and improves on weaknesses. The drawback to this approach is that frequently when the planning for this institutional approach is taking place, key stakeholders are not involved in the planning process (Edwards, 2007). This leads to lackluster engagement and disjointed internationalization efforts.

**Faculty Involvement in Internationalization Planning**

The role of the faculty in internationalization is important to the development of an internationalized curriculum. Dewey and Duff (2009) explain that the purpose of their study was to address the roles, responsibilities, and problems of faculty involvement in internationalization planning efforts on U.S. college campuses. They also explain that another reason for writing the article was to provide college administrators with some insight into faculty perspectives on the goals, strategies, and the planning processes of internationalization. This qualitative study provided a view of internationalization planning from a school and departmental perspective. Dewey and Duff (2009) illustrated faculty perspectives by sharing a case study of a faculty-driven internationalization plan in the School of Architecture and Applied Arts (A&AA), which contains 10 academic departments, at the University of Oregon (UO), a comprehensive public university in the U.S.

The authors shared that the catalyst for the internationalization project in A&AA were university addresses in which university leadership expressed a desire to have UO become more internationalized. The tenured and pre-tenured faculty of undergraduate and graduate programs in A&AA decided to develop an internationalization initiatives committee that discussed ways in which to internationalize the school. Administrators from A&AA participated in the internationalization planning as well. The authors utilized the findings and recommendations of
this committee to develop a generalization on faculty involvement in developing goals, strategies, and processes for internationalization efforts on U.S. college campuses. Dewey and Duff (2009) articulated four core generalizations of faculty perspectives on internationalization. 

First, the authors suggested that faculty be included at the start of the planning sessions to develop a working definition of what internationalization means to institutions. In A&AA’s case, this led to an understanding that internationalization meant strategies, activities and funding to support international efforts on a college campus. Second, the authors suggested that because of the nature of faculty work, faculty have a desire to investigate. Dewey and Duff (2009) explained that the A&AA faculty sought to learn more about all of the internationalization activities engaged in on campus. Dewey and Duff (2009) felt that when this investigation was accomplished the faculty and administration could then begin to systemically discuss internationalization strategies in the school. Third, the authors explained that as the data was collected, faculty would learn of major barriers to internationalization efforts. In the case of A&AA there were four barriers. The first was a lack of coordination and information on international initiatives. The second barrier was limited funding availability for international work. The third barrier consisted of policies and procedures that served as disincentives to participation in international initiatives. The fourth barrier was lack of sufficient staff to facilitate international initiatives. Dewey and Duff recommended that faculty should be ready to design strategies to overcome the barriers. Finally, faculty should create long term infrastructure to advance the internationalization strategic priorities. The A&AA school felt their long-term goals should be to continue with the internationalization initiatives committee indefinitely and to appoint an institutional leader dedicated to internationalization efforts. Involvement in planning internationalization activities is the first step to effective internationalization of a campus. The
role of the student in internationalization planning has been overlooked and understudied (McCabe, 2001).

**Implementation of Internationalization Efforts**

The limited literature on internationalization planning and measurable commitment to internationalization has been previously established, as is evidenced by Altbach and Knight (2007) who found a considerable gap between what universities claim they want to see happen in internationalization, the resulting agendas, and the lag in the budgets that limit any real progress. Given the likelihood of a further reduction in financial support within U.S. higher education, the gap between the rhetoric and internationalization efforts might only increase. Internationalization becomes more difficult as institutions move from discussing the need for internationalization to measuring what they are doing.

The American Council on Education (ACE) (2005) organized a quantitative study to examine how research universities are internationalizing their curricula and student experiences. They also explored what strategies are common among institutions that have actively pursued internationalization. The study addressed these questions by examining the responses from 144 research universities to an institutional survey conducted in 2001 by ACE and funded by the Ford Foundation. ACE (2005) developed a survey known as the “internationalization index”. The institutional survey instrument was created to measure comprehensive internationalization, and is comprised of six dimensions: articulated commitment, academic offerings, organizational infrastructure, external funding, institutional investment in faculty, and international students and student programs. ACE quantitatively defined institutional levels of internationalization by rating their overall levels of internationalization on a five-point scale, ranging from “zero” (0) to “high” (4). The overall scores for the dimensions were derived by averaging the item scores of the six
dimensions. ACE (2005) created this “internationalization index,” then re-examined the data collected in 2001 to measure internationalization along the six key dimensions. They created a “high activity” university status and “less active” university status. The 144 research universities were made up of ACE’s membership institutions. Of the 144 universities that responded, 38% were Research I Universities; 15% were Research II Universities; 21% were Doctoral Universities I; and 26% were Doctoral Universities II.

ACE (2005) reports that institutions that were highly active showed a higher level of articulation of international education commitment than their less active counterparts. Highly active institutions were also more likely to have international education as a part of their institutional mission and strategic plan, have an emphasis on foreign language learning, had higher prevalence of for-credit education abroad offerings, were more likely to seek and receive external funding, provided more funds for international activities on campus while spending the same as their less active colleagues on recruiting international students, and were more likely to finance faculty research, teaching, and professional development abroad. Institutions with internationalization committees as a part of the organizational infrastructure were more likely to receive a highly active internationalization rating. The more engaged and supportive an institution is to internationalization efforts, the more likely it is that they will have effective implementation of internationalization.

Taylor (2004) added qualitative literature on the topic of internationalization implementation. Taylor (2004) utilized a qualitative method to review the strategies for internationalization in four universities: the University of British Columbia (UBC), Canada; the University of Chicago, United States; the University of Uppsala, Sweden; and the University of Western Australia (UWA), Australia. The author explained that he selected these institutions
because of the international notoriety these universities have. The author reviewed institutional
documents related to internationalization planning and activities. He then connected his findings
of the review of documentation to his three research questions. Taylor (2004) found that the key
factor affecting the development of strategies for internationalization was to have stakeholders
involved in the planning. He suggests that understanding and accounting for the culture of the
institutions would allow institutionally specific strategies to be developed. Taylor (2004) also
found that strategies that connect to teaching and learning outcomes were more likely to be
practiced. Teaching and learning outcomes are embraced by all on campus, so they are the most
likely to be implemented. Taylor (2004) asserts that universities have been uneven and reactive
to internationalization. He shares that based on his examination of the documents, leading
universities are proactive, and articulate the importance of an institutional commitment to
internationalization. Taylor (2004) concludes that planning must involve appropriate strategies
for implementation. Those strategies have to be assessed continually. If they are assessed, the
strategies become the foundation for internationalization practices.

Assessing Internationalization Indicators

Establishing measurable goals from internationalization plans is critical to effective
efforts on college campuses. He developed these internationalization indicators by reviewing
literature on internationalization assessment. He qualitatively applied the key indicators to five
universities, which consisted of two Canadian, two U.S., and one Australian. There were no
specifications as to key characteristics of the institutions, or why they were selected for the case
study other than his awareness of those institutions’ comprehensive internationalization efforts.
Paige (2005) gives anecdotal examples of how the five higher education institutions in his study
have in some way accounted for and implemented internationalization efforts on one or more of the ten key indicators. Paige (2005) explains that formal plans need to be designed in order to have a systematic way to assess the ten indicators at universities. Institutions that have a systematic way to measure these ten indicators are likely to be more internationalized institutions. He concludes that because of the complex processes of assessing these key indicators, internationalization efforts cannot be done quickly, easily or inexpensively.

**Student and Faculty Perceptions of Internationalization**

One means to measure internationalization outcomes is to evaluate the perceptions of the internationalization that has taken place on the campus. Iuspa (2010) examined the internationalization process, and faculty and student attitudes toward internationalization of Florida International University (FIU), a research extensive university in the U.S. In this mixed methods study the author used the theoretical model and instrument (International Dimension Index) developed by Van Dijk and Miejer (1997). The model measures the policy, support, and implementation dimensions of an institution's internationalization effort. The author collected data by examining institutional documents, interviews, and descriptive data on FIU’s international activities. The Likert-type survey scale’s frequencies and percentages were calculated as well as Spearman Rho correlations between the survey’s three scales and demographic and perception variables.

The study found that FIU’s international activities categorized them as an internationalized campus. The author did argue, because of some lack of institutional policy and support, FIU needed to work on areas of foreign language study, international students, study abroad and, faculty movement and involvement in international projects. Students and faculty reported high levels of internationalization at FIU, even though they did not perceive
internationalization to be a strong institutional initiative. The author explained that the lack of funding for internationalization activities brought on this negative attitude. The study concluded that an association exists between FIU’s internationalization policy and the implementation of international activities. Iuspa (2010) concluded that if FIU wanted to improve their internationalization status it needed to adjust policy support and implementation dimensions. Iuspa (2010) also argued that taking into account student and faculty views toward internationalization in the planning phases of internationalization can lead to improved implementation of efforts. This study suggests that internationalization does effect perceptions of the university.

Summary

In a review of literature on internationalization, collaboration is a focal point of effective internationalization efforts. Campus members are required to work together no matter the strategy to find success in internationalization efforts (Childress, 2009). A major benefit of internationalization is the development of graduates ready to interact professional, socially, and personally in a more interconnected society. Scholars and students are better prepared to solve major global issues (NASULGC, 2004). Campuses have a variety of approaches to planning and implementing internationalization.

Internationalization plans serve as a core method of actualizing these efforts (Childress, 2009). Campuses must have an understood definition of internationalization. Stakeholder involvement is important because it is with the input of stakeholders that personalized institutional plans can be developed. Taylor (2004) found that effective leaders understand the motivations of their stakeholders as they work to build coalitions and channel their energy into
mutually supportive action toward internationalization, and this led to successful internationalization plans.

The literature suggests that non-collaborative planning leads to lackluster implementation of internationalization (Taylor, 2004). Altbach and Knight (2007) suggest that around the world there are hundreds of examples of failed educational internationalization efforts that were developed from myopic perspectives. Altbach and Knight (2007) explain that given the likelihood of a further reduction in financial support within U.S. higher education, the gap between the rhetoric and internationalization efforts will only increase. Funding and effective leadership have been the greatest challenges to implementation of internationalization (Dewey & Duff, 2009). Internationalization efforts with senior administrative support are more likely to be effectively implemented (Childress, 2009). Also, clear and measureable outcomes should be core to implementation efforts (Paige, 2005).

The literature on the internationalization of U.S. higher education has traditionally been based on qualitative research. To add methodological diversity to this body of literature, this researcher utilized a mixed methods research model to contribute to the knowledge base on internationalization of U.S. higher education. The current body of internationalization of U.S. higher education literature is in need of empirical data to provide a holistic perspective on internationalization planning and implementation processes. Therefore, this study contributed to the empirical data regarding the phenomena of internationalization planning and implementation.
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the methodology employed in the study. This section begins with an overview and rationale for the research design of the study. The researcher provides an overview of the sample and sampling techniques. Attention was given to the participants and their characteristics. The researcher will explain the data collection method and data analysis techniques with some consideration about appropriate statistical and content analyses that will help provide insights into the research questions. A Bracketing will be provided to share the researcher’s experiences with the topic. Finally, the section will end with an account of the major assumptions of the study.

Research Design

The researcher sought to understand the relationship and perceptions of full-time administrators’ on stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning and internationalization implementation at a U.S. public university. The purpose of the study was to develop a better understanding of the complex phenomena of internationalization by measuring quantitatively the level of planning and internationalization. Also, exploring the experiences of administrators involved in the planning and implementation of internationalization qualitatively with the goal of more comprehensively studying the topic is a key component of the study. Because of the quantitative and qualitative implication of this study, the researcher utilized a mixed method (MM) research design.

Mixed methods research combines quantitative and qualitative research techniques, methods, approaches, concepts or language into a single study (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p.17). To explore complex issues, and limit the weakness of each of the individual methods Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) have suggested utilizing a mixed methods research approach. As
researchers blend the statistical generalization and in depth narratives they will increase the strength of their findings (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007).

There are four types of mixed methods designs: triangulation, embedded, explanatory, and exploratory (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). As a result, there are six variants of the aforementioned designs: (1) sequential explanatory design, (2) sequential exploratory design, (3) sequential transformative design, (4) concurrent triangulation design, (5) concurrent embedded design, and (6) concurrent transformative design (Creswell, 2009). This study utilized a sequential explanatory design (SED) which is explained further below (See figure 2).

Figure 2. Sequential explanatory mixed methods design, adapted from “Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research,” by B. Angell and L. Townsend (2011), workshop for the 2011 Society for Social Work and Research annual meeting.

SED focuses on collecting data in a sequential manner in order to add details to the study’s findings (Onwuegbuzie & Collins, 2007). This method is utilized when researchers seek to use qualitative findings to further interpret or contextualize quantitative results. The priority of the research is equal so the design is written as QUANT + QUAL (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). After the collection and analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data separately, a meta-inference is established.
Altbach and Knight’s (2007) discussion of internationalization in higher education suggests that internationalization in higher education is complex and as such is misunderstood and needs to be further examined. This need to further explore this phenomenon is a major driving force for the proposed study. Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) argue that comprehensive examination should involve components of quantitative (Quant), qualitative (Qual), and mixed methods (MM). The complex nature of internationalization lends itself to a thorough and comprehensive examination that mixed methods provides. This method allows researchers to ask confirmatory and explanatory questions at the same time, allowing for the generation and verification of theory at the same time (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007). Research methods have their strengths and weaknesses (Johnson & Turner, 2003). MM provides researchers with tools to explore complex issues, and limit the weakness of each of the individual methods (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). The researcher blended statistical generalization and in depth narratives to increase the strength of the findings. This approach to the study heightened the validity of the findings and increased the rigor of the study (Johnson & Turner, 2003). This study provided the researcher with a foundation for collecting and analyzing data in this dynamic manner. Specifically, the sequential explanatory design allowed the researcher the opportunity to review and analyze the survey results, and tailor the follow-up in-depth interview questions based on significant responses (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009).

Quantitative Strand

The quantitative strand of the study entailed administering a survey at a midwestern university to collect administrators’ views on internationalization planning and implementation on their campus. The survey assessed the administrators’ perceptions of the level of internationalization planning and implementation on the Mid-Western University campus. A
correlational quantitative research design was utilized to explore a mutual relationship between the level of internationalization planning and implementation. Creswell (2009) argues that correlational research is a productive way to measure the relationship between two quantitative variables. Frankel, Wallen, and Hyun (2011) explain that this relationship is measured by using a correlation coefficient. Because the researcher studied the relationship between the level of planning and implementation, no attempts to manipulate the variables were utilized. While correlational studies can suggest a relationship between two variables, these studies cannot prove that one variable causes a change in another variable. Correlation studies do not attempt to assert causation (Frankel et al., 2011). Because the researcher sought a deeper understanding of this relationship, qualitative research was explored. The researcher also examined group differences in perceptions of internationalization planning and implementation based upon administrative classifications. The survey data was utilized to select six administrators with varying perceptions of internationalization at Mid-Western University to interview. Utilizing participants from one strand of the study to inform another strand is referred to as nested sampling. This sampling strategy “facilitates credible comparisons of two or more members of the same subgroup, wherein one or more members of the subgroup represent a sub-sample of the full sample” (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2007, p. 246).

**Qualitative Strand**

Three interviewees were sampled from those respondents with low perceptions of internationalization planning and implementation and three from respondents with high perceptions, based on survey responses. The participants of this strand of the study were given pseudo names to protect their identities at MWU. Because the researcher seeks to explore the experiences of six administrators involved in the phenomenon of internationalization at Mid-
Western University (Creswell, 2007), the research was interpretative in nature. Interpretative research is an attempt to understand phenomena through accessing the meanings participants assign to these phenomena (Glesne, 2010). Interpretative researchers study how people create and associate their own subjective and inter-subjective meanings as they interact with the world around them (Orlikowski & Baroudi 1991). Interpretive research is based on the idea that all phenomena being studied are influenced by the humans preconceptions and languages, and is captured by listening through interviews to their descriptions of what their own world is like for them in their own terms (Glesne, 2010). This method of analysis suggests that researchers also have preconceptions and knowledge of the phenomena being studied (Glesne, 2010). The researcher utilized a semi-structured interview protocol to explore the experiences of all six participants. The purpose for interviewing the participants was to explore their experience with internationalization planning and implementation at Mid-Western University. The questions for the interviews were developed based on the participants’ responses to the survey. This approach to designing the questions allows for participants to react to specific responses that were made on the survey (Onwuegbuzie & Collins, 2007). The samples of participants included three administrators with high perceptions and three administrators with low perceptions of internationalization at MWU.

Six interview participants were purposely selected using their survey responses as the major criterion. A purposive extreme case sampling method was utilized, in which the researcher selected six cases that explained the success and failures of the phenomenon of internationalization. The purpose of this sampling technique was to illustrate the differences in experiences of the administrators as related to planning and implementation of internationalization at MWU. The perception of the level of internationalization at MWU was
the criterion utilized. Three participants reported low perceptions of internationalization. While the remaining three reported high perceptions of the level of internationalization. Interviewees reported being members of the three of the administrative categories including: three Academic Administrators, two Professional administrators, and one administrative staff member.

**Interpretive Analysis Approach**

The researcher utilized an interpretive analysis approach to analyze the qualitative findings. This analysis technique provided the researcher with a way of exploring the experiences of participants through their own languages and understandings (Smith, 1996). The focal point of this analysis approach was to try to understand the content and complexity, focusing on the meanings of the participants’ experiences rather than measuring their frequency (Smith, & Osborn, 2007). The researcher was deeply engaged in an interpretative relationship with the transcript (Creswell, 2007). While one is attempting to capture and do justice to the meanings of the respondents to learn about their mental and social world, those meanings are not transparently available – they must be obtained through a sustained engagement with the text and a process of interpretation (Smith, & Osborn, 2008, p. 63). The purpose for interviewing the participants was to explore their experience with internationalization planning and implementation at MWU. The questions for the interviews were developed based on the participants’ responses to the survey regarding their views and opinions of the six subscales of internationalization (Internationalization Planning; Institutionalization of International Education; Administrative Components; Internationalized Curriculum; International Students and Scholars; and Study Abroad).

The researcher recorded and transcribed all of the data collected via the interviews. Then the transcripts were thoroughly read multiple times for an understanding of the content of each
interview. The researcher began to make notes on each of the transcripts to begin to summarize and code the data. The researcher then read through the transcripts based on perception level. As notes were made based on the perceptions of the interviewees’, similarities and differences developed leading to preliminary themes. The researcher analyzed the responses based on the six internationalization subscales. Clusters of themes began to emerge, and the transcripts were again consulted to verify the themes linked to the actual words of the participants. Smith and Osborn (2007) assert this is the best way to find the meaning of the participants’ words, and to account for one’s own understanding. The next step was to develop tables to sort out themes based on the level of internationalization perception. Direct quotes were accumulated to link to the themes from the six subscales. This provided the researcher with a way to explain thoroughly the themes (Smith, & Osborn, 2007). The researcher also sent the transcripts and themes to the participants to member check the findings (Creswell, 2007).

The purpose of the study was not to generalize the findings to a larger context, but to deeply understand internationalization at Mid-Western University. The data from both strands were given equal relevance in the study, and combined to establish concise overall results.

**Participants**

The particulars of the respondents and interviewees will be explored in this section of the paper.

**Profile of Mid-Western University**

The participants of the study are administrators at Mid-Western University employed during 2012-2013. Mid-Western University (MWU) was founded in the 1900s as a normal school in the Midwest region of the United States of America. MWU markets that they are preparing students for lifelong career growth, living as engaged citizens, and being leaders in a
global society. MWU is ranked as one of the top 100 public universities, where there is a focus on developing creative ideas and achievements so that the region, nation, and the world can benefit. The university has over 20,000 students attending from 50 states in the U.S. and 70 countries around the world.

MWU has 576 administrators that are responsible for all of the administrative function of the university (Institutional Research, 2012). The administrators work out of 10 key units which include: University Communication, Office of the President, Human Resources, Academic Affairs, Governmental Affairs, University Advancement, Finance and Administration, Student Affairs and Athletics, and the Board of Trustees.

The university’s strategic plan lay out two goals that are linked to internationalization. First, Mid-Western University wants an increase in diverse students (2010). In the late 1990s to the early 2000s the university had standing committees dedicated to exploring curricular and organizational issues related to internationalization on campus (Personal Communication, 2013). As a result of turnover in senior university administration many of these committees were dissolved for other organizational initiatives (Personal Communication, 2013). In a public address, the university president stated that student diversity should include an increase in international students, especially Chinese nationals (State of the University address, 2010).

Second, to increase student personal growth and understanding, the president has suggested an increase in study abroad programs. Recently, the university has had various conversations about internationalization on its campus, including: learning community, faculty and administrator roundtables, and external consultants (Personal Communication, 2012). In the 2011 inaugural address of the new university president it was stated that many international initiatives are going to be top priority for the university (Inaugural Address, 2011). As a result of these
conversations, multiple internationalization plans and strategies have been developed (Personal Communication, 2012). These plans and strategies have been department specific, but have been disjointed in approach (Personal Communication, 2012). These plans have not received senior administrative human or financial support leading to a perception of administrative disinterest in the topic (Personal Communication, 2012). Some internationalization practices have been implemented on campus with varying success due to limited stakeholder support and funding. These conversations and plan development have led to some dialogue around institutional internationalization. Organizational and structural changes to some of the internationalization departments on campus have accounted for some of these conversations (Organizational Chart, 2013). As a result, an experienced administrator was hired to manage a critical function of internationalization (Personal Communication, 2012). That being said, a major international education post on the campus has been vacant for an academic year (Personal Communication, 2012). This position has traditionally provided limited leadership for the overall internationalization strategy (Personal Communication, 2012). As a result of these occurrences, MWU is a rich environment to explore the complex phenomena of internationalization.

**Level of change readiness at Mid-Western University.** Utilizing literature on change readiness, the researcher provides a brief assessment of the change readiness of MWU. Organizational readiness for change varies based on how organizational members value the proposed change (Demers, 2007). At this point in MWU’s internationalization initiatives, there seems to be some value for the change at the senior administrator level. It could be argued that this is limited value because of the vacancy of the internationalization leadership position. There are three key determinants of implementation capability that affect change initiatives in
organizations, (1) task demands, (2) resource availability, and (3) situational factors (Weiner, 2009).

Task demand is a need for a certain type work to be done in order to resolve a problem (Ames, & Archer, 1988). The tasks needed for internationalization at MWU are varied and need to be accomplished collaboratively in order to be successful (Knight, 1997). Plans and internationalization practices have been developed by a variety of units on campus, but they have only had departmental level support (Personal Communication, 2012). These practices have had an inadequate impact on campus, therefore, the task demand for internationalization on MWU’s campus has not been embraced or supported by key stakeholders on campus (Personal Communication, 2012).

Resource availability refers to the fact that the resources needed to implement change are available for organizational members to utilize (Kezar, 2001). Human resources have been provided to develop a greater understanding and plans for internationalization through university committees, learning communities, and consulting. MWU has dedicated financial resources for a critical internationalization position recently hired (Organizational Chart, 2013). There is still a key international education leader position vacant on campus (Organizational Chart, 2013). Previously funded internationalization efforts on campus have not been renewed even after being viewed as key to internationalization by university stakeholders (University Cabinet Meeting, 2012). Resources have been provided at MWU for internationalization, but are limited.

Mid-Western University, like many organizations, has many factors that influence its day-to-day operations. Situational factors are any dynamics that contribute to the set of conditions to which organizational members act or react to change (Kezar, 2001). With new senior leadership, MWU has a renewed interest in internationalization (Personal Communication,
2012). This is evidenced by two recent university-wide public addresses where internationalization has been a major topic (Presidential Addresses, 2011, 2012). These and other conversations have led to interest and excitement on the part of organizational members (Personal Communication, 2012). The situation is changing at MWU with key senior administrative support.

Burke (2001) argues that when organizational readiness for change is high, organizational members are more likely to initiate change. Also, when the readiness factors are low, an organization can face resistance to change. Presently at MWU, there are change ready and resistance dynamics at play on campus. The overall assessment is that MWU is attracted to the possibility of internationalization change, but in order for the members to embrace the change, the university has to provide a plan for collaboration and the resources to implement that plan.

**Quantitative Participants**

In conjunction with MWU the researcher invited 576 administrators (Senior Administrator, Academic Administrator, Professional Administrator, Administrative Staff) on MWU’s campus to participate in the study. Of the 576 administrators invited to participate only 80 administrators completed the survey. The limited response rate (14%) could be a reason for the varying number of participant responses for each of the sub scales of the IPI. Many of the participants in this strand of the study are non-international education administrators on campus. They have had limited knowledge and experience with internationalization. This may lead to participants being uncomfortable with completing the survey because of their lack of knowledge and experience with the topic. This could be a contributing factor to the low response rate, and the variance in responses based on subscales that were less familiar to the participants. Senior
administrators are those leaders who articulate, lead, and manage the mission and purposes of the university. These senior leaders represent 17.7% of the administrative population on campus.

The Academic administrators are members of the campus community that have comprehensive impact on university curriculum, and lead day-to-day operations in their academic units. They represent about 10.2% of the administrative population at MWU. Professional Administrators represent 22.0% of university administrators at MWU. These are the leaders of the staff and create policies for institutional support functions at the university. Administrative staff members are about 52.1% of the population, and are those professionals that provide support to university administrators, and are front line professionals meeting the needs of students, faculty, and external constituents. The participants of this strand of the study work out of the offices of University Communication, the President, Human Resources, Academic Affairs, Governmental Affairs, University Advancement, Finance and Administration, Student Affairs and Athletics, and the Board of Trustees. The researcher had access to the participants at MWU because of their academic pursuits on the campus. Frankel et al., (2011) defined the sampling methods where participants are available conveniently to the researcher as a convenience sample.

**Qualitative Participants**

The researcher employed a purposive extreme case sampling method for the qualitative strand of the study. Extreme case sampling is the practice of selecting cases that illustrate important components of the phenomenon being studied. This is a process of selecting cases that are the most unique successes or failures related to the phenomena (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). These cases are thought to yield the most information and have the greatest impact on the study (Patton, 2001, p. 236). Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) also explain that extreme cases provide data that can be easily contrasted and compared to other cases. The researcher selected
six administrators from the quantitative strand of the study, three interviewees who perceive MWU with a low level of stakeholder involvement and implementation of internationalization, and three administrators who perceived MWU having a high level of stakeholder involvement and implementation of internationalization. The purpose of this sampling technique was to illustrate the differences in experiences of the administrators as related to planning and implementation of internationalization at MWU.

**Instrumentation**

The author electronically administered a 28-item Internationalization Planning and Implementation (IPI) survey. The participants were informed at the start of the survey that they gave consent to be studied by completing the survey. The IPI combined items from an existing instrument called the Institutional Fingerprint Measure, with self-developed items. The following sections will describe the existing instrument, the self-developed items, and finally the overall IPI.

**Institutional Fingerprint Measure**

Rodenberg (2011) argues that there is a significant difference between supporting the idea of internationalization and actually finding concrete ways of implementing internationalization across a campus. Therefore, Rodenberg developed an instrument that assesses what institutions are doing to actually internationalize their campus. He designed a 125-item instrument that measures the level of internationalization on college campuses known as the Institutional Fingerprint Measure (IFM). The survey is separated into eight components or dimensions representing various aspects of a campus’ efforts toward internationalization. These components are resources, administration, institutional philosophy, faculty, curriculum, marketing, alumni relations, and student/faculty support dimensions. All items utilize a four
point Likert scale (Never=0 Seldom=1 Sometimes=2 Always=3). He developed the questions for this instrument from personal observation, literature from the field of international education, and through piloting it with international educators from across the country. The major literature cited in developing this instrument came from Michael Paige’s (2005) basic ideas on measuring internationalization on campuses. Rodenberg (2011) then expanded in scope and specificity the questions to meet the changing nature of internationalization in a more current context. Rodenberg (2011) suggests that this tool can be used to assess internationalization on campuses as well as what needs to be improved. Rodenberg (2011) utilized an expert panel of 18 international affairs/education administrators from 20 states to account for content validity in the IFM. As a result of the panel’s feedback, a few of the questions were given greater importance to the internationalization of a campus, so these questions were weighted differently than the other questions. The current researcher only utilized 38 items from the IFM, specifically items 8 (a-h), 10 (a-h), 12 (a-f), 14 (a-j), and 16 (a-f). The following subscales were utilized for the current study from the IFM: Internationalization Planning is higher education institutions’ written commitment to internationalization (Childress, 2009). Institutionalization of Internationalization (items 8a-h) is the process of internationalization permeating all components of the university. This subscale assessed administrators’ perceptions on internationalization campus wide. Administrative Components (items 10a-h) refers to internationalization efforts that affect the administrative dimensions of the institution. Participants expressed their views on internationalization as it relates to the administrating of the university. Internationalization of the Curriculum (items 12a-f) is the process of integrating international and global dimensions and perspectives into the curriculum (van der Wende, 2007). In this subscale respondents reported their perceptions of international components integrated into the university’s curriculum. The
International Student and Scholar (items 14a-j) variable denotes the roles international students and scholars play in internationalization on campuses. Administrators reported their beliefs on International Student and Scholar involvement in internationalization practices at MWU, in this subscale. The Study Abroad (items 16a-f) subscale refers to students and scholars pursuing academic and experiential learning in foreign countries. In this subscale, participants informed the researcher on their views of the Study Abroad impact on internationalization on campus. These questions were chosen from the IFM because of the direct link they have with the literature on measuring internationalization on college campuses. The other questions from the IFM repeated the themes from the 38 questions utilized in the IPI, and that added to the length of the survey.

**Self-Developed Items**

The researcher developed an additional 25 items for the IPI (items 1-7, 9-11, 12(g-i)-13, 15, 17-28) designed to measure the involvement, knowledge, and values of administrators in internationalization on the subject campus. Table 1 describes the items and literature support for each of the subscales of the IPI.
Table 1

Selected Literature Support for Internationalization Planning and Implementation Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Descriptors</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-Developed*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Self-Developed*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-Developed. Bartell, 2003; Stohl, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Self-Developed*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Involvement in Internationalization Planning</td>
<td>5a-h</td>
<td>Self-Developed, Childress, (2007); Childress (2009); Dewey, &amp; Duff, 2009; Edwards (2007); Ellingboe (1998); Green, &amp; Olson (2003); Horn, Hendel, &amp; Fry (2007); IFM (2011); Knight (1997a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Self-Developed*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Self-Developed*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization of Internationalization</td>
<td>8a-h</td>
<td>IFM (2011) Items (Resources Dimension, 1, 2, 12, 15; Institutional Philosophy Dimension, 1, Marketing Dimension, 6,10,11 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Self-Developed*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Components</td>
<td>10a-h</td>
<td>IFM (2011) Items (Administrative Dimension, 1, 4, 7,13,14; Faculty Dimension 7; Alumni Dimension, 4, 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Self-Developed*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalized Curriculum</td>
<td>12a-h</td>
<td>IFM (2011) Items (Curriculum Dimension 1,2,3,8,10, 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12g-i</td>
<td>Self-Developed, (Items 12 (g-i), Altbach, &amp; Knight (2007); Edwards (2007); Hser (2005); Paige, &amp; Mestenhauser (1999); Pandit (2009); Turner-Essel, &amp; Waehler (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Self-Developed*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students and Scholars</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>IFM (2011) Items (Student/Faculty Dimension, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12; Faculty Dimension, 1,3,9,10,13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Self-Developed*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>IFM (2011) Items (Resource Dimension, 6, 14; Curriculum Dimension, 14,15; Marketing Dimension, 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Self-Developed. Does not contribute to subscale score.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Internationalization</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Self-Developed*. Bartell, 2003; Stohl, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Implementation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Self-Developed*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographical</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Self-Developed*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Class.</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>Self-Developed*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative participation</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Self-Developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation drawing</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Self-Developed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Does not contribute to subscale score.
Item 1 clarifies the purpose of the survey and solicits consent from participants. Item 2 of the IPI is a yes, no, or I don’t know response to whether the institution has developed an internationalization plan. The IFM was designed to gather information from international educators, who likely have a high level of knowledge and values around components of internationalization planning and implementation. The IPI assessed the perceptions, knowledge, and values of all administrators with varying experiences and understanding of internationalization, so it was necessary to measure these individuals’ knowledge and values of Internationalization Planning and Measurements. These diverse perspectives make up the reality of internationalization on college campuses (Knight, 1997a). The researcher developed two items to measure participants’ values, responses being 1-No Value through 4-Very Valuable, for internationalization planning (item 3) and implementation (item 18). To gather a grade of A (Exceptional efforts)-F (No Effort) on internationalization planning practices based on the respondents’ perceptions, item 4 was developed. As described in chapter 2, comprehensive stakeholder involvement in planning is influential in assessing the effectiveness of internationalization planning. Childress (2007; 2009) argues that administrators, faculty, students, and staff are key to developing an Internationalization Plan that is comprehensive and implementable because of the insights they bring from their varying roles on campus. Knight (1997) suggests, because of the potential impact students and scholars might have on society as a whole, alumni’s and external constituents’ inputs are needed to explore societal concerns with internationalization. Therefore, in order to best examine the relationship between Internationalization Planning and Internationalization Measurement it is necessary to gather data on those groups involved in the planning process (item 5). The 7 components of item 5 ask participants to rate the level of agreement with statements concerning stakeholder involvement in
internationalization planning on their campuses. These items apply a 5-point Likert scale (0-Strongly Disagree, 1-Disagree, 2 Agree, 3-Strongly Agree, 4- I don’t know). The seven stakeholders explored in item 5 are Students (5a), Senior Administrators (5b) (e.g. Trustee, President, or Provost), Faculty (5c), Staff (5d), Administration (e.g. Multicultural Affairs director, Department chair, or Institution/Center director) (5e), Alumni (5f), and External Constituents (5g). The knowledge and experiences of participants with the subscales were assessed based on the subscale : stakeholder involvement in Internationalization Planning (item 6); Institutionalization of Internationalization (item 9); Administrative Components (item 11); Internationalized Curriculum (item 13); International Students and Scholars (item 15); Study Abroad (item 17). The scale for these questions was 1- No knowledge or experience through 4- Extremely knowledgeable. Item 7, a write-in question, provided participants with a way to qualitatively express their views on internationalization planning at MWU.

Researchers (Altbach, & Knight, 2007; Edwards, 2007; Hser, 2005) argue a major reason for internationalization on campuses is to assist students and scholars with global skill sets that will allow them to contribute to solving world issues. Thus, the researcher developed items to reflect this important component of internationalization. As a result, the researcher also created items 12 (g-h) to measure whether these skills were being developed on the subject campus. Item 12(i) measures the impact international students and scholars have on the global learning environment of the campus (Paige, & Mestenhauser (1999); Pandit (2009); Turner-Essel, & Waehler (2009)). Items 12g-i utilized a 5 point Likert scale (0-Strongly Disagree, 1-Disagree, 2 Agree, 3-Strongly Agree, 4- I don’t know). Item 19 was developed to gather a grade of A (Exceptional efforts)-F (No Effort) on internationalization implementation practices at MWU based on the respondents’ perceptions. A write-in question was provided for participants to
express their beliefs on internationalization implementation at MWU, thus item 20 was created. To gather data on Sex (item 21), age (item 22), degree level (item 23), race/ethnicity (item 24), years of employment (item 25) the aforementioned items were developed. The employment classifications (1-Senior Administrator, 2-Academic Administrator, 3-Professional Administrator, and 4-Administrative Staff) of the participants were gathered through item 26. Item 27 was created to request participation from survey respondents in the interview portion of the study. In order to contact respondents for a prize drawing, the researcher sought the email addresses of the participants, and collected those through item 28.

The author utilized an expert panel of 12 public and private university administrators to assess content validity. The author applied the feedback to the final survey used in the study. The respondents should need no more than 20 minutes to complete the survey.

**Internationalization Planning and Implementation Survey (IPI)**

The lengthy nature of the IFM could have had a negative impact on response rates (Sheehan, 2001; Tomaskovic-Devey, Leiter, & Thompson, 1994). To develop the 28 item IPI, the researcher adopted 38 components drawn from the IFM and drafted 25 components based upon a thorough review of the literature on measuring internationalization and planning on college campuses. The IPI developed by the researcher measured the perceptions of the overall level of Stakeholder Involvement in Planning (IP) and implementation of internationalization (IM). Six subscales are assessed in the IPI: 1) stakeholder involvement in Internationalization Planning (IP) (items 5a-h); 2) Institutionalization of Internationalization (II) (item 8a-h); 3) Administrative Components (AC) (item 10a-h); 4) Internationalized Curriculum (IC) (item 12a-h); 5) International Students and Scholars (ISS) (item 14); 6) Study Abroad (SA) (item 16). The aforementioned subscale titles are internationalization indicator terms based upon the
foundational work on the topic by Ellingboe (1998) and Knight and de Wit (1999). As mentioned earlier, the stakeholder involvement portion (item 5), and three questions from the internationalized curriculum dimension of the survey were developed by the researcher. The six subscales of the IPI were based on Rodenberg’s (2011) Institutional Fingerprint Measure. All subscales of the IPI utilized a 5-point Likert-scale (0-Strongly Disagree, 1-Disagree, 2 Agree, 3-Strongly Agree, 4- I don’t know). The scale was designed to limit the use of neutral positions on the survey items by participants (Garland, 1991; Matell & Jacoby, 1972). The researcher asked demographic items (21-25) to learn more about the specific participants of the study. The researcher also developed Item 26, which assessed the employment classifications of the participant. Item 27, a 1-yes, 2-no, or 3- I don’t know response category established if participants were interested in taking part in the qualitative strand of the study. Item 28 was developed to recruit survey participants to take part in the qualitative strand of the study. The scores from both Internationalization Planning (IP) and Internationalization Measurement (IM) items (items 5, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18) were summed to create an Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus (OIC) score. Table 1 identifies selected literature supporting each item in the IPI.

**Qualitative Instrument**

An interview method was employed to collect the qualitative data. At the beginning of all interviews, a signed consent was collected from the six participants. A semi-structured interview method was utilized to collect qualitative data. The researcher also developed a four-question interview protocol to guide the interview with the six participants. These semi-structured questions seek four types of information from participants: (1) participant’s background and professional experience, (2) experience with and understanding of internationalization, (3)
experience at the university with internationalization, (4) perceptions of the six subscales (stakeholder involvement in Internationalization Planning, Institutionalization of Internationalization, Administrative Components, and Internationalized Curriculum, International Students and Scholars, Study Abroad) related to Internationalization Planning and implementation. All interviews were 30-45 minutes, and audio recorded. Transcriptions were created based on the audio recording.

A pilot test of the interview protocol was completed via 12 university administrators from private and public U.S. universities to refine the data collection plan and questions for this strand of the study (Creswell, 2007). In order to assess for trustworthiness of the findings, the researcher utilized member checking. The transcripts and themes that were developed from the data collected were sent to the participants to obtain their feedback on the researchers understanding of the participants’ experiences. This type of activity provides researchers with a forum for validating their understanding of the findings (Creswell, 2007). The researcher made adjustments to the findings based on participants’ responses. Detailed field notes were taken to account for all collection methods. To account for consistency of the study, all data collection methods and analysis techniques were documented in this study, so that other researchers can transfer the research processes to their studies (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007).

Procedures

To proceed with the mixed methods study, the researcher received Bowling Green State University HRSB approval. After approval, the researcher worked with MWU administrative staff council, Academic Affairs, and the President’s council to contact prospective respondents via their university email addresses. The researcher invited the administrators to electronically complete a 28-item Internationalization Planning and Implementation survey (IPI), which took
approximately 20 minutes to complete. Qualtrics was utilized to collect data and track participant completion, and provide preliminary organization of the data. The IPI was administered to the university administrators from January- March 2013. The low response rate, which eventually was only 14%, required a longer period for administering the IPI. The researcher reminded prospective participants every other week for three months to complete the survey. The data was downloaded from Qualtrics into SPSS for analysis. Item 27 of the survey identified participants’ interest in being interviewed for the second strand of the study. Based on the quantitative findings the researcher solicited extreme cases (low and high levels of Overall Levels of Internationalization on Campus) to participate in the qualitative interview strand of the study via their university email address. Eleven respondents from the quantitative strand of the study volunteered to participate in the qualitative strand. The researcher then calculated the Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus of these volunteers by summing their responses (scores) to the Planning and Internationalization Measurement (see table 2). The researcher then sought, via email, participants starting from the lowest perception of Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus until three participants with low perceptions were interviewed. Then participants with the highest perception of Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus were invited, via email, until three participants with high perceptions were interviewed. The email invitations were sent out weekly to invite participants to participate in this strand until all 6 interviews were completed. All of the interviews were conducted in the month of April 2013. It’s important to note that no demographic information (e.g., Gender, Administrative Classification, and Years of Service) was considered when selecting the participants for the interviews. The purpose of the study was to explore the perceptions and experience of the university administrators, so the Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus was the only factor
contributing to the selection of the participants. The researcher requested private
office/classroom space on campus to perform the interviews in order to protect the anonymity of
the participants. The interviews took 30-45 minutes to complete. All qualitative data was audio
recorded and transcribed. Information provided remains confidential, and identities were not
revealed. The participants were notified that their identities will be protected and their responses
throughout all strands of the study will be confidential. The university’s identity will remain
anonymous. All participants were assured that their identities would not be revealed in any
published results unless by written consent. Also, they were informed that pseudo names would
be created by the researcher for further protection of their identity. All information will be stored
in a very secure manner: by locking all research material in locked filing cabinet, using a
password protected computer database, and presenting the results in summary report form
(without names of participants). All participants of the quantitative strand were advised to clear
caches and browser information after taking the survey. Participants of the qualitative strand
were informed that they might be directly quoted, but the details of their positions would be
limited. To store, organize, and analyze the qualitative data, the researcher utilized Microsoft
Word software.

**Research Questions**

The research questions for both strands of the study are clarified in this section of the
study.

**Quantitative**

1. Is there a relationship between the perceived level of overall stakeholder involvement in
   internationalization planning and perceived level of internationalization at MWU?
2. Does specific stakeholder (Students, Senior Administrators, Faculty, Staff, Administrators, Alumni, and/or External Constituents) involvement in internationalization planning predict the level of internationalization at MWU?

3. Are there differences in the perceived level of overall and specific stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning based on administrative classification (Senior Administrator, Academic Administrator, Professional Administrator, and Administrative Staff)?

4. Are there differences in the perceived overall level of internationalization on campuses based on administrative classification?

Qualitative

5. What are the experiences of administrators with low perceptions of overall level of internationalization at MWU?

6. What are the experiences of administrators with high perceptions of the overall level of internationalization at MWU?

Data Analyses

The analysis techniques for the quantitative and qualitative strands of the study are examined in this segment of the study.

Quantitative Strand

The researcher utilized descriptive and inferential statistics to examine the research questions. Multiple independent variables were examined in the research questions. The first set of independent stakeholder involvement included the individual involvement level for each of the 7 stakeholder groups and the overall involvement, which summed the individual levels. Each of these was quantitative. The second independent variable was the employment classification.
and categorized four administrative groups at MWU. The five dependent variables utilized to measure internationalization implementation were: Institutionalization of Internationalization (8 items); Administrative Components (8 items); Internationalized Curriculum (9 items); International Students and Scholars (11 items); Study Abroad (6 items).

The data from the survey was downloaded in an excel file and converted for use in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for analysis. Responses from the Internationalization Planning and Implementation survey for each respondent were calculated. First, the score of each subscale was calculated by summing the values of the responses to the items (see Table 2). The IFM identifies some items as having greater importance to the internationalization process on campuses. As a result, Rodenberg (2010) developed a weighted system to account for the impact that these areas have on internationalization. Rodenberg (2010) suggested that institutions multiply 2 or 3 points to the responses of the important items before summing the total of the dimensions. Therefore, the researcher of this study weighted items (8b, 8e, 8g, 10h, 12a, 14a, 14c, 14f, and 16c) by multiplying 2 points to the score of each of the items. The Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus (OIC) was based upon the sum of the scores for both the Internationalization Planning and Internationalization Measurement portions of the survey.
Table 2

*IPI Scoring Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale/variable</th>
<th>Computation and Items</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization Planning (IP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (a)</td>
<td>IPI item 5a</td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Administrators (b)</td>
<td>IPI items 5b</td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (c)</td>
<td>IPI item 5c</td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff (d)</td>
<td>IPI item 5d</td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators (e)</td>
<td>IPI item 5e</td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni (f)</td>
<td>IPI item 5f</td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External constitutents (g)</td>
<td>IPI items 5g</td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Level of Involvement in planning (OIP)</td>
<td>Sum (IPI item 5)</td>
<td>0 - 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization Measurement (IM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization of Internationalization (II)</td>
<td>Sum (IPI items 8a-h)</td>
<td>0 – 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Components (AC)</td>
<td>Sum (IPI items 10a-h)</td>
<td>0 - 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalized Curriculum (IC)</td>
<td>Sum (IPI items 12a-i)</td>
<td>0 - 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students and Scholars (ISS)</td>
<td>Sum (IPI items 14a-j)</td>
<td>0 - 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad (SA)</td>
<td>Sum (IPI items 16a-f)</td>
<td>0 - 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Internationalization Measurement (OIM)</td>
<td>Sum (IPI items 8, 10, 12, 14, 16)</td>
<td>0 - 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus (OIC)</td>
<td>Sum (IPI 5, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16)</td>
<td>0-178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scores from the IPI and its respective subscales were used for the analysis. High scores on the overall perceptions of the level of involvement in planning (OIP) indicate a high level of involvement in internationalization planning, and high scores on the Internationalization Measurement (IM) portion of the IPI indicate participants report a high level of internationalization practices on their campuses. The Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus (OIC) score was calculated by summing the OIP and IM from each respondent.

The analysis of Research Questions utilized a number of statistical methods to analyze the results of the study. The researcher created frequency distributions and inspected for missing data and outliers.
Table 3 presents the inferential statistics to be used for each research question. To address Research Question 1 concerning the relationship between stakeholder involvement in planning and implementation of internationalization efforts, the researcher conducted correlation analysis using the OIP and the IM. The Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated for stakeholder involvement with the five subscales of internationalization planning. In addition, the square of a correlation coefficient was analyzed as the explained variance to examine how much perceived stakeholder involvement explains the variance in the perceived level of implementation of internationalization at the institution being studied. For RQ 2, Pearson’s r correlation coefficients were calculated to measure the relationship between internationalization measurement subscales and stakeholder variables. Forward multiple regression analysis was conducted with Stakeholder Involvement subscales entered as independent variables and implementation subscales entered as dependent variables separately. Multiple regression is an extension of simple linear regression involving more than one independent variable, and it is a technique used to predict the value of a dependent variable from a combination of more than two independent variables (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010).

To address Research Questions 3 and 4, a series of univariate Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were conducted to assess any significant differences in group means (Fraenkel, & Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). The univariate ANOVA is “a hypothesis testing procedure that simultaneously evaluates the significance of mean differences on a dependent variable between two or more treatment conditions or groups” (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010, p. 67, citing Agresti & Finlay, 2009). An ANOVA was conducted for each stakeholder involvement as a dependent variable, and the administrator classifications as independent variable. The results of this analysis
were used to identify the level of perceptions of internationalization planning and implementation based on administrator classification.

Table 3

Research Questions, Variables, and Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Stakeholder involvement in planning  
• Overall stakeholder involvement in planning (OIP) | Internationalization Measurement (IZC)  
• Institutionalization of Internationalization (II)  
• Adm. Components (AC)  
• Internationalized Curr. (IC)  
• Int. Students & Scholars (ISS)  
• Study Abroad (SA)  
• Internationalization Measurement (IM) | • Descriptive Statistics  
• Pearson Correlation |
| 2  | Stakeholder involvement in planning  
• Students (IP3)  
• Senior Administrators (IP4)  
• Faculty (IP5)  
• Staff (IP6)  
• Administrators (IP7)  
• Alumni (IP8)  
• External constituents (IP9) | Internationalization Measurement  
• IE, AC, IC, ISS, SA  
• IM | • Descriptive Statistics  
• Pearson Correlation  
• Multiple Regression |
| 3  | Administrator classification  
• Senior Administrator  
• Academic Administrator  
• Professional Administrator  
• Administrative Staff | Stakeholder involvement in planning  
• IP3-IP9  
• OIP | • ANOVA |
| 4  | Administrator classification  
• Senior Administrator  
• Academic Administrator  
• Professional Administrator  
• Administrative Staff | Stakeholder involvement in planning  
• IP3-IP9  
• OIP  
Internationalization Measurement  
• IE, AC, IC, ISS, SA  
• IM  
Overall Internationalization on Campus (OIC) | • ANOVA |
Qualitative Strand

To address research questions 5 and 6, the researcher utilized an interpretative analysis approach (IPA). Smith (2004) explains IPA is used to explore in detail how participants are making sense of their world, and specific events they have experienced. First, the author developed a Bracketing, a statement expressing his experiences and views with the topic of internationalization. This is done so that the researcher can account for and set aside any personal biases with the topic (Creswell, 2007). The researcher then read and reread the transcript of the data collected. The transcripts were read line-by-line and coded for specific phrases that indicated a salient aspect of the experience. The author pulled out significant statements and themes from the data that were frequently expressed by the participants. These statements were placed into larger groups of themes. These themes included verbatim examples from participants with written descriptions of how the experiences happened. The significant statements were used to develop a comprehensive description of the phenomena being studied (Creswell, 2007).

Because the researcher was doing an in-depth examination of six participants, the themes from each participant were compared in order to identify shared and contrasting themes. This analysis technique was utilized for all participants including those with low and high perceptions of overall internationalization at MWU.

Meta-Inference

Meta-inference refers to an inference developed through an integration of the findings that are obtained from the quantitative and qualitative strands of a mixed methods study (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). In mixed methods, research inferences are obtained from each strand of a mixed method study and are distinguished from meta-inferences which are obtained by integrating the initial inferences (Cameron, 2009, p. 148). The researcher divided the findings of
the data into the two separate strands of inferences. Then general themes from both strands were brought together to illustrate the parallel findings of both strands (Green & Caracelli, 1993). The researchers then restated all of the research questions and summarize the findings of each strand of the study. Answers to the research questions were based on the summarizations of findings for each question (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). First the researcher examined the quantitative research questions (1-4) and findings. Then, the qualitative questions (5-6) and findings were examined. The purpose of this analysis technique was to combining the quantitative and qualitative findings in order to illustrate the purpose for a mixedmethods sequential explanatory research design (Ivankova, Creswell, & Stick, 2006).

**Bracketing**

As an English as a Second Language (ESL) instructor to Koreans living in South Africa, the researcher experienced firsthand the flattening world. The ESL students in these courses were very cognizant of the impact of the Test of English as a Foreign Language had on their future. They frequently shared how attending an American university would increase their likelihood of finding employment in any place in the world, and how lifelong prosperity and happiness would follow. These conversations resulted in a deep appreciation for opportunities afforded by U.S. higher education.

Upon returning to the United States the researcher immediately sought to understand more about U.S. higher education. It was evident that the vast resources accessible to this system and its participants were unparalleled. After enrolling at a university in the U.S., [not the current university under study] the researcher quickly became connected to a population of students known as international students and became aware of the many barriers and challenges international students face as they try to successfully complete their higher education in the U.S.
The researcher observed that many of the obstacles (e.g. extra student fees, limited advising, and no translation services) placed in the paths of international students were pointless, especially considering the great personal, social, and financial sacrifice these students make to come to the U.S. The obvious solution to helping students navigate these concerns was to join university administration in conversations about how the university might limit these obstacles. From some of these initial communications with administrators, it seemed that some viewed international students mainly as a revenue generating resource for the university. Having worked with and served these students, it was clear that they added more value to the university than a financial one. Shortly thereafter, the university began a process known as internationalization planning; beginning to plan ways to accentuate the strengths of having international students and scholars on their campuses. The researcher was invited to participate on these internationalization planning committees which yielded both positive and unsuccessful outcomes. This illustrated the concept that the complexity of institutional internationalization prevents comprehensive implementation of many internationalization plans (Hudzik, 2011).

At MWU the researcher worked with many offices that have international implication on campus. The office supporting international students and scholars recruited me to redesign their international student orientation program. Also, the researcher participated in a learning community on campus that designed a comprehensive internationalization plan for the campus. As a member of the university curriculum development committee, the researcher was able to participate in the redevelopment of the international/global-learning outcome of the general education program. When a professional association came to MWU to assess internationalization practice the researcher was invited to represent the student perspective on internationalization at
MWU. These experiences have given networks and insights into the internationalization strategies and practices at MWU.

The above experiences were a motivation for this study. A practical goal of this study was to provide practitioners with strategies to better engage in the planning and implementation processes. An intellectual goal of this study was to provide more empirical data to contribute to the study of internationalization in higher education. The choice to pursue a mixed methodology was a means of facilitating and reaching these goals. Mixed methods allowed the researcher to better understand the phenomenon of internationalization planning and implementation, and the experiences of those involved in these processes. Studying the experiences of those stakeholders involved in the internationalization processes provided the researcher with a deeper understanding of how the events, actions, and meaning of this phenomenon are shaped by the specific experiences of the participants (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007).

The experiences the researcher has had with the topic provided some practical knowledge that has added to the exploration of the experiences of the stakeholders. Some might view these as a means to lead participants to a desired outcome. Strict adherence to the quantitative and qualitative data collection protocol mitigated any such occurrences. A pilot group vetted the quantitative instruments and qualitative interview protocol to measure the level of internationalization planning and implementation and participants’ experiences with both. As all administrators on the subject campus were invited to participate in the study, both domestic and international stakeholders’ perceptions and experiences could be explored. This bracketing acts as a reminder of how important this topic is to the researcher and the necessity to maintain the highest standards of research.
Assumptions

The study explored the association between university stakeholders and the internationalization of postsecondary education institutions in the U.S. The following were the major assumptions in this study. First, this study assumed association and not causality between university stakeholders' involvement in internationalization planning and the degree of internationalization implementation. Second, the researcher asserted that comprehensive internationalization implementation can be measured based on Rodenberg (2010). Third, based on the researcher’s experience and the literature, it was argued that administrators have the needed knowledge and scope of involvement to assess stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning and the implementation of that plan (Childress, 2009). Fourth, it was assumed that all participants will respond honestly and accurately. Fifth, it was assumed that the instrument utilized in this study was accurate and consistent.
CHAPTER IV. SURVEY RESULTS

Introduction

Chapter IV provides quantitative results of the 80 survey participants. Descriptive results are presented followed by the inferential findings for each research question. In addition, the qualitative results for the open-ended survey items are summarized. Utilizing the Administrative Staff council listserv, the Office of Academic Affairs, and the Secretary of the Board of Trustees, the researcher invited 576 academic administrators and fulltime administrative professionals to complete an online Internationalization Planning and Implementation Survey. The preliminary number of participants who responded to the survey was 107; however, after data screening, 27 cases were eliminated because of incomplete responses to the subscales and/or demographic questions. The actual size of the sample analyzed for the study was 80, which is 14.0% of the invited participants of Mid-Western University. The 14% response rate was lower than the desired 30% rate sought by the researcher. Many respondents did not answer all of the items for various subscales. Therefore, the subscales respondent numbers vary throughout the Internationalization Planning and Internationalization Measurement subscales. These response practices from the participants account for the varying number of responses throughout this strand’s finding.

Descriptive Findings

Demographics

The sample of 80 administrators responded to several demographic items. The majority of the sample was comprised of female (67.3%), white (82.9%) respondents. Age somewhat
varied with 40% between the ages of 36-50 and 37.1% greater than 50 years. Table 4 summarizes the sample’s demographic variables.

Table 4

*Demographics: Gender, Age, and Race and Ethnicity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18- 25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36- 50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51- +</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnicity</td>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative staff at MWU may hold a variety of positions. MWU’s human resource office indicates the following representation across positions: Senior Administrators, Academic Administrators, Professional Administrators, and Administrative Staff.

Survey results indicate that the distribution of administrative classification is somewhat inconsistent within the population. Of the 68 participants that reported their employment classification, the largest group was Professional Administrator at 34.3% followed by Administrative Staff (28.6%) and Academic Administrators (24.3%). Table 5 provides frequencies of respondents’ demographics for employment classification, education, and years of service.
All 68 respondents reported their education levels. Those with Master degrees were the majority with 29 (41.4%), then 22 (31.4%) with Doctoral degrees, followed by 16 (22.9%) with Bachelor degrees. Respondents who have worked for over 20 years (38.6%) made up the largest percentage of respondents. Out of the 68 participants, 11 (15.7%) have worked for 1-5 years, 9 (12.9%) worked for 6-10 years, 21 (30.0%) worked for 10-20 years, and 27 (38.6%) reported working over 20 years.

Table 5

Demographics: Employment Classification, Education, and Years of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Classification</td>
<td>Senior Administrator</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Administrator</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Administrator</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Staff</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate degree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Service</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internationalization Planning Subscale

In this subscale the researcher sought to measure the perception of university administrators on their campus’ stakeholder involvement in Internationalization Planning efforts. The stakeholders explored were Students, Senior Administrators, Faculty, Staff, Administrators,
Alumni, and External Constituents. Eighty administrators responded to the Internationalization Planning subscale. Forty-five percent of the participants reported “I don’t know” if specific stakeholders were involved in the planning efforts. The “I don’t know” response was the most utilized response in the Planning subscale. Senior Administrators were viewed as being the most involved ($M = 3.38$) stakeholder group in the internationalization planning process.

Administrators and Faculty were perceived as the second most involved ($M = 3.11$) groups in the internationalization planning process. The respondents declared that they disagreed that Alumni ($M = 2.40$), Students ($M = 2.58$), and External Constituents ($M = 2.61$) were involved in internationalization planning at MWU. Table 6 depicts the descriptive statistics of the planning subscale.

Table 6

*Descriptive Statistics for Internationalization Planning (n=80)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Administrators</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>43.</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Constituents</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutionalization of Internationalization Subscale

The Institutionalization of Internationalization subscale explored respondents’ perceptions of how internationalization efforts were infused in the university’s organizational structure and culture. There were 76 participants that responded to the Institutionalization of Internationalization subscale. International events/activities on campus are public knowledge
according to 72.9% of the respondents, leading to an awareness of international events by the campus community. The participants (58.6%) perceived the institutional mission as endorsing international education on campus. Respondents (47.2%) reported they disagreed that funding was adequate for internationalization efforts. It was also suggested by 47.1% of respondents that they did not agree that staff was adequate to serve the international needs of the campus’ internationalization efforts. Also, participants (44.2%) reported that campus employees are not provided with opportunities and support for international involvement. International enrollment as an institutional policy is part of the overall enrollment management strategy suggested 81.5% of participants. The descriptive statistics for the institutionalization subscale is illustrated by Table 7.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International involvement</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Mission</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Activities</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Enrollment</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Internationalized</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrative Component Subscale

This subscale was utilized to assess the opinion of respondents on administrative practices directly related to internationalization efforts. About 70% of respondents stated that they did not know if the administration involved alumni in internationalization practices. Also, 64.3% of participants did not know if the chief internationalization officer met with stakeholders
concerning internationalization efforts on campus. For the items related to institutional review of internationalization effort, participants reported over 50% of the time that they did not know if the institution reviewed any of the internationalization efforts on campus. Participants (47.1%) did not know if the chief internationalization officer held a senior administrator role on campus. The upper administration was viewed (44.3%) as being involved in internationalization activities. A total of 74 participants responded to the Administrative Components subscale. Table 8 represents the descriptive statistics for this subscale.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Administrative Component (n=74)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Administration</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief International Officer</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Review</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization Public Comments</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization in Governance Meeting</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges/Departments</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Alumni</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Stakeholders</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internationalization of the Curriculum Subscale

The Internationalization of the Curriculum subscale investigated the views of participants on the internationalization of the university’s curriculum. Seventy-three individuals responded to the Internationalization of the Curriculum subscale. Respondents (82.8%) reported international experiences are offered to students in the university’s curriculum. The participants (77.2%) perceived diverse foreign languages as being offered in the curriculum at MWU. Seventy-five percent of participants observed courses for global understanding as being available to students.
There are international majors available for students in the view of 60.0% of respondents. The majority of participants (55.7%) did not know if international students and scholars were utilized as teaching resources when exploring global issues. Participants (54.3%) suggested that internationalization courses are a part of the general education curriculum at MWU. Table 9 represents the descriptive statistics for the Internationalization of the Curriculum subscale.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major/Minor</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Degree Program</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Credit</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Foreign Languages</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses for Global Development</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Experience</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Tools</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International Student and Scholars Subscale

Table 10 illustrates the descriptive statistics of the International Student and Scholar subscale. This subscale sought to explore respondents’ perceptions on the institutional culture and resources for International Students and Scholars at MWU. A total of 70 participants responded to whether they perceived MWU’s campus culture as supportive of international students and scholars. Participants (45.7%) reported agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement “Campus culture strongly supports the presence of international students and scholars at your campus”. Respondents (71.8%) perceived that international students are receiving experiential learning opportunities to supplement their academic experience at MWU. Seventy-
one percent of participants agreed that international students’ clubs are being organized and funded by MWU. The respondents (68.6%) disagreed that faculty involvement in international activity was considered in promotion and tenure. Also, it was reported that 57.1% of the participants did not know if international expertise was considered in faculty recruitment. Of the respondents, 55.7% reported they do not know if international students are being used as resources for the campus’ teaching and learning. Respondents (50%) did not know if faculty had been involved in international programming on campus.

Table 10

*Descriptive Statistics for International Student and Scholars (n=71)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Culture</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Involvement</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Programs</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Expertise</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student as Resources</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Experiential Learning</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International clubs supported</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Study Abroad Subscale**

The Study Abroad subscale had 69 respondents report their perception of the role and quality of Study Abroad at MWU as an internationalization effort. The Study Abroad subscale’s descriptive statistics are illustrated in Table 11. Respondents overwhelmingly reported (78.5%) that they did not know or disagreed that study abroad opportunities were utilized as a student-recruiting tool at MWU. The facilities abroad for students and faculty were reported as adequate
by 75.7% of the participants. The availability of study abroad to all students was viewed as strongly agree or agree by 70% of participants. Respondents reported (65.7%) that they agreed or strongly agreed that MWU has faculty-led study abroad programs. Participants (54.3%) viewed scholarships as being available for MWU’s students. Forty-nine percent of respondents reported that study abroad programs had the necessary curricular support needed to be successful.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Abroad</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-Led Programs</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Supports</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting Tool</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowledge and Experience Items

The descriptive statistics for the Knowledge and Experience items are denoted in Table 12. These questions had 70 participants respond to the knowledge and experience items. The items examined the level of knowledge and experience administrators have with the following subscales: (1) Institutionalization of Internationalization; (2) Administrative Components; (3) Internationalized Curriculum; (4) International Students and Scholars; (5) Study Abroad; and (6) Internationalization Planning. Study Abroad was reported as the subscale that most participants (78.5%) had at least some knowledge of at MWU. Study Abroad was followed by the Student and Scholar subscale with just over 74.3% of respondents reporting having at least some knowledge of the campus’ culture of supporting those groups. The Planning subscale was the subscale that respondents had the highest level (54.3%) of no knowledge of the
Internationalization Planning practice on MWU’s campus. The Administrative Component of Internationalization followed with 48.6% of respondents having no knowledge of the subscale.

Table 12

*Descriptive Statistics for Knowledge and Experience Questions (n=70)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1 No Knowledge</th>
<th>2 Some Knowledge</th>
<th>3 Frequent Experience and Knowledge</th>
<th>4 Extremely Knowledgeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students and Scholars</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values Items

Table 13 represents the descriptive statistics for the Value questions of the survey.

Seventy respondents replied to questions exploring the level of value they place on Internationalization Planning and Implementation of the Internationalization efforts, those efforts being (1) Institutionalization of Internationalization; (2) Administrative Components; (3) Internationalized Curriculum; (4) International Students and Scholars; (5) Study Abroad. There were 53 (75.7%) respondents that felt internationalization planning was valuable or very valuable to MWU’s internationalization process. The implementation process was viewed as very valuable or valuable by 55 (78.6%) participants.
Table 13

Descriptive Statistics for Values Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>1 No Value</th>
<th>2 Some Value</th>
<th>3 Valuable</th>
<th>4 Very Valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inferential Results

Research Question #1

*Is there a relationship between the perceived level of overall stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning and the perceived level of internationalization at MWU?*

Subscale scores were first created by calculating the sum of the respective items (See Table 14). The descriptive statistics were then conducted for each subscale (see Table 14). The descriptive findings suggest that administrators had average perceptions of the overall level of stakeholder involvement in Internationalization Planning (OIP) \((M = 13.87)\) activities at MWU, which ranged from 1 to 27. Respondents reported having a moderate perception of the Internationalized nature of the Curriculum \((M = 21.37)\) at MWU. It was conveyed by respondents that Students and Scholars are involved and supported \((M = 19.53)\) on campus with responses ranging from 1 to 27. Institutionalization of Internationalization responses ranged from 4 to 26, and is viewed as slightly higher than moderately \((M = 15.61)\) implemented on campus. Study Abroad \((M = 14.00)\) is perceived as incorporated into internationalization efforts at MWU. Respondents reported a less than average perception of Administrative Components \((M = 11.40)\) of internationalization on campus with a range from 8 to 36. The Internationalization Measurement (IM) subscale reports the sum of the perceptions of the respondents on the
following subscales: (1) Institutionalization of Internationalization; (2) Administrative Components; (3) Internationalized Curriculum; (4) International Students and Scholars; (5) Study Abroad). The Internationalization Measurement subscale was viewed as moderately implemented ($M = 81.92$) in the internationalization efforts at MWU with responses ranging from 38 to 141. The Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus subscales (OIC) which includes the sum of the following subscales: (1) Institutionalization of Internationalization; (2) Administrative Components; (3) Internationalized Curriculum; (4) International Students and Scholars; (5) Study Abroad; and (6) Internationalization Planning had responses that ranged from 41 to 165 leading to a higher than moderate ($M = 95.79$) perception of the Overall level of internationalization at MWU (see Table 14).

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Computation</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Stakeholder Involvement in INTZ</td>
<td>Items: Sum (5a-g)</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization of INTZ</td>
<td>Items: Sum (8a-h)</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Component</td>
<td>Items: Sum (10a-g)</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTZ Curriculum</td>
<td>Items: Sum (12a-i)</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students &amp; Scholars</td>
<td>Items: Sum (14a-j)</td>
<td>19.53</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
<td>Items: Sum (16a-f)</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTZ Measurement</td>
<td>Items: Sum (8,10,12,14,16)</td>
<td>81.92</td>
<td>24.29</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>141.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Campus INTZ</td>
<td>Items: Sum (5,8,10,12,14,16)</td>
<td>95.79</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>165.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Correlation coefficients were calculated for all the subscale scores in relation to the level of overall stakeholder involvement in the Internationalization Planning Subscale (see Table 15). The correlational findings indicate that all the Internationalization Measurement subscales (Institutionalization of Internationalization, Administrative Component of
Internationalization, Internationalization of the Curriculum, International Student & Scholar, & Study Abroad) had positively significant \( p<.01 \) correlations with the Internationalization Planning subscale. The relationship between the subscale Internationalization Measurement \( (r = .69) \) has a strong positive relationship with Internationalization Planning. A strong relationship exists between Administrative Components of Internationalization \( (r = .68) \) and Internationalization Planning subscales. A strong positive Pearson’s Correlation \( (r = .64) \) between the International Students and Scholars subscale and Internationalization Planning is present. A positive relationship was found between Internationalization Planning and Institutionalization of Internationalization \( (r = .55) \). Study Abroad and Internationalization Planning are correlated at \( (r = .55) \). Also, the Internationalization of Curriculum \( (r = .43) \) and Internationalization Planning subscales produced a slightly moderate relationship. Table 15 presents the correlation coefficients calculated for this question.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficients of Internationalization Measurement Subscales w/ Overall Stakeholder Involvement in Internationalization Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization of INTZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTZ Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student &amp; Scholars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTZ Measurement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Research Question # 2**

*Does specific stakeholder (Students, Faculty, Staff, Administrators, Senior Administrators, Alumni, and/or External Constituents) involvement in internationalization planning predict the level of internationalization at MWU?*

To evaluate Research Question 2, the researcher calculated descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation coefficients for the specific stakeholders’ (Students, Faculty, Staff, Administrators, Senior Administrators, Alumni, and/or External Constituents) involvement in Internationalization Planning and Internationalization Measurement subscales, and then a multiple regression analysis was conducted. While alumni ($M=2.47$) were viewed as the least engaged stakeholder group in the planning process of internationalization, Senior Administrators ($M=3.32$) were perceived as the most involved group on campus. The Internationalization Measurement was perceived very favorably by respondents reporting high levels ($M=91.3$) of internationalization at MWU.

A Pearson ($r$) correlation was computed to determine the relationship between the Overall Level of Stakeholder Involvement in Internationalization Planning with the Internationalization Measurement subscale. Faculty were the only stakeholder group statistically significant at $p = .013$, and were positively correlated ($r = .51$). Table 16 illustrates the descriptive and correlation results.

Forward multiple regression was then conducted to determine which Stakeholder groups best predicted Internationalization Measurement on MWU’s campus. Faculty Stakeholder Involvement was the only variable identified in the predictive model, $R^2 = .257$, $R^2_{adj} = .214$, $F (1, 17) = 5.90$, $p = .027$. The equation of $y=14.16x+48.10$ accounted for approximately 25.7% of the variance in the Internationalization Measurement subscale.
Table 16

Descriptive of Internationalization Planning Subscale in Relation to Overall Internationalization Measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Administrator</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>- .02</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Constituents</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question # 3

Are there differences in the perceived level of overall and specific stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning based on Administrative Classification?

Descriptive statistics were calculated for the specific and overall level of Stakeholder Involvement in Internationalization Planning subscales by Administrative Classifications (see Table 17). One way ANOVA was conducted was with Administrative Classification entered as the independent variable and specific (Students, Faculty, Staff, Administrators, Senior Administrators, Alumni, and/or External Constituents) and Overall Stakeholder Involvement in Internationalization Planning as the dependent variables. The ANOVA results indicate that only the Stakeholder Involvement subscale of Faculty involvement in Internationalization Planning was perceived differently across Administrative Classifications; $F(3,33) = 4.5$, $p = .009$. A Bonferroni post hoc test indicated that Senior Administrators perceived Faculty as being significantly less involved in Internationalization Planning than both Academic Administrators and Administrative Staff. Table 18 presents the ANOVA results.
Table 17

Descriptive Statistics for Stakeholder Involvement in Internationalization Planning and Administrative Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Senior Admin</th>
<th>Acad Admin</th>
<th>Admin Prof</th>
<th>Admin Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Admin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Constituents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note *OIP= Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus

Table 18

ANOVA Results for Stakeholder Involvement in Internationalization Planning by Administrative Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Involvement</th>
<th>ANOVA Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$F (3,27)=.33, p=.799$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Admin</td>
<td>$F (3,38)=.84, p=.489$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>$F (3,34)=1.4, p=.268$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>$F (3,32)=.58, p=.630$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>$F (3,33)=4.5, p=.009$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>$F (3,19)=1.0, p=.406$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Constituents</td>
<td>$F (3,19)=.606, p=.619$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIP</td>
<td>$F (3,60)=1.6, p=.202$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note *OIP= Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus
Research Question # 4

Are there differences in the perceived overall level of internationalization on campus based on administrative classification?

Internationalization subscales were examined in relation to Administrative Classification. Table 19 presents the descriptive statistics of each Internationalization subscale by Administrative Classification. One way ANOVA was conducted to examine mean differences for each Internationalization Measurement subscale (Institutionalization of Internationalization, Administrative Component of Internationalization, Internationalization of the Curriculum, International Student & Scholar, and Study Abroad), against the Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus by Administrative Classification. Results indicate significant Administrative Classification differences for four of the seven variables: Institutionalization of Internationalization, $F(3,61)=2.8$, $p=.043$; Internationalization of Curriculum, $F(3,61)=3.8$, $p=.014$; Internationalization Measurement, $F(3,63)=4.4$, $p=.007$; and Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus, $F(3,64)=3.4$, $p=.023$. Bonferroni post hoc tests were conducted to determine which Administrative Classifications were significantly different. Results revealed, first, Institutionalization of Internationalization was perceived significantly lower by Administrative Staff as compared to Senior Administrators. Second, Academic Administrators felt the university’s Curriculum was more internationalized than their Administrative Staff colleagues. Third, the Administrative Staff viewed the Internationalization Measurement was not as strong on MWU’s campus as the Academic Administrators perceived. Finally, Academic Administrators perceived the Overall level of Internationalization on Campus higher than Administrative Staff. The ANOVA results are represented in Table 20.
Table 19

Descriptive Statistics for Internationalization Measure, Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus, and Administrative Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Senior Admin</th>
<th>Acad Admin</th>
<th>Admin Prof</th>
<th>Admin Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization of INTZ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Component</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTZ Curriculum</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students &amp; Scholars</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTZ Measurement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall INTZ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20

ANOVA Results for Internationalization Measurement and Administrative Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>ANOVA Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization of INTZ</td>
<td>$F(3,61)=2.8$, $p=.043$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Component</td>
<td>$F(3,56)=1.8$, $p=.164$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTZ Curriculum</td>
<td>$F(3,61)=3.8$, $p=.014$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students &amp; Scholars</td>
<td>$F(3,59)=1.7$, $p=.182$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
<td>$F(3,59)=0.3$, $p=.861$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTZ Measurement</td>
<td>$F(3,63)=4.4$, $p=.007$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall INTZ</td>
<td>$F(3,64)=3.4$, $p=.023$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Survey Results

Two open-ended survey items were designed to elicit participant views on their experiences and perceptions with internationalization planning and implementation at MWU. The researcher read the written responses multiple times in order to develop a better understanding of the data and participants (Smith, 1996). The researcher then coded the data based on the responses to the questions; afterward organizing the findings into large overarching
themes. After reading over the larger themes the researcher removed specific data that did not link to the content patterns found in the responses (Creswell, 2009). The data that remained were themes that were generalizable for the respondents (Smith, 1996).

The first question, “Do you have further insight on internationalization planning at your university?” was aimed to gather written responses on administrators’ understanding of the planning process on campus. Secondly, “Do you have further insight on internationalization implementation at your university?” was asked to glean the comprehension of the respondents’ perceptions of the implementation of internationalization at MWU. The two questions developed four major themes from this source of data. The response rates for the open-ended items are presented in Table 21.

**Planning Themes**

Seven respondents reported that they were not aware of the planning process taking place on MWU’s campus. The following statement from the planning write-in response supports this position, “I am not aware of any internationalization planning at my university.” Also, senior Administrators were viewed by 21.5% of the respondents as the only stakeholder group involved in the planning process. A respondent shares, “Most of the employees are not part of the process and basically handled purely by top administrators”.

**Implementation Themes**

The first theme for the implementation write-in question was that the university’s administration has made great efforts to verbalize their commitment to internationalization implementation. This was reported by three participants. One participant wrote, “The new(ish) administration has given good lip service to the idea [internationalization]”. Three Participants also reported at MWU there are limited comprehensive implementation efforts. One of the
respondents reported, “This effort, if there is an effort going on, needs to be aimed at every student as part of their learning experience. Not just as an add-on”.

Table 21

*Response Rates for Write-in Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Do you have further insight on internationalization planning at your university?</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Do you have further insight on internationalization implementation at your university?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

In this chapter, the author presented quantitative and qualitative findings from the survey administered to the 576 Administrators of Mid-Western University. A total of 68 (8.5%) of participants responded to the survey. The aim of this summary is to clearly state the major findings of the survey results. Table 22 presents the author’s understanding of the major findings of the chapter.
### Table 22

**Summary of Results by Research Question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Significant Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.  Is there a relationship between the perceived level of overall stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning and perceived level of internationalization at MWU?</td>
<td>• Level of Internationalization was positively significantly related to all subscales. The strongest correlations were with: Internationalization Measurement ((r = .69)), Administrative Components of Internationalization ((r = .68)), and ((r = .64)) International Students and Scholars subscales between Internationalization Planning are present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.  Does specific stakeholder (students, faculty, staff, administration, senior administrative leadership, and/or external constituents) involvement in internationalization planning predict level of internationalization at MWU?</td>
<td>• The regression results indicate that only Faculty Stakeholder Involvement significantly predicts internationalization measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.  Are there differences in perceived level of overall and specific stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning based on administrative classification?</td>
<td>• Senior Administrators perceived Faculty as being significantly less involved in Internationalization Planning than both Academic Administrators and Administrative Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.  Are there differences in perceived overall level of internationalization on campuses based on administrative classification? | • Institutionalization of Internationalization was perceived significantly lower by Administrative Staff as compared to Senior Administrators.  
• Administrative Staff viewed the Internationalization Measurement was not as strong on MWU’s campus as the Academic Administrators perceived.  
• Academic Administrators perceived the overall level of internationalization higher than Administrative Staff. |
CHAPTER V. QUALITATIVE RESULTS

This chapter represents the results from the qualitative strand of this study. Chapter V is divided into four sections. First, an introduction to the chapter is laid out. Second, the themes from the interviews are shared. The third section addresses research questions five and six. The last section summarizes the results of the chapter.

Results of Interviews

Participant’s Profile and Analysis

A profile and analysis of the interview for the six participants is produced in this section of the chapter. The participants’ responses to the four major interview questions will be examined. The major qualitative research questions are based on: (1) the participant’s background and professional experience, (2) the experience and understanding of internationalization, (3) the experience at the university with internationalization, (4) the perceptions of the six subscales (stakeholder involvement in Internationalization Planning, Institutionalization of International Education, Administrative Components, and Internationalized Curriculum, International Students and Scholars, Study Abroad) related to internationalization planning and implementation. As a reminder to the reader, the participants were selected based on their willingness to be interviewed and their responses to the IPI. Table 25 provides a summary of the backgrounds and level of perceptions of the participants. Pseudo names were created by the researcher to protect the identities of the participants.
Greg: Low perception of internationalization at MWU. The first interviewee was an Administrative staff member named Greg. He works as a technology professional on MWU’s campus. He has worked at MWU for less than five years. He has also taken courses at MWU. Greg had an IPI score of 49 out of possible score of 178, which indicated low levels of perception of internationalization at MWU.

Understanding of internationalization. Greg has a limited understanding of internationalization, but has linked his knowledge to the university setting. He explains, “I guess the way I understand internationalization is being aware of different cultures and different languages, and making accommodations for those cultures and languages. That’s how you internationalize something I guess is to accommodate for people for those things.”

Overall level of internationalization at MWU. Greg reported that he would give MWU a “D” grade on a traditional A-F grading scale for its internationalization implementation efforts. He explained that in his area of work there are limited conversations about the topic at the university. He explains, “I’d say we’re pretty far down the totem pole as far as how well you do with internationalization. I don’t see many accommodations being made for internationals, but

Table 23

Summary of Demographic Background of the Interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Greg</th>
<th>Charles</th>
<th>Michael</th>
<th>Jennifer</th>
<th>Nancy</th>
<th>Larry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Work</td>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>Over 10</td>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>Over 5</td>
<td>Under 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Perception</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception Score</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I’m not an international, but I know there’s not a whole lot that we do specifically in my area to accommodate for internationalization stuff.”

**Six subscales of internationalization.** Greg reported that he attended a university at an institute that had a strong internationalization background, so he feels that he understands what internationalization should look like at a university, but feels MWU does not behave in this manner. He shares, “Well for example I attended [university]. The student body is very diverse and they make a lot of accommodations for international everything. They have strong language programs. They have strong International Studies programs, International Business Programs. There’s a lot of Study Abroad. It’s hard to attend a class without hearing about study abroad. Like any class doesn’t matter what subject you’re in, you could go study English in England if you want to I would think and by being aware of the cultures and associated with different nations and stuff, it really makes it easier to interact with other people. [MWU’s] campus actually has quite a few international students but there’s no effort to really, at least not in the classes that I’ve attended or the work that I’ve done, there’s no effort to really cater to understanding the different cultures and advancing or advanced communication or understanding really who different cultures are.”

As far as Internationalization Planning, he reported having no knowledge that internationalization planning has taken place on campus. For example, he said, “I haven’t heard of it. I haven’t worked on it. And it’s not apparent to me that there is any type of this thing.”

In regard to Institutionalization of Internationalization Greg reported feeling that efforts were limited by the university, and possibly student driven, but not university driven. He shares, “I think there is some implementation of internationalization. I know there’s a Chinese Culture
club. I don’t know if that’s just strictly student driven or where that comes from. I would assume its student driven.”

Greg had limited knowledge of the *Administrative Components of Internationalization* at MWU. He reported having no knowledge or experience with the administrative components of internationalization at the institution. Speaking of the administrative components, he posits, “It’s [Administrative Components of Internationalization] either not there or I haven’t heard about it being done.”

Greg feels the university is inadequate in its *Internationalization of Curriculum* efforts. As a student at MWU, he has experienced international components in the curriculum at MWU. Discussing the curriculum, he reports, “I’m studying [at MWU] so it’s not necessarily the most culturally or internationally focused thing. However there are a lot of computers, universal languages… I’ve met people and worked with people from those different areas so I feel like it would be appropriate to focus on that somehow. I’m not sure how that could be done but I know it wasn’t a part of the curriculum [at MWU].”

The participant suggested the university had to be purposeful about effectively creating an environment where *International Students and Scholars* could flourish as members of a university community. He does not feel MWU is promoting that type of environment, explaining, “I know it doesn’t feel like that [encouraging to international students and scholars]. I don’t know that that type of thing is particularly welcome or I think if it doesn’t feel that way then if it’s not encouraged, it’s discouraged.”

As a result of his undergraduate university’s active recruitment and student participation in *Study Abroad* he argues it is limited at MWU. He shares, “I’m starting my second class and I haven’t heard of any study abroad anything.”
Greg suggests that the *Future Possibilities* of internationalization at MWU be based on the university’s ability to plan and to hire administrators who understand internationalization, “It [effective internationalization] really requires those who are in charge to understand it and to understand how to plan for it and to understand how to implement it but I think it has to be experienced before it can be, in order to understand… So I think that the university has to have people who have had that exposure. I don’t know if they can be successful if you don’t know what to do.”

**Charles: Low perceptions of internationalization at MWU.** Charles has worked at MWU for over 10 years. A score of 110 was calculated for him based on his responses to the IPI, and he was categorized as having a low perception of internationalization on campus. He has worked and lived overseas multiple times in his professional life. He currently serves as an academic administrator in one of the largest colleges on campus, administering in a unit that has extensive interaction with international students and scholars. He has been involved on university committees dedicated to exploring issues around internationalization.

*Understanding of internationalization.* The participant’s work in study abroad and academic training makes him very familiar with internationalization as a field. He shares, “We could, we can aspire to be a unique place in this region, the center for international activities and a place that is known to some as a part of [the region] that is not part of [the region]. That is aware. You know there’s this real international presence. There’s real energy and interactions with ongoing serious relationships with all sorts of universities and communities throughout the world.”

**Overall level of internationalization at MWU.** Charles feels the university administration is interested in implementing internationalization, but is limited by human and financial
resources. “It [university administration] continues with lip service and I continue to trust the lip service is somewhat, I think it’s sincere. I think that our administration really does see the value and of course I think they see economic value in attracting international students so I think things are happening but I’m, and I’m not going to blame the administration because there’s just so much stuff on everyone’s plates and there are few, there are limited resources.”

**Six subscales of internationalization.** Internationalization Planning has not been very clear to the participant. He knew of an internationalization planning committee, but the meetings stopped because of the lack of direction and time. Charles explains, “We were trying to be all things to all people… still I feel like nothing is happening because [university administrators] are all incredibly overworked… We don’t need to reinvent the wheel but we need to have some idea of where we’re going, and so I would say as far as I’m aware nothing is happening except that people mean to have something happen but they’re too busy”

Charles felt that *Institutionalization of Internationalization* was operating in an average manner because of the university’s limited financial and human resources. He posits, “Okay well if you had unlimited resources of course you have to give us like a D, let’s say because we hired an Education Abroad Director, we haven’t been able to implement anything else. With the resources we’ve been given, I’ll just I’ll go for the C again…. We are doing some things”

*Administrative Components of Internationalization* is nonexistent according to the participant, he shares, “I don’t think we’re doing much of anything right now. I think that there’s the intention to do something. We tried to hire someone to oversee all of the international student services but there weren’t funds to do that.”

*Internationalization of Curriculum* is decentralized here according to him, so MWU has limited its ability to internationalize the curriculum in a systemic manner. He expounds, “If you
want internationalization … if you want to change the mentality on campus in my opinion you do those things not with every class but you have a handful of classes that everyone takes and if you want an international and global perspectives class that everyone on this campus takes in my mind that internationalizes the curriculum. Here at [MWU] everything is so decentralized. ‘Well we’re going to create a bunch of internationalization courses. Just go out and create classes that will get counted as an internationalization component’, you get a whole mix of all sorts of things, nothing coherent.”

He views International Students and Scholars as an asset that is not utilized or cared for at MWU. Charles says, “I would say as far as students are concerned, not as well as they should be. Students aren’t all able to get into their English as Second Language classes. How do we bring over international students, and then just say ‘Oh you have to take these classes because without these classes you can’t perform well in your studies but you’ve got to wait until your second or third semester to actually take them.’ That just seems completely ludicrous….as far as international faculty, we have international faculty all over the place but I think [MWU] doesn’t market them well enough. They’re not used the right way. I think the way students see international faculty, in the mind of most students they are an impediment to students’ education rather than this wonderful opportunity… all they hear is a bad accent they can’t understand and a teaching style that they don’t get.”

Study Abroad is a strong point of internationalization at the university because it recently hired an experienced Education Abroad director. He said, “We actually have the first ever Director of Education Abroad at [MWU]… she brings a wealth of experience. It’s great to know that [MWU] was able to hire someone with so much experience. It’s been so far a pleasure working with her. Well, we’re still in the planning and figuring things out stage. We’ll have to
see how the other stages go, but at least we have someone who can give some sense of direction there and establish some standards.”

Positive Future Possibilities are linked to increases in resources and empowerment of current employees, in his view. He shares, “I think I want to continue to believe that we’re heading in the right direction but if we don’t have the resources to hire people you’ve got to then empower people who you’re not going to hire to do big things.”

Michael: Low perceptions of internationalization at MWU. Michael is a senior academic administrator, and has been at MWU for less than five years. This administrator has worked at other universities exposed to internationalization practices. A low perception of internationalization was viewed by Michael with a score of 113 out of 178 on the IPI.

Understanding of internationalization. Michael has a very broad view of internationalization at universities. He explains, “It’s just this all-encompassing notion of broadening our horizons at the university level by trying to take down barriers and put, not even necessarily it’s symptoms, just take barriers so that there can be this cross-pollination of thoughts and ideas as we get ready for twenty-first century global society.”

Overall level of internationalization at MWU. The participant had mixed feelings about the internationalization on campus. He states, “I would say it’s mixed. They’re trying. Clearly trying. There’s no doubt about it. I don’t know if the efforts are more because it’s the right thing to do or because of the student enrollment. I don’t know what the motives are. It doesn’t matter. This is what it is but seems like all of a sudden there’s kind of money available for students to study abroad and all these kinds of things but I don’t know how organized it is.”

Six subscales of internationalization. Internationalization planning has been limited to key administrators according to the participant, he shares, “I would suggest, again there’s
probably some key folks giving it lip service, strategic plan. You know that doesn’t mean much because the devil’s in the details.”

*Institutionalization of Internationalization* has to be a purposeful initiative to embody internationalization, he feels. He states, “We have to avoid this notion of giving lip service to it and not really being true to what we think is someone who’s sincerely and honestly undertaking internationalization.”

*Administrative Components of Internationalization* He does not see an administrative approach to internationalization at MWU. He remarks, “So that part of faculty and staff I don’t see as practicing internationalization, unless it’s just by discipline.”

*Internationalization of Curriculum* has been focused on local diversity, and not true internationalization, in the opinion of participant five. He explains, “No, ‘cause what we’ll say is we make sure diversity is in our curriculum … You need to be able to interact with all folks to do so successfully and I don’t think we are really prepared to do that in our curriculum. It’s at most, because even when we do have those conversations, it’s trying to bring people out there. You know it’s the white male in the world… And that’s diversity. That’s not internationalization.”

Michael suggested that *International Students and Scholars* services at MWU are limited, and do not promote cross-cultural development. He states, “If it happens it’s by happenstance. It’s usually you’ll see like groups do like things. You know? So all the kids from Korea, they’ll be sponsored by Korean faculty and they’ll do things, and I understand you need your support from your home country, country of origin. I get that but, it doesn’t do us a lot of good to bring their culture over here or vice versa and we stay in our little cocoons.”

*Study Abroad* is seen in a positive, but skeptical way by this participant as it relates the purpose of study aboard at MWU. He states, “We’re making improvements… all of a sudden we
have this kind of flash and study abroad. It’s pretty good. Now the problem is I can get all excited about that and think I’ve done great just because we got funds. Now what is Study Abroad? Some students, because of their parents, will call it a nice little vacation and how many of them are really going over there to learn about the culture, to engage interactively, bring something back which we can contribute back here at the university?”

_future possibilities of internationalization are strong at MWU if the proper human resources and strategy are in place. He says, “You’ve got to have the right personnel in place, first of all. Make sure you have a plan.”

Jennifer: High perception of internationalization at MWU. Jennifer has worked at the university for over five years. She works in a department with direct responsibility for international education. As a professional administrator, she works with students and faculty from a variety of units on campus. Jennifer reported a score of 132 leading to a categorization of a high level of perception of internationalization at MWU.

Understanding of internationalization. Jennifer reported integration of international components of the university as her understanding of internationalization. She reports, “Internationalization for me is the integration of international concepts, both culture, language, understanding, all of that cultural sensitivity. All of that. The integration of all of those things into the institution and into the mission, what we’re trying to do here, trying to really diversify what we’re doing. Our current existing structure, trying to diversify what we have but also add to what we have with more international complexity.”

Overall level of internationalization at MWU. She thinks that MWU is working at an average level of effectiveness of internationalization. “I think, across the board I gave us a C. I
think it’s happening. I don’t think that everybody that should be involved is involved to the extent that everybody should be involved, if this is a core piece of what we are trying to do.”

**Six subscales of internationalization.** She perceives Internationalization planning as being developed at the top administrative level, but is not being communicated to all on campus. She shares, “Well I think that we’re doing a really good job in that we have an upper administration that’s really dedicated. I think we do. I think their wishes and desires are slowly being communicated down and trying to get those ideals and those goals going. I don’t think we’re there in terms of everybody needing to know.”

She views *Institutionalization of Internationalization* as a process that has not received full buy-in on campus. She posits, “I guess I would say there’s more awareness and understanding of the fact that we would like to institutionalize here, internationalize the institution. I don’t know that I would say that there’s acceptance yet in terms of how every unit across campus could make that happen or how every student organization could work with international students to integrate them more into the campus community.”

**Administrative Components of Internationalization** are limited at MWU according to the participant because of the lack of human resources. Jennifer states, “I think that right now the trick is finding the people to actually make those things happen and that’s the piece of the puzzle that I think that we don’t have the infrastructure yet in terms of number of staff. We have quality staff right now but it’s just we have one or two people doing absolutely everything. I mean everything and that’s when you’re talking about wanting to triple the number of international students. Well you can’t do it with one and half people.”

**Internationalization of Curriculum** is not a general education requirement, so this component is weak at MWU according to the participant. Jennifer explains, “We have a couple
courses that you could take like International Studies, International Communications, Intercultural things like that but we don’t have courses that are required or courses that count as General Education requirements. Those courses that students don’t necessarily want to take. There’s areas for opportunity where we could infuse internationalization into the curriculum in ways that we’re not right now.”

As far as the International Students and Scholars component, the participant feels improvements in services to the students should be a focal point of the university, but scholars’ services are limited. She said, “I think that over the course of the past year there’s been a lot more focus on the quality we’re providing to international students. I don’t know since I’ve been here over the course of the past six, seven years that that’s ever really been a full focus… I don’t know a lot about the scholar’s piece. I know that really there aren’t a ton of people that are advising the scholars that are visiting campus so I’m sure that that’s an area for opportunity.”

Study Abroad has improved according to the participant because of the resources and structural changes made to the office. Jennifer responded, “I think that we are very lucky in that we have the structure to have some of the best Study Abroad programs out there... I think with the hiring of the new director…there’s a lot of really cool opportunities that are being developed and a lot of quality programs and policies that we’re now developing that were never in place in terms of how to build a new program and how to sustain it financially and things like that.”

Future Possibilities, for the university, according to the participant, have to be purposeful to improve internationalization on campus. She shares, “Doing it [internationalization] in a meaningful way... how do we do it across the board and in a way that makes sense. Not just to say that we’re doing it for the fact that we want internationalize but also that we’re doing it in a way that would actually benefit the students.”
Nancy: **High perception of internationalization at MWU.** Nancy has worked and lived overseas in her professional life. Currently she works as an administrative professional within international education in a service-oriented capacity. She has been at MWU for less than five years. The second highest score among the qualitative participants on perceptions of Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus was 143 gathered from Nancy’s IPI score.

**Understanding of internationalization.** Nancy has developed an understanding of internationalization that is student and scholar oriented. She responded, “Well for me that would mean a diverse student population. And diverse faculty and robust exchange programs as well as degree seeking students both here at [MWU] and also sending students overseas.”

**Overall level of internationalization at MWU.** She thinks the university is improving in its internationalization efforts, but needs to focus their priorities. She shares, “I think we’re making headway….So let’s reel it back in and have one focal point and one strategy. And everyone does have great ideas. We can listen to them and tweak the strategy. But let’s keep on focus.”

**Six subscales of internationalization.** Nancy felt that internationalization planning has not traditionally been coordinated very well at the university, but recent efforts have begun to change this pattern. She says, “I think that there’s planning being done, but until recently I don’t think it was very well coordinated… I think there’s a very large effort to coordinate, not stop those things from happening but to make sure that we are all moving in the same direction and that we’re not duplicating efforts and that these different efforts are fitting into an overall strategic plan.”

**Institutionalization of Internationalization.** She believes the university is moving in the right direction to internationalize the campus, but have limited resources. She shares, “So we are
making huge efforts to coordinate that [internationalization] better and it’s just right now we don’t really… We’re stretched very thin.”

Nancy thinks *Administrative Components of Internationalization* messages are mixed and not very direct from the leadership of internationalization at the university. She states, “I think there’s a commitment and there’s conversation about that [*Administrative Components of Internationalization*]. The conversation is splintered. And I think it’s really critical right now that the leadership, to internationalize the campus, comes out very strongly and says ‘This is the leadership’.”

*Internationalization of Curriculum* is not linked to the work of Nancy, but she feels it is vital to internationalization at MWU. She explains, “I would say that’s outside my area of expertise. I’m more involved with the administrative pieces... if we don’t have that [internationalization of curriculum] piece then we will fail with the other pieces that I’ve talked about. Completely fail. It’s just as important or more important than bringing people here and sending people away.”

Nancy feels *International Students and Scholars* should be viewed as resources for MWU, and should be valued as such. She explains, “So while we need to definitely respond to the financial and economic power that some of our faculty have, we also have to deliberately bring people over who will make our campus a better place esoterically and not just financially. That is what we are. We are an institute of higher education. Again we must do things and balancing them out and not depriving anyone if possible. So I think we’re doing better because there is a more transparent process for that.”

She suggested *Study Abroad* at the university is a strength because of the recent hiring of the new director, and the possibility of a new organizational direction. She shares, “The
university made a big step in hiring a director for Education Abroad and trying to bring that into best practices along with fresh practices so, I don’t think we’ve been in balance with many of our programs and that might not be due to any preferential treatment. It might just be lack of organization and direction.”

The participant suggested that positive *Future Possibilities* for the university would be to focus resources on internationalization efforts. She said, “We have to get focused. We have to have one focal point. We have to have a real strategy. It has to be based on real, real data, real facts. There has to be real resources put behind it. Not just words.”

**Larry: High perception of internationalization at MWU.** Larry has been an Academic Administrator at MWU for just over five years, and has the highest level of perception of all the participants with a score of 166. Most of his professional and academic work has been in the Midwest. He works with international students and faculty in his current administrative responsibilities

*Understanding of internationalization.* Internationalization should be a way to add international components to campus, according to Larry. He shares, “My perspective of internationalization is it endeavors to bring international presence to students, to the college campus, and in so doing to enhance the experience of all the students on campus and bring an international flavor and perspective to campus.”

**Overall level of internationalization at MWU.** He has a positive perception of internationalization at MWU, stating, “First of all I do believe that they have [MWU] made efforts to internationalize their campus. Could they do more? Absolutely. And there is an initiative that has just begun to reenergize that internationalization effort here on campus.”
Six subscales of internationalization. Internationalization planning has been put into place and is a resource oriented planning approach. In Larry’s opinion, “I believe they’ve reallocated and redistributed some resources and really made that part of their strategic plan.”

The Institutionalization of Internationalization at MWU has been administratively driven in his view. He says, “It does seem, at least initially, that it has been a top down initiative. It’s great, it has a lot of merit don’t get me wrong but it does seem to have been implemented top down.

Regarding the Administrative Components of Internationalization, from Larry’s perspective, the university administration is taking a discursive approach to internationalization. He states, “All right, so not a lot of experience with the administration [component], and it just seems like they’re going to expand that office [international education] but again it’s kind of like they’re telling and selling at the same time.”

Internationalization of Curriculum has its challenges at MWU, in Larry’s opinion. He explains, “I don’t think there’s been much effort to differentiate the curriculum for the international student…I don’t get a sense that there’s been a lot of support for students in, for example, writing dissertations. If English is your second language I haven’t experienced that there’s been a lot of support for students that way. Seems like you come with the necessary prerequisites skills or not.”

He believes that International Students and Scholars service focuses on student enrollment at MWU. He states, “I think that reality is what’s fueling the universities desire now, it is to first of all increase its overall enrollment but to put a real special emphasis on increasing the enrollment of international students.”
There are resources being dedicated to Study Abroad, in his understanding. He states, “Again it sounds like the university is ramping up to increase those opportunities for students and to create more connections with universities abroad and trying to see if there’re some ways [MWU] can partner with them, and actually creating some programs in some of the international universities abroad.”

Positive Future Possibilities of internationalization are based on discourse and collaboration. He suggests, “It’s something that we need to really work at, I think it’s an admirable goal. We’ll see. Hopefully the implementation will include more discussion and engagement of people affected by it.”

**Emergent Themes**

As Table 24 displays, key themes emerged from the interpretative analysis. It is important to note that the themes, for the most part, were reported by all participants regardless of their level of perception of overall internationalization at MWU.
Table 24

*Overall Themes from Interviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales and Themes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understand Internationalization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Internationalization efforts are effective organizational practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Diversity and cultural understanding increases with internationalization efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall level of Internationalization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase interest in internationalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No reasoning for interest in internationalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internationalization Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>Low Perceptions</em> - Limited to no knowledge of whether planning was taking place on campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>High Perceptions</em> - Senior administration involved, but not others in planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutionalization of Internationalization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Human and financial resources are limited to implement internationalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Components of Internationalization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Limited to no real practice of internationalization in administrative components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of funds and human resources for internationalization efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internationalization of Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Internationalization of the curriculum is vital to effective internationalization efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>Low Perceptions</em> - Insufficient internationalization courses available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More robust internationalization course in general education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Students and Scholars</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>Low Perceptions</em> - International students not supported on campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <em>High Perceptions</em> - Students are supported on campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Limited resource for scholar support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Abroad</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hiring of the new director was viewed positively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More robust academic offering needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increases in funds needed for programs and participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Possibilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need more internationalization planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need more human and monetary resources to plan and implement internationalization efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Understanding Internationalization. Two themes emerged from this question. First, the participants understood internationalization as an organizational effort to add international components to MWU’s campus. This applied to those working directly in internationalization and those who did not have direct responsibility for internationalization components. This was also prevalent at all level of perceptions. Michael shared, “I guess my broad understanding is that internationalization represents an effort to bring international perspectives into the university” Lastly, the idea of increase in diversity and cultural understanding was a major theme for this question especially prevalent in all of the participants’ responses. Jennifer explained, “Internationalization for me is the integration of international concepts both culture and, you know, language. You know understanding, You know all of that is cultural sensitivity”.

Overall level of Internationalization. The first major theme from the assessment of internationalization was that participants with high and low perceptions believed that the university has a “reenergized” interest in internationalizing the campus. The second theme was that there is no clear reasoning or understanding for the new approach to internationalization. This theme was clear no matter the perception. Michael puts it well when he states, “I don’t know what the motives are” concerning internationalization at MWU.

Internationalization Subscales

Internationalization Planning

The results suggested two themes in this subscale. First, those with low perceptions had limited knowledge whether planning was taking place on campus. Second, those with higher perceptions like Nancy and Jennifer reported that senior administration was involved in the planning process, but no other groups were involved, in their experience.
Institutionalization of Internationalization

The major theme from this subscale from those with high and low perceptions of internationalization at MWU was that human and financial resources are limited, so it’s difficult to implement internationalization. This is demonstrated by Nancy’s response where she stated, “We’re stretched very thin”, as an organization this limits institutionalization of internationalization plans.

Administrative Components of Internationalization

Greg, Charles, Jennifer, and Michael felt that there was limited, to no real practice of internationalization in the administrative components of MWU. The participants suggested in the second theme that the lack of funds and human resources were the basis for the lack of implementation in this subscale. For example, Nancy assesses the limited resources as, “It’s just, we have one or two people doing absolutely everything”.

Internationalization of Curriculum

Three themes emerged with this subscale. First, all the participants suggested that internationalization of the curriculum was vital to internationalization efforts on campus. Nancy expressed the groups’ thoughts well when she reported, “If we don’t have that piece then we will fail.” Second, those with low perceptions reported that the curriculum was not currently operating with internationalization courses which made for negative views on the topic. Third, Greg, Charles, and Jennifer, felt that a more robust internationalization course offering should be required in the university’s general education core.

International Students and Scholars

Three themes emerged from this subscale. First, according to those with low perceptions of internationalization, international students are not being supported socially or academically by
the university. This position is evident in Charles’s response where he suggested that international students cannot get into the English as a Second Language courses they need to be successful at MWU. He states, “How do we bring over international students? And then just say ‘Oh you have to take these classes because without these classes you can’t perform well in your studies but you’ve got to wait until your second or third semester to actually take them.’” Second, those with high perceptions suggested that students were cared for well by the university. Third, Charles and Jennifer suggested that the university does not provide enough resources to properly support scholars. Jennifer asserts that since resources are limited on campus, scholars are not provided for properly at MWU.

**Study Abroad**

Three themes arose from the study aboard subscale. The hiring of the new director of study abroad was a factor in the positive view of study abroad among the participants. Second, participants Charles, Jennifer, Nancy, and Larry viewed new directions, programs, and policies as great opportunities for a more robust offering for faculty and students. Third, Jennifer, Michael, and Larry believed there were increases in funds in the departments that have given financial support to senior administration’ initiative for increase in study abroad participation.

**Future Possibilities**

There were two theme observed in this subscale. Respondents reported that planning practices are important for a strategic approach to effective internationalization practices at MWU. Secondly, according to participants Greg, Charles, Nancy, and Michael, increased monetary and human resources would be vital to successful future possibilities.
Research Questions Results

The findings below summarize the responses of participants as related to research questions three and four. The data sources are based on the findings from the interview transcripts. Table 24 illustrates some of the themes from the interviews of those participants with low and high overall perceptions of internationalization at MWU.

Research Question # 5

What are the experiences of administrators with low perceptions of the overall level of internationalization at MWU?

The researcher sought to understand and make meaning of the experiences of administrators with a low perception of internationalization at MWU. There were only three subscales that had significant findings that differed from participants with a high level of perceptions of overall internationalization at MWU. First, there is limited to no knowledge of internationalization planning on campus. Those with low perceptions of internationalization had no idea that planning had taken place, and if they did know of it they did not know details of who was involved in the planning process. For example, Greg stated, “I haven’t heard of it. I haven’t worked on it. It’s not apparent to me that there is any type of this thing.”

Second, internationalization curriculum is insufficient to meet international needs at MWU. Those with low perceptions of internationalization noted that courses with international topics were inadequate at the university. Charles reported, “Here[ at MWU] everything is so decentralized. ‘Well we’re going to create a bunch of internationalization courses. Just go out and create classes that will get counted as the internationalization component.’ You get a whole mix of all sorts of things, nothing coherent.” Moreover Michael stated,” No, because what we’ll say is we make sure diversity is in our curriculum… that’s not internationalization.”
Third, *international students are not supported* at MWU. The respondents with low perceptions of internationalization submitted that international students were not being properly supported while studying at MWU. For instance, Charles reported, “How do we bring over international students? And then just say ‘Oh you have to take these classes because without these classes you can’t perform well in your studies but you’ve got to wait until your second or third semester to actually take them.”

**Research Question # 6**

*What are the experiences of administrators with a high perception of the overall level of internationalization at MWU?*

The purpose of this question was to explore the experiences of administrators with high perceptions of internationalization at MWU. Two themes were reported from the experience of administrators with a high level of perception of internationalization at MWU. The first theme suggested that *internationalization planning is being practiced only by senior administrators* at MWU. The respondents with high perceptions felt that planning was taking place on campus, but the practice was limited to administrators. Speaking of planning, Larry states, “It does seem, at least initially that, it [planning] has been kind of a top down initiative.” Jennifer reported, “Well I think that we’re doing a really good job in that we have an upper administration that’s really dedicated…I think their wishes and desires are slowly being communicated down … I don’t think we’re there in terms of everybody needing to know.”

Second, respondents reported international *students are supported* while studying at MWU. Participants with high perceptions of internationalization at MWU suggested that international students are supported and are a priority for the university. Jennifer explained, “I think that over the course of the past year there’s been a lot more focus on the quality we’re
providing to international students. I don’t know, since I’ve been here over the course of the past [years] that that’s ever really been a full focus.” While Larry shared, “What’s fueling the universities desire now is to, first of all, increase its overall enrollment but to put a real special emphasis on increasing the enrollment of international students.”

**Summary**

Chapter V presented the findings of the second strand of the study, the qualitative results. An interpretive analysis was employed based on the questions raised in the interview protocol. Along with the background information of the participants, the protocol sought responses to four main questions, (1) the participant’s background and professional experience, (2) the participant’s experience and understanding with internationalization, (3) the participant’s experience at the university with internationalization, (4) the participant’s perceptions of the six subscales (stakeholder involvement in Internationalization Planning, Institutionalization of International Education, Administrative Components, and Internationalized Curriculum, International Students and Scholars, Study Abroad). This was done in order to understand the internationalization experiences of administrators with high and low perception of the overall level of internationalization at Mid-Western University.

Research questions five and six had five major findings. First, *internationalization planning* was not common knowledge to those who had low perceptions of internationalization. Second, the *internationalized curriculum* at MWU is insufficient to promote international education according to those with low perceptions of internationalization. Third, *international students are not supported* in their academic endeavors, claimed those with low perceptions of internationalization at MWU. Fourth, those with high perceptions reported that *internationalization planning* is taking place on campus, but the practice is limited to senior
administrators. Fifth, international students are supported and are a priority according to those with high perceptions of overall internationalization at MWU.
CHAPTER VI. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Chapter VI consists of four segments. The chapter starts with an overview of the mixed methods study. The second section is a meta-inference of the results from both strands of the study that provides a discussion of the overall findings. The implications and recommendations are presented in the third section. Finally, the researcher will offer concluding remarks for this study.

The purpose of this sequential mixed methods dissertation was to understand the perceptions and experiences of university administrators on stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning and implementation of internationalization at Mid-Western University. As mentioned earlier, globalization is negatively and positively influencing educational institutions (Kubow & Fossum, 2007). As such, teaching and learning in higher education are being impacted progressively and adversely (Altbach, 2007). Higher education institutions have utilized the process of internationalization to enhance the positive and limit the negative influence of globalization. Internationalization refers to “any systematic, sustained effort aimed at making higher education (more) responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy and labour markets” (Keber, 2009, p. 2). Universities have used internationalization to increase global awareness and understanding, however, the lack of strategy and collaboration has restricted the effect it has had on college campuses (Childress, 2009).

Internationalization is a complex process impacting institutional administrative structural and cultural components, international exchanges of students and scholars, international student and scholar recruitment and satisfaction, internationalized curriculum, and domestic students
studying abroad (Hser, 2005). The goal of these efforts is to provide students and scholars with an environment where they collaboratively explore the world and its social, cultural, political, and economical issues more comprehensively in order to find creative ways to engage and solve those issues (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008). This comprehensive influence on the academy requires complex strategic planning and broad stakeholder involvement in implementation.

Three main concepts are blamed for the limited implementation of internationalization on college campuses: 1) a lack of internationalization leadership at universities (Pandit, 2009); 2) limited involvement of campus stakeholders in planning and implementation practices (Childress, 2009); and, 3) minimal human and financial resources for internationalization efforts (Hawawini, 2011). As a result, internationalization efforts are often disjointed and ineffective (NASULGC, 2004).

Lisa Childress (2009) argues that “There is a gap between the higher education institutions’ development and implementation of internationalization plans” (p. 292). This gap led to the development and implementation of this study. The hope was that the study would lead to finding ways to close the gap in practices and literature around these internationalization efforts. Principally, this study examined the internationalization efforts of a specific university in the Midwest of the United States of America. The selection of this university was based on the university’s recent development of strategies, practices, and interest in internationalization.

This study was guided by six research questions. The next section of this chapter will briefly discuss the main results from both research components, quantitative and qualitative. Through this study, the researcher has blended statistical generalization and in-depth narratives to increase the strength of the findings (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007).

To remind readers, the research questions that are discussed are as follows:
Quantitative Questions

1. Is there a relationship between the perceived level of overall stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning and the perceived level of internationalization at MWU?

2. Does specific stakeholder (Students, Faculty, Staff, Administrators, Senior Administrators, Alumni, and/or External Constituents) involvement in internationalization planning predict the level of internationalization at MWU?

3. Are there differences in the perceived level of overall and specific stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning based on administrative classification?

4. Are there differences in the perceived overall level of internationalization on campuses based on administrative classification?

Qualitative Questions

5. What are the experiences of administrators with low perceptions of the overall level of internationalization at MWU?

6. What are the experiences of administrators with high perceptions of the overall level of internationalization at MWU?

Meta-Inference of Results and Discussions

Research questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 employed correlational, multiple regression, and ANOVA. Research questions 5 and 6 applied an interpretive qualitative analysis method. This section’s structure will be guided by the themes of the findings from both strands of the study and the conclusions gleaned from these themes.

Relationship between Stakeholder Involvement in Planning and Internationalization

The researcher examined administrators associated with internationalization planning and internationalization practices at MWU. The correlational findings indicated that Overall
Stakeholder Involvement in the Internationalization Planning subscale was positively related \((p<.01)\) to each of the Internationalization Measurement subscales (Institutionalization of Internationalization, Administrative Component of Internationalization, Internationalization of the Curriculum, International Student & Scholar, & Study Abroad), and Overall Internationalization Measurement. The strongest correlations of Overall Stakeholder Involvement in Internationalization Planning were with Overall Internationalization Measurement \((r = .69)\), Administrative Components of Internationalization \((r = .68)\), and the International Students and Scholars subscale \((r = .64)\).

These quantitative results, drawn from the responses of all administrators, were substantiated by the qualitative findings. Administrators interviewed indicated that internationalization planning and internationalization practices are core to effective internationalization efforts. This position is well articulated by Nancy when she states, “I think there’s a very large effort to coordinate, not stop those things from happening but to make sure that we are all moving in the same direction and that we’re not duplicating efforts and that these different efforts are fitting into an overall strategic plan.” In this quote Nancy is suggesting that the Internationalization Measurement components should fit into the overall plan for internationalization leading to a more successful approach to internationalization on campus. The relationship between internationalization efforts and planning is reinforced by findings in the literature on the topic. Childress (2009) explains that internationalization plans can act as a map for actual internationalization efforts, and give a direction on how to implement those practices. The diversity of stakeholders is a key element, as well, because those stakeholders give input that helps plans become more inclusive. As the plans are more inclusive they become more attractive to diverse stakeholders on campus, and that leads to an increase in implementation of the plans.
Kotter (2001) contends strategic planning is a tool organizations utilize for the purpose of helping an organization do a better job at focusing the resources of an organization in the same direction. Kotter’s work teaches that planning is connected to the actual work that will be performed by an organization. In light of the literature, the participants at MWU may view planning and implementation as linked because they have seen, through the failure of efforts, the need for comprehensive planning and internationalization efforts on their campus, and know the success of sustained internationalization initiatives are based on the relationship of these practices.

**Differences in Perceptions of Stakeholder Involvement**

The researcher also explored how perceptions of stakeholder involvement in the internationalization process may differ by administrators with low or high perceptions of internationalization. Administrators with low perceptions of internationalization had no knowledge of it or limited details to explain it. To illustrate administrators having no knowledge of the planning process, Greg stated, “I haven’t heard of it. I haven’t worked on it. It’s not apparent to me that there is any type of this thing.” For example, according to campus community members, a learning community of faculty and students at MWU created an internationalization plan, and presented it to senior university leadership (Personal Communication, 2013). The leadership of the university explained that a university committee had been mandated with the charge of creating an internationalization plan, and that the plan developed by this learning group would be given to these community members. The university committee was eventually defunct, the learning community plan was not utilized, and no plan was developed by the university committee (Personal Communication, 2013). In speaking about the details of the plan, Michael asserts that details are limited to key administrators. He states, “I
would suggest, again there’s probably some key folks giving it lip service, strategic plan. You know that doesn’t mean much because the devil’s in the details.”

This perception was also found in the quantitative data. Forty-five percent of the respondents of the IPI reported not knowing who was involved in the internationalization plan. Also, 64.3% of participants said, “I don’t know” if my university has an internationalization plan. Likewise, 54% of the responses to the knowledge and experience of internationalization planning question reported having no knowledge or experience with the topic. Similarly, 75.7% of all the survey respondents felt that internationalization planning was valuable or very valuable to MWU’s internationalization process. The following statement from the qualitative data from the survey backs this finding, “I am not aware of any internationalization planning at my university.” The perception of limited knowledge and involvement that has been reported by participants does not provide MWU with the necessary stakeholder involvement for effective internationalization planning or implementation. Knight (1997) suggests the greatest asset to stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning is developing creative ways to navigate obstacles of internationalization that are university specific. Kotter (1996) contends that organizations that develop and share their strategic planning with a variety of stakeholders are more likely to receive comprehensive buy-in and participation for the change initiative.

In contrast, administrators with high perceptions of internationalization at MWU were more positive about stakeholder involvement. Specifically, two themes were revealed based on the analysis the interviewees’ responses. The first theme was that internationalization planning is being performed only by Senior Administrators at MWU. The administrators with high perceptions felt that planning was taking place on MWU’s campus, but the practice was limited to Senior Administrators. Speaking of senior administrators involvement in planning, Larry
states, “It does seem, at least initially that, it [planning] has been kind of a top down initiative.” Furthermore, Jennifer who has high perception of internationalization shared, “Well I think that we’re doing a really good job in that we have an upper administration that’s really dedicated…I think their wishes and desires are slowly being communicated down … I don’t think we’re there in terms of everybody needing to know.” Jennifer offers that this approach to internationalization is good for MWU based on where they are currently with their internationalization efforts.

This theme was found in the quantitative data as well. Quantitatively speaking, Senior Administrators were perceived by all participants as the most involved ($M=3.38$) in the internationalization planning process. As mentioned earlier, Senior Administrators ($M=3.20$) themselves perceived that they were the most involved stakeholder group in the planning process. The qualitative data from the survey supports this position. A respondent shares, “Most of the employees are not part of the process and it is basically handled purely by top administrators”. Childress (2009) argues that internationalization plans that are supported by senior administration emerged as a critical factor in the development of implementable plans. Senior administrator backing provided funding, credibility with the campus community, and active participation in the development of the plan (Knight, 1997). The view that senior administrators were the most involved in the internationalization process with limited stakeholder engagement can be viewed negatively. The lack of stakeholder engagement substantially limits the institutionalization of the outcomes and goals of internationalization initiatives (Childress, 2009).

To account for this prospective it might be speculated that MWU operates from a Top-Down change approach. Demers (2007) suggests organizations that utilize a Top-Down approach create structures to limit the input from other stakeholders in the organization in order to limit the
resistance to the desired change outcomes. The perception of engaged senior management with limited engagement from other groups might mean that the management at MWU wants to plan and implement the internationalization initiative to avoid any resistance to a needed organizational change. In the Top-Down change approach having the engagement from other stakeholders might undermined the desired change state with influences of resistance to the wanted change, and this could be a reason why senior administrators at MWU limit access to other stakeholders in planning and implementation practices.

**Faculty Involvement in Internationalization Planning**

The researcher examined if Stakeholder Involvement in Internationalization Planning impacted the perception of the actual internationalization taking place on campus. Correlational analyses based on the aggregate data from the survey indicated that faculty were the only stakeholder group significantly related with the Overall Internationalization Measurement ($r = .51$, $p = .013$). Forward multiple regression also identified faculty stakeholder involvement as the only predictor of the Overall Internationalization Measurement, $R^2 = .257$, $R^2 adj = .214$, $F (1, 17) = 5.90$, $p = .027$. Similarly, faculty were perceived as the second most involved ($M = 3.11$) group in the internationalization planning process according to participants. The faculty stakeholder group was perceived as vital in planning and international implementation processes according to respondents of both strands of data.

The qualitative data did support the quantitative findings. In Charles’s opinion, the faculty is a key stakeholder group in developing an effective internationalization strategy. He stated, “[the university] needs to get a group of faculty with clout to sit down together and draw up a real internationalization plan with areas of focus in private conversations to develop a plan for broad use.” At some types of higher education institutions faculty hold a position of power
where their opinions and views are taken into consideration in organizational decision making (Birnbaum, 1991). Dewy and Duff (2009) assert that the faculty are important to the internationalization process because of the many departments and units they represent on campus. The view of faculty participation in internationalization at MWU can be developed from this perspective. Participants might believe that the faculty are so comprehensively involved in other aspects of university operations that internationalization is no different, like the views of Dewy and Duff (2009). Respondents may have taken Birnbaum (1991) beliefs and feel, because of the authority faculty have on college campuses, that they are perceived as valuable in the internationalization process as a result of their employment status on campus. Nancy believes faculty to be important to effective internationalization as well, but she stated the planning process should include other stakeholders. She shares, “we need to start an international committee that would involve students, faculty members, senior administration, and communication with the Board of Trustees. Having them define their direction, what they think our role should be. Graduate Student Senate should be involved, and Undergraduate Student Senate.”

In the examination of perceptions of Faculty involvement in internationalization planning based on administrative classification the researcher found that some differences existed based on classification. The results of the aggregate quantitative findings suggested that Faculty involvement in Internationalization Planning was perceived differently across Administrative Classifications; $F (3, 33)=4.5, p=.009$. Senior Administrators perceived Faculty as being significantly less involved in the Internationalization Planning process than both Academic Administrators and Administrative Staff. The findings assert that Professional Administrators ($M=3.08$) and Administrative Staff ($M=3.44$) perceived Faculty as being more involved in the
Internationalization Planning process than did Senior Administrators ($M=2.75$) at MWU. If MWU Senior Administrators do view internationalization as a Top-Down change initiative, then they have purposely limited other stakeholder involvement, including faculty, in the initiative. Thus, Senior Administrators at MWU do not feel faculty are as involved in internationalization processes as do their colleagues.

Childress (2009) argues that faculty are involved in internationalization planning based on their academic disciplines and faculty are able to engage stakeholders in a variety of areas on campus in the implementation process. Moreover, as faculty engage in the internationalization processes they can find ways to connect the strategies of internationalization to the work and culture of their own departments and colleges (Dewey & Duff, 2009). Faculty not only help create ideas that integrate internationalization efforts to their academic disciplines, but also become ambassadors for the internationalization change initiatives (Childress, 2009). They promote the strategies of internationalization to other areas of the campus, acting as members of an internationalization coalition. Finally, faculty engagement in planning can lead to an increase of internationalization implementation through a larger sector of the university (Dewey & Duff, 2009).

**Perceptions of Internationalization on Campus**

While exploring the perceptions of the Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus, the researcher found differences based on Administrative Classification. ANOVA results indicated that four of the Internationalization subscales differ by Administrative Classification: Institutionalization of Internationalization, $F(3,61)=2.8$, $p=.043$; Internationalization of Curriculum, $F(3,61)=3.8$, $p=.014$; Internationalization Measurement, $F(3,63)=4.4$, $p=.007$. The Institutionalization of Internationalization was perceived significantly lower by Administrative
Staff as compared to Senior Administrators. Also, Academic Administrators felt the university’s curriculum was more internationalized than did Administrative Staff. Finally, Academic Administrators perceived the Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus higher than Administrative Staff. The quantitative findings illustrated some other key issues including perceptions of the resources for internationalization. Some participants (47.2%) reported they did not think funding was adequate for internationalization efforts MWU. It was also suggested by 47.1% of respondents that they did not agree that staff levels were adequate for internationalization efforts. A reason that Administrative Staff might not view these areas of internationalization as favorably as their colleagues is because they lack the knowledge and experience with the topics. If MWU has a Top-Down change approach it might be possible that Administrative Staff members are one of the stakeholders that are not involved in the planning or implementation of internationalization. Therefore, this group could not possible have high perceptions of processes and practices that they have no knowledge or experience with at the university.

Greg, an Administrative Staff member, reported feeling that Institutionalization of Internationalization efforts were not a strategic priority for the university because he has not noticed it being done by the university as a whole. When speaking about resources for institutionalization of internationalization on campus, he explains, “I think there is some implementation of internationalization. I know there’s a Chinese Culture club. I don’t know if that’s just strictly student driven or where that comes from. I would assume it’s student driven.” As an Administrative Staff member, Greg’s perception is that internationalization efforts are not driven by university administrators, but by groups taking responsibility for their own internationalization strategies. This approach to internationalization creates disjointed and
ineffective practices. The disadvantage to this approach is that frequently when this institutional approach to internationalization is taking place, key stakeholders are not involved in the processes (Edwards, 2007). The lack of collaboration makes the planning and implementation limited in that these decentralized efforts cannot account for all aspects of the university’s internationalization needs. This leads to lack luster engagement and disjointed internationalization practices (Knight, 2004).

**Internationalized Curriculum**

Respondents to the survey reported having a moderate perception of the Internationalized nature of the Curriculum (M = 21.37) at MWU with responses ranging from 8 to 36. Respondents (82.8%) reported international experiences are offered to students in the university’s curriculum. The Participants (77.2%) perceived diverse foreign languages as being offered in the curriculum at MWU. Seventy-five percent of participants observed courses for global understanding as being available to students. There are international majors available for students in the view of 60.0% of respondents. In the qualitative strand of the study, most administrators (Greg, Charles, Michael, and Jennifer) expressed concern for the inadequate resources and strategies supporting Internationalization of the Curriculum. In Greg’s academic experience at MWU he has not perceived internationalization as a part of his course work. He explained, “I’m studying [a major at MWU] so it’s not necessarily the most culturally or internationally focused thing. I’m not sure how that could be done but I know it wasn’t a part at all of the curriculum [at MWU].” Jennifer asserts that the university is not only lacking internationalization in the curriculum, but is also not taking advantage of the opportunity to internationalize the teaching and learning. Jennifer says, “There are areas for opportunity where we could infuse internationalization into the curriculum in ways that we’re not right now.” MWU’s curriculum was also viewed as
inadequate by those with a low perception of Internationalization on campus. Michael explained that domestic diversity trumped internationalization components of the curriculum at MWU. He said, “I don’t think we are really prepared to do that in our curriculum it’s at most because even when we do have those conversations it’s trying to bring people out there. You know it’s the white male in the world… And that’s diversity. That’s not internationalization.” Similarly, it was perceived that the university’s procedure to develop internationalization courses is limited. Charles reported, “Here at [MWU] everything is so decentralized. ‘Well we’re going to create a bunch of internationalization courses. Just go out and create classes that will get counted as the internationalization component.’ You get a whole mix of all sorts of things, nothing coherent.” Jennifer offers that the campus recognizes the need for curricular development, but is not equipped to develop this area. She states, “You know I think that the awareness is out there and we have more students coming in and saying I want to study abroad but we don’t necessarily have all of the curriculum, curricular mechanisms in place to allow that to happen.” Two examples of the inadequate nature of the curriculum at MWU are shared by a respondent of the write-in responses in the survey “Here is a fact: approximately .8% of BGSU’s 20,000 undergraduates are enrolled in an entry level course on Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, or Russian. Another: the vast majority of students nominated to Phi Beta Kappa (A&S) take no language and culture course at BGSU, having completed the requirement with high school credits. If internationalization takes place in part in the curricula, then internationalization at BGSU is weak.”

An internationalized curriculum is at the core for effective internationalization efforts. One respondent reported that the effort supporting an internationalized curriculum, “needs to be aimed at every student as part of their learning experience. Not just as an add-on”. Olson (2005)
asserts an internationalized curriculum provides the academic “learning experience” foundation for all components of internationalization on a campus. Nancy shares this sentiment with the following comment, “if we don’t have that [internationalization of curriculum] piece then we will fail with the other pieces that I’ve talked about. Completely fail. It’s just as important or more important than bringing people here and sending people away.”

Support for International Students

A major component of an internationalized curriculum is the resource that International Students are in the classroom (Pandit, 2007). Administrators with low perceptions of internationalization perceived that international students were not being supported while studying at MWU. Academic support for international students was limited according to some of the interviewees. Charles reported, “How do we bring over international students? And then just say ‘Oh you have to take these classes because without these classes you can’t perform well in your studies, but you’ve got to wait until your second or third semester to actually take them.” Another respondent indicated this lack of support for international students by stating, “I had a student in my office-hours come and say to me that he was embarrassed at the treatment of the international students in his writing class this semester, I think that opened my eyes to maybe there’s a little bit of prejudice against the international students on campus.”

Some quantitative data supported these qualitative results. For example, 34 % of respondents reported that they did not know if international students’ needs were being met at MWU. International Students add to diversity in the classroom, and are a key component of global learning for their domestic counterparts (Pandit, 2007). These students provide global perspectives in university classrooms allowing for dialogue and insight in exploring global issues and solutions to those issues (Leask, 2009). Also, international students have historically played
an important role in supporting the STEM disciplines (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) (Pandit, 2007). Their involvement in the STEM areas is important because domestic students do not enroll in these disciplines as much as is needed (Leask, 2009). As such, they fill a valuable gap in the STEM workforce throughout the USA. Not providing for international students’ needs on campus puts global understanding in the curriculum and workforce resources in jeopardy at the university.

Internationalized curriculum on a college campus should lead to the promotion of ideas and practices that solve global economic, cultural, and political issues (American Council of Education, 2002). Green, Luu, and Burris (2008) assert those involved in an internationalized curriculum will develop an understanding of an increasingly connected society, and the ideas, values, and cultures of those who inhabit the world. Also, skills to engage in a global economy should be established in graduates of internationalized institutions (ACE, 2005). Limiting the curricular component of internationalization, whether because of planning or implementation, would be restricting the knowledge and skill development of students and scholars.

Conversely, those with high perceptions stated international students are supported in their studies at MWU. These administrators suggested that international students are supported because they are viewed as a priority to the university. Jennifer contends that the value of international student is a recent occurrence. She explained, “I think that over the course of the past year there’s been a lot more focus on the quality we’re providing to international students. I don’t know, since I’ve been here over the course of the past [years] that that’s ever really been a full focus.” Jennifer continues to discuss these new initiatives and gives an example in orientation. She shares, “this year [MWU] has worked with New Student Orientation to actually integrate international students into the actual orientation process from day one as opposed to
something completely separate.” While Larry shares that international students are important to the university because they play an important role in the overall enrollment strategy, “What’s fueling the universities desire now is to, first of all, increase its overall enrollment but to put a real special emphasis on increasing the enrollment of international students.”

Forty-eight percent of respondents to the survey question “Unique needs of international students are recognized and addressed on campus.” perceived that students’ needs were known and resolved. Likewise, 71% of participants agreed that international student clubs are being organized and funded by MWU. Similarly, participants (45.7%) report they agree with the statement “Campus culture strongly supports the presence of international students and scholars at your campus”. Also, survey participants (71.8%) perceived that international students are receiving experiential learning opportunities to supplement their academic experience at MWU.

As mentioned previously, International students are important to successful internationalization efforts in and out of the classroom (Leask, 2009). It is therefore imperative to provide for the needs of this significant resource to the university’s internationalization efforts.

**Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus**

Finally, the perception of Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus (OIC) was examined. There was a moderate ($M=95.79$) view by participants of the survey of the Overall Level of Internationalization on Campus with responses ranging from 41 to 165. This moderate view continues in the qualitative findings with views changing based on level of perception. Larry, an Academic Administrator, has a more positive view on the institution’s internationalization performances. He states, “First of all I do believe that they [MWU] have made efforts to internationalize their campus. Could they do more? Absolutely. And there is an initiative that has just begun to reenergize that internationalization effort here on campus.”
Charles, also an Academic Administrator, perceives the university’s internationalization efforts as decent given the limited resources it has to dedicate to these initiatives. He shares, “It [university administration] continues with lip service and I continue to trust the lip service is somewhat, I think it’s sincere. I think that our administration really does see the value and of course I think they see economic value in attracting international students so I think things are happening but I’m, and I’m not going to blame the administration because there’s just so much stuff on everyone’s plates and there are limited resources.” Greg, an Administrative Staff member, viewed internationalization as lacking compared to the Academic Administrator participants. He said, “I’d say we’re pretty far down the totem pole as far as how well we do with internationalization. I don’t see many accommodations being made for internationals, but I’m not an international, but I know there’s not a whole lot that we do specifically in my area to accommodate for internationalization stuff.” From these findings, it’s clear that Academic Administrators viewed OIC in a much more positive light than did Administrative Staff members.

The lack of resources, leadership, and organization available for internationalization are likely the major reasons for the moderate view of internationalization at MWU. The lack of resources for internationalization in higher education has been studied by researchers (Childress, 2009; Hser, 2005; Knight, 1997; NASULGC, 2004). Researchers (Hser, 2005; Knight, 1997) argue that limited funding acts as a barrier for successful internationalization practices. Green (2005) found in her study of internationalization efforts on U.S college campuses that funding was determined to be the most significant dimension to internationalization. Without organized and informed leaders, stakeholders will be limited in their knowledge and willingness to participate in a change initiative that they feel will only end in failure (Kotter, 1995). An
example of the respondents’ view of internationalization leadership is expressed in this statement, “There is no permanent senior administrative position charged with international connections.” The lack of leadership for internationalization will continue to produce lackluster views until competent and stable leadership is guiding the initiative. These resource allocation issues can account for the moderate view of internationalization at MWU. It is imperative for MWU to align internationalization desires with appropriate human and financial resource allocation to provide a foundation for successful implementation.

**Conclusions**

The single case focus of this study has added to the body of internationalization literature and supported several previous findings. First, internationalization planning at MWU is limited in knowledge and practice. This limitation is based on models of internationalization that are non-collaborative in nature, and lead to ineffective and poorly planned efforts (Knight, 1997b). According to Connors, Lake, and Stackman (2003), “ownership and responsibility that people can get from increased autonomy can happen only if they are knowledgeable about the outcomes of their work” (p. 43). By having stakeholders involved in the process of developing and implementing internationalization plans they become knowledgeable and empowered. The authors explain that the most effective plans are plans that are organizationally specific, and MWU’s plans will lack details and specificity if organizational members are not knowledgeable about those plans.

Second, this study also found that having senior administrators involved in internationalization can lead to both positive and negative observations, both influencing the perceptions of internationalization success (Childress, 2009). Top leadership involved in the internationalization planning process can be advantageous to the internationalization process.
Participation by senior management can lead to resource allocation and a perception of managerial commitment by other stakeholders. Senior administrators’ involvement in planning can also conjure suspicion about the motives of managerial participation in internationalization (Hser, 2005) Having other key stakeholders define and be involved in the planning process will limit these questions of the purpose of the initiatives as these stakeholders will be assisting in defining that purpose. This finding confirmed the importance of collaborative approaches to internationalization planning. Well before the programming or practices phase of internationalization, campuses need to design collaborative plans for internationalization that will appeal to the campus community as a whole.

Third, internationalization planning and implementation are linked to the perceptions of internationalization, and both are viewed as being vital to meeting the internationalization goals of campuses. Internationalization plans provide campuses with direction and commitment to internationalization goals. These goals are developed for the purpose of implementation of internationalization practices. Planning also facilitates the engagement of stakeholders in the internationalization, which is a key factor to implementation practices (Green & Olson, 2003; Knight, 1994). Thus, the planning and implementation processes work together to involve stakeholders in all of the facets of internationalization on a campus.

Lastly, in the resource-limited climate of higher education, internationalization at MWU is viewed as insufficiently funded. As mentioned by respondents of the qualitative strand of the study, MWU’s senior administrators have to reallocate current resources for effective internationalization practices to be implemented.
**Recommendations and Implications**

This final unit of this study explores the researcher’s recommendation for future research, practices, policies and implications.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The researcher does suggest further studies in order to better understand internationalization as a practice in a broader higher education context. The limited sample size for both the strands of the study suggests a need to reproduce the methodological approach of this study. Replication would be important to view whether the internationalization variables and frameworks studied at MWU are applicable to similar types of universities. A major strength of this study is the development of an instrument (IPI) that can quantitatively measure planning and implementation of internationalization on college campuses. The IPI could be further validated as a result of the replication of this study on other campuses. As the IPI is utilized as a medium for measuring internationalization, the variables of the study can be assessed for reliability. Also, it would be important in adding to the literature to seek the perceptions and experiences of non-administrators on campuses. Based on the findings, Mid-Western University should have a follow-up study on the implementation of change practices in the planning and implementation of internationalization. Further research approaches were inspired by this study, and are outlined below for further research consideration.

In this study it was found that Internationalization Planning and the Internationalization Measurements variables—1) Institutionalization of Internationalization; 2) Administrative Components; 3) Internationalized Curriculum; 4) International Students and Scholars; 5) Study Abroad—were all valued by the participants of this study. Studying these Internationalization Measures at similar institutions would be helpful in validating the important role they have on
internationalization in higher education. This is especially true for examination of like institutions. This could be accomplished by examining these variables at higher education institutions with a similar makeup as MWU.

In the internationalization literature, it is clear that administrators were the key element to successful internationalization practices on campuses (Childress, 2009; West, 2012). The current study found that faculty were important to the planning and implementation stages of internationalization at MWU. However, only the administrator perspective was explored. Further research would be important to examine the perceptions of internationalization from the view of other stakeholder groups to glean insights they might have on the phenomena.

The literature suggests that based on institution type, different challenges and advantages exist for internationalization (Gonzales, 2009). To understand the perceptions and experiences of administrators at different types of institutions, it would significant to survey and interview these individuals at a variety of institutions. This might help support the idea that internationalization is planned and implemented in different ways based on institutional type.

After an examination of an institution’s internationalization practices has taken place and recommendation are suggested, what strategies and practices do these university utilize to implement the recommendation? Are the financial or organizational costs of implementation too encumbering to implement the recommendation? The study of the implementation of internationalization practice after consulting or research could assist universities in developing planning for the implementation of internationalization practices.

With these lines of inquiry, researchers will better understand the strategies and practices utilized to eliminate negative and extenuate positive perceptions of internationalization on a campus.
Recommendations for Practice and Policy

This study provides higher education practitioners and policy makers with a greater understanding of the complexity of change initiatives in that industry. More specifically, these professionals can develop an enhanced comprehension of internationalization practices and policies at four year, public United States institutions. Mid-Western University can also develop from the results of this study; the following recommendations are specific to their internationalization efforts.

As MWU is developing more internationalization goals and strategies, it is important to explore these efforts in an institutional context. The internationalization work of university administrators has become more apparent to the university community as a whole. The planning and implementation of these components are perceived as non-collaborative and poorly funded. These issues limit the internationalization processes at MWU.

Literature on the topic provides some insight that might improve the internationalization practices at the university. Developing a collaborative and rigorous planning process provides institutions with common definitions on internationalization leading to campus-wide buy-in (West, 2012). The collaboration leads to a process of planning and vision that take into consideration the needs of the diverse stakeholders involved in the process (Demers, 2007; Burke 2011). A common definition for internationalization provides universities with a context for the development of a succinct vision for how to go about internationalizing the campus (Childress, 2009). Kotter (1996) explains that once a vision is developed, those who work on the planning and vision become members of the guiding coalition, a group that promotes the vision of the change initiative. The articulation of the vision and implementation becomes a core responsibility for all of the stakeholders involved in the planning process (Kezar, 2002). These
change agents can than seek to implement the desired change at various levels of an organization. Without this stakeholder buy-in at the planning and implementation levels, the internationalization at MWU will be viewed as fragmented and ineffective.

Literature suggests that U.S. higher education internationalization efforts should lead to: 1) the production of international experts with the knowledge to address national (economic, cultural, and educational) needs; 2) strengthening of the U.S.’s ability to solve global problems, and 3) development of a globally competent citizenry and workforce. Internationalization initiatives such as study-abroad, curriculum enrichment, international studies, foreign-language instruction, and sponsorship of foreign students and scholars to study on U.S. campuses are ways for higher education institutions to meet these guidelines (Altbach & Knight, 2007). The following are recommendations for Mid-Western University internationalization efforts in order to reap some of the benefits of internationalization.

The researcher recommends the university consider the following actions:

- Mid-Western University has recently had university addresses and hires that have established an interest for internationalization efforts. It is vital for MWU to establish a need for change: university leaders should make a clear commitment through bold, up-front statements that in order for institutions to maintain and improve market value they have to consider the impact that globalization and internationalization will have on them (Bryant & Sheehan, 2007). Leaders can use this time to share stories, and share narratives to promote urgency of the internationalization agenda. University Administrators should also use this time to explain resource allocation for these efforts. Childress (2009) argues that as resources are linked to planning strategies university stakeholders’ commitment is increased. These resources do not necessarily need to be financial, as there are human
resources already in place on campus that might be better utilized to assist in planning and implementation. The resources can be from a variety of internal and external sources, but if they are articulated, stakeholder commitment is increased (Childress, 2009).

- MWU should develop a taskforce consisting of all stakeholder groups (Students, Faculty, Staff, Administrators, Senior Administrators, Alumni, and/or External Constituents) dedicated to defining and planning internationalization on its campus. Even though internationalization seems a great cause it has had a tradition of failure because of siloed implementation approaches (Altbach & Knight, 2007). The lack of collaboration stems from campus community members not having the same definition of internationalization efforts and purposes (West, 2012). University stakeholders should create committees that are established to formulate a shared definition, vision, strategic approach, and specific action steps toward implementation of internationalization initiatives (Dewey & Duff, 2009).

- MWU needs to provide a clear leader responsible for the internationalization planning and implementation. The Office of Study Abroad was viewed so positively by participants because of the new experienced leader it had acquired. This leader has to have experience and a reputation or interest in becoming a change leader, so that they can bring successful stories and experience to the change initiative. This approach to change is known as a discursive change model. This is a model of organizational change where narrative and text oriented methods facilitate the change. The narrative method is defined by Demers (2007) as a story telling method to promote meaning-making of social practices. Based on the story being told by members of the organization, colleagues learn beliefs, values, and practices related to the desired change.
• As internationalization goals are planned and announced it would be advantageous for MWU to develop subcommittees with comprehensive stakeholder involvement to develop goals for each of the Internationalization Measurement subscales (Institutionalization of Internationalization; Administrative Components; Internationalized Curriculum; International Students and Scholars; and Study Abroad), and the discursive approach to linking these goals to campus values. According to West (2012) “People are more willing to get involved, Kezar says, when leadership can connect its goals with common values—such as being student-centered—and recommends building social networks and “communities of practice” around issues with which you are seeking engagement. “Campuses that care,” she says, “have conversation and dialogue about educational goals and campus leadership.” (p. 1).

• The university should utilize engaged stakeholders to form assessment teams to measure the goals and outcomes of the internationalization practices. Once an internationalization vision has been implemented, it is vital for centralized systems to be created to assess the internationalization vision and goals. Assessment can ensure that the internationalization vision will be acted upon. It can also support the production of further internationalization efforts throughout the campus (Childress, 2009). This step should promote sustainability, adaptability, and incremental procedures for change throughout divisions of the organization (Kotter, 1996).

• To address the perceptions of a limited internationalized curriculum the researcher recommends the creation of an academic policy that requires all internationalization courses to be reviewed by a diverse board of faculty and administrators to assess whether
the courses are meeting the internationalization goals established through the planning process.

- To maintain comprehensive stakeholder involvement in the planning and implementation processes, MWU should develop an institutional policy requiring all stakeholders be represented on internationalization planning and implementation committees.

**Closing Reflections**

Globalization is changing the world in which we live, including higher education (Altbach & Knight, 2007). Based on institutional context these changes vary. Internationalization efforts are and should be higher education’s method for managing an increasingly interdependent society. Internationalization professionals have to explore their specific organizational contexts in order to truly effect change. The aforementioned change theories and models can be used as a means for university leaders to promote and develop an internationalization value system within the academy. Collaborative internationalization conversations that emerge from the process of developing an internationalization change plan for institutions can help them improve teaching and learning to produce graduates who can solve the global issues of the future.

This study provided insight into the Internationalization efforts at the MWU. Internationalization at MWU has mixed perceptions. The current administration should consider an extensive development of change practices to resolve some of the negative perceptions about internationalization, including comprehensive stakeholder planning and implementation committees, definition for internationalization at MWU, clear leadership for internationalization efforts, promoting internationalization successes, formally assessing internationalization goals.

The aforementioned recommendations are not an all-inclusive guide to effective planning and implementation practices for internationalization. The key to the successful
internationalization practices at MWU is stakeholder involvement in the planning and implementation phases of any change initiative. An international profile has become increasingly important in admission and recruitment decisions (Knight, & de Wit, 1999). It will be essential for MWU to consider how internationalization on their campus impacts their international profile. The lack of collaboration and planning can become a hindrance to an environment for healthy internationalization. Therefore it is important for MWU to act quickly to address the issues related to the negative perceptions of internationalization.

This study should serve as another point of reference for further exploration of internationalization in higher education. These types of studies are needed for the organizational change framework, and the field of internationalization.
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APPENDIX A: INTERNATIONAL PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION SURVEY

Q1. Dear Participant, as an administrator at Bowling Green State University, you are invited to complete this survey that examines your perceptions of BGSU's Internationalization Planning and Implementation efforts. Your participation and your honest opinions will be highly appreciated. I know that you may not have professional/personal experience with all areas of this study, but ask you to record your perceptions for all areas of the study at your university. Internationalization of higher education is the attempt by university members to add international components to all areas of the university in an effort to develop a more globally savvy student. According to Kerber (2009), traditional internationalization of higher education refers to “any systematic, sustained effort aimed at making higher education (more) responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy and labour markets” (p. 2). Please take 20 minutes to respond to all questions appearing below. When you are finished, please be sure to press “submit” at the end of this questionnaire. If you have questions, feel free to call me (801-636-0589) or email me via rjason@bgsu.edu. Remember that you can save and stop responding at any point and resume completion later. In addition, you will be entered in a drawing for one of five $50.00 Amazon gift certificates. After the data is collected, an electronic drawing will take place. Winners will receive the gift certificate via e-mail. All responses will be confidential. By clicking next you are consenting to participating in the study.

Q2. Planning- The development of strategic directions for international efforts. Has your university developed an internationalization plan?
   Yes (1)
   No (2)
   I don't know (3)

Q3. To what degree do you value internationalization planning?
   No value; not important (1)
   Some value; slightly important (2)
   Valuable; fairly important (3)
   Very valuable; very important (4)

Q4. How would you grade your institution's internationalization planning efforts?
   No grade; I am unaware of an Internationalization Plan at my institution (6)
   F--No Internationalization Planning effort being made (1)
   D--Minimal Internationalization Planning effort; minimal stakeholder involvement being made; top-down planning (2)
   C--Some Internationalization Planning with stakeholder involvement (3)
   B--Institution is committed to Internationalization Planning; good effort in stakeholder involvement (4)
   A--Institution is very committed to Internationalization Planning; exceptional effort in stakeholder involvement (5)

Q5. Indicate your level of agreement with the following statements regarding stakeholder participation in internationalization planning activities on your campus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I am or have been involved in the internationalization planning processes on your campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Students participate in your institution’s internationalization planning.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Senior administrator(s) (e.g. Trustee, President, or Provost) participate in your institution’s internationalization planning</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Faculty participates in your institution’s internationalization planning.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Staff participates in your institution’s internationalization planning.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Administrator(s) (e.g. Multicultural Affairs director, Department chair, or Institution/Center director) participate in your institution’s internationalization planning.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Alumni participate in your institution’s internationalization planning.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. External Constituent(s) participate in your institution’s internationalization planning.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. What level of knowledge and experience do you have with internationalization planning on your campus?
No knowledge or experience (1)
Some knowledge and experience with internationalization planning (2)
Fair knowledge and experience because of my work at the university with internationalization planning (3)
Extremely knowledgeable and experienced because of my work in internationalization planning (4)

Q7. Do you have further insight on internationalization planning at your university? Write in a comment.

Q8. Institutionalization - The integrated nature of international efforts on campus. Indicate your level of agreement with the following internationalization activities on your campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>I don't know (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Adequate facilities are available to house the offices working within international education on your campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Adequate staff is available to meet the needs of faculty, international students, and study abroad students</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Campus employees are provided with opportunities and support for international involvement</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Funding is adequate to meet institution’s international needs</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The institutional mission statement endorses international education on campus</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. International events/activities on campus are public knowledge</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. International enrollments is a part of the overall enrollment management strategy</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Portions of your institution’s website are available in languages other than English</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9. What level of knowledge and experience do you have with institutionalization of internationalization on your campus?
No knowledge or experience (1)
Some knowledge and experience with institutionalization of internationalization (2)
Frequent experience and knowledge because of my work at the university with institutionalization of internationalization (3)
My work duties make me extremely knowledgeable and experienced in institutionalization of internationalization (4)

Q10. Administrative- The integration of internationalization on campus administration. Indicate your level of agreement with the following administrative components in internationalization efforts on your campus.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Upper-level administrators actively involve themselves in international activities.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The chief international officer holds an upper administrative rank of director or above.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The administration requires an institutional review process that links student outcomes to goals of internationalization.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. International topics are included in the chief administrator’s public comments to the faculty, campus, and community.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. International topics are included in the regular discussions among institutional governance groups (e.g., faculty senate, student government, and Board of Trustees).</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Colleges/departments have identified one or more individuals to lead the internationalization efforts for their unit.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11. What level of knowledge and experience do you have with administrative components of internationalization on your campus?
No knowledge or experience (1)
Some knowledge and experience with administrative components of internationalization (2)
Frequent experience and knowledge because of my work at the university with administrative components of internationalization (3)
My work duties make me extremely knowledgeable and experienced in administrative components of internationalization (4)

Q12. Curriculum- International components linked to the campus' curriculum. Indicate your level of agreement with the following internationalization of the curriculum activities on your campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>I don't know (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. International content are required in the general education program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Academic majors and minors with international focus exist for students. (international business, area-studies programs, international studies)</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Joint or shared degree programs have been established with partner institutions in other countries</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Departmental chairs/advisors are flexible in evaluating transfer credit for courses taken abroad</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. There are foreign language requirements for all students as part of their general education requirements</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Languages other than French, Spanish, and German are available as regular offerings in your curriculum</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. International oriented courses assist students in developing global awareness.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. International experiences (e.g., courses, internships) are available for students to develop skills to be utilized in a global economy</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q13. What level of knowledge and experience do you have with internationalization of the curriculum on your campus?**

No knowledge or experience (1)
Some knowledge and experience with internationalization of the curriculum (2)
Frequent experience and knowledge because of my work at the university with internationalization of the curriculum (3)
My work duties make me extremely knowledgeable and experienced in internationalization of the curriculum (4)

**Q14. Students and Scholars involvement in international efforts on campus. Indicate your level of agreement with the following international students and scholars activities on your campus.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>I don't know (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Campus culture strongly supports the presence of international students and scholars at your campus</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Finance and resources support exists on your campus to support faculty international travel, research, and/or teaching opportunities</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (1)</td>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>Agree (3)</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (4)</td>
<td>I don't know (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. International involvement (presenting abroad, teaching abroad, grant-writing, and/or publishing on international topics) is viewed positively in meeting the promotion/tenure criteria for faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>I don't know (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

d. Faculty are involved in establishing programs or forums that regularly address international topics or issues on the campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>I don't know (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

e. Faculty with international expertise are actively recruited by the institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>I don't know (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

f. Unique needs of international students are recognized and addressed on campus. (e.g., provision of housing during breaks, food options, places of worship available, pre-registration available, health insurance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>I don't know (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

g. Scholarships/graduate assistantships are available for international students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>I don't know (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

h. Programs using international students as campus or community resources exist and are conducted regularly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (4)</th>
<th>I don't know (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q15. What level of knowledge and experience do you have with international students and scholars on your campus?

No knowledge or experience (1)
Some knowledge and experience with international students and scholars (2)
Frequent experience and knowledge because of my work at the university with international students and scholars (3)
My work duties make me extremely knowledgeable and experienced on international students and scholars (4)

**Q16. Study Abroad—Academic and experiential learning of students in foreign countries.**
Indicate your level of agreement with the following study abroad activities on your campus.

| a. Your institution has its own study abroad and/or research facilities abroad | Strongly Disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Agree (3) | Strongly Agree (4) | I don't know (5) |
| b. Your institution provides resources for study abroad scholarships | Strongly Disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Agree (3) | Strongly Agree (4) | I don't know (5) |
| c. Study abroad options are available for all students on your campus | Strongly Disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Agree (3) | Strongly Agree (4) | I don't know (5) |
| d. Your campus offers a variety of faculty-led study abroad programs every year | Strongly Disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Agree (3) | Strongly Agree (4) | I don't know (5) |
| e. Your campus curriculum strongly supports student participation in study abroad | Strongly Disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Agree (3) | Strongly Agree (4) | I don't know (5) |
| f. Your institution uses study abroad as a key component of its recruiting strategies for domestic student recruitment | Strongly Disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Agree (3) | Strongly Agree (4) | I don't know (5) |

**Q17. What level of knowledge and experience do you have with study abroad on your campus?**
No knowledge or experience (1)
Some knowledge and experience with study abroad (2)
Frequent experience and knowledge because of my work at the university with study abroad (3)
My work duties make me extremely knowledgeable and experienced with study abroad (4)

**Q18. Implementation—Operationalizing international efforts on campus.**
To what degree do you value internationalization implementation?
No value; not important (1)
Some value; slightly important (2)
Valuable; fairly important (3)
Very valuable; very important (4)

Q19. How would you grade your institution's internationalization implementation efforts?
F--no effort being made (1)
D--minimal implementation of international practices being made (2)
C--some implementation of international practices being made (3)
B--fair amount of implementation of international practices being made (4)
A--exceptional effort in the implementation of international practices being made (5)
No grade; I don't know (6)

Q20. Do you have further insight on internationalization implementation at your university? Write in a comment.

Q21. What is your sex?
Male (1)
Female (2)

Q22. What is your age?
18-25 (1)
26-35 (2)
36-50 (3)
51-+ (4)

Q23. What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? If currently enrolled, mark the previous grade or highest degree received.
High School (1)
Associate degree (for example: AA, AS) (2)
Bachelor's degree (for example: BA, AB, BS) (3)
Master's degree (for example: MA, MS, MEng, MEd) (4)
Professional degree (for example: MD, DDS, DVM, LLB, JD) (5)
Doctorate degree (for example: PhD, EdD) (6)

Q24. Race/ethnicity
American Indian or Alaska Native (1)
Asian (2)
Black or African American (3)
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (4)
White (5)
Hispanic or Latino (6)
Multiracial (7)

Q25. How many years have you worked in your profession?
1-5 (1)
6-10 (2)
11-20 (3)
20-+ (4)

Q26. What is your current employment classification (what takes more than 50% of your working time) at your university?
Senior Administrator (e.g., President, Trustee, Vice President, Associate/Assistant Vice President, Chief Officer) (1)
Academic Administrator (e.g., Dean, Associate Dean, Director, Chair) (2)
Professional Administrator (e.g., Office Director, Associate/Assistant Director, Coordinator) (3)
Administrative Staff (e.g., Accountant, Academic Advisor, Development Officer, IT personnel) (4)

Q27. Are you willing to participate in an interview to further discuss your responses to the survey? If Yes, please type in your email address below, so that an interview can be arranged. If no, please type No below

Q28. In order for me to contact you if you won one of the gift cards please enter your email address below.
APPENDIX B: RESEARCH CONSENT FORM (QUANTITATIVE STRAND)

School of Leadership & Policy Studies
Educational Administration & Leadership Studies
550 Education Building
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
Phone: 419 372 7377

Dear Research Participant:

You are kindly requested to participate in this study that is a part of dissertation research. The researcher, Mr. Jason “JR” Ratliff, a doctoral student in the leadership studies program at Bowling Green State University, is responsible for this study. The study will examine internationalization (IZ) efforts at your university. You have been identified as an administrator on campus, and as such you are important to this study. You are first requested to read the information below; and if necessary, you may ask questions for more clarification before deciding whether to participate or not. You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study.

The Purpose of the Study:
The purpose of the study is to explore the perceptions and experiences of university administrators in internationalization planning and implementation at your university. The main study will aim at:

better understanding the perceived level of stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning at you university,

better understanding the perceived level of internationalization efforts being implemented at your university,

understanding the experiences of those involved in internationalization at your university

Procedures:
You will be requested to honestly complete this online survey and submit it by pressing the ‘submit’ button at the end of the survey. The survey will take about 20 minutes to complete; and you are requested to complete it by December 30, 2012. You can access the survey through this link:

http://survey.bgsu.edu/surveys/edas/pmateso/spmassessment001.htm

Risks and Benefits:
There are no risks anticipated for your participation in this study besides those you normally encounter in daily life or during performance of routine physical or psychological tests or examinations. Once I receive your completed survey by December 30, 2012, I will e-mail you a letter of appreciation. Information obtained from the survey will be used to understand issues
related to internationalization efforts at your university, and generate recommendations that will address those issues. Internationalization can be of great benefit to your university by enhancing the international profile of your university, which will eventually benefit all research participants and the university at large. Moreover, you can also benefit through better understanding the role you can play in developing internationalization at your university. I will e-mail you the summary of the findings after the completion of the main study, if you so desire.

Privacy and confidentiality:
Information you provide will remain confidential and your identity will not be revealed. I will protect confidentiality and your responses throughout the study and publication of the report. Your university will remain anonymous by using a pseudonym. You will also remain anonymous to all but the researcher, who will have access to the data / information you provide. Moreover, your identity will not be revealed in any published results unless by your written consent. I will store your information in a very secure manner by: locking all research material in locked filing cabinet, using password protected computer database, and presenting results in summary report form (without names of participants). However, since this is an online survey, a 100% security might be difficulty to guarantee; therefore, you are advised to use your home computer or a public computer, if you think your employer is likely to track your office computer activities. In addition, if you will use a computer that can be accessed by other people, you might need to clear all browsers cache and page history after submitting the survey.

Voluntary Participation:
You are free to decline participation in this study, or you may withdraw your participation at any point without penalty. Your decision whether or not to participate in this research study will have no influence on your present or future status at your university.

Rights and Complaints:
If you are not satisfied with the way this study is performed, you may discuss your complaints with me, Mr. Jason “JR” Ratliff, using my telephone (801-636-0589) or through my e-mail (rjason@bgsu.edu); or write a letter addressed to Mr. Jason “JR” Ratliff using above given address. In addition, you may reach the office of Dr. Rachael Reinhart, who is my advisor, using her telephone (419-372-0451) or e-mail (rvanna@bgsu.edu). Furthermore, you may contact the Chair, HSRB at BGSU for concerns about your rights as a research participant through 419-372-7716, or hrsb@bgsu.edu.

Participant Certification:
By completing this survey and submitting it you are indicating your consent to participate.
APPENDIX C: AN INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR INTERNATIONALIZATION PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION (IZ) AT A UNIVERSITY

Place: ………….. Date: ……… Time of Interview: From…… To ……….

**Directions:** Use this interview guide to help you identify and understand internationalization at the subject university. (These questions will be posed to each of the six interview participants) **Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Notes on Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tell me briefly about your background and your work in this department/division/university</td>
<td>(Expected data: participant’s background/demographic/career info)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do you understand internationalization (as a field of study and as a practice)?</td>
<td>(Expected data: participant’s factual knowledge about internationalization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. From your experience, why have you assessed internationalization at the university in this way (high or low based on survey results)?</td>
<td>(Expected data: participant’s experiential assessment about the university’s internationalization efforts in general)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What is your opinion about the university’s performance in the six subscales of internationalization planning and implementation? (rate the performance and mention successes, challenges, and future possibilities)</td>
<td>(Expected data: participant’s views about six subscale practices)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Research Participant:

You are kindly requested to participate in this study that is a part of dissertation research. The researcher, Mr. Jason “JR” Ratliff, a doctoral student in the leadership studies program at Bowling Green State University, is responsible for this study. The study will examine internationalization (IZ) efforts at your university. You have been identified as an administrator on campus, and as such you are important to this study. You are first requested to read the information below; and if necessary, you may ask questions for more clarification before deciding whether to take part or not. You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study.

The Purpose of the Study:
The purpose of the study is to explore the perceptions and experiences of university administrators in internationalization planning and implementation at your university.

The main study will aim at:

better understanding the perceived level of stakeholder involvement in internationalization planning at your university,

better understanding the perceived level of internationalization efforts being implemented at your university,

understanding the experiences of those involved in internationalization at your university

Procedures:
You will be requested to honestly respond to the interview questions conducted by me as the researcher. The interview session will at most take 40 minutes to complete; and it will take place in the location, date, and time that we will mutually agree upon within December, 2012. Also, you will later be asked to review the transcripts and preliminary findings to make sure that your views are not misrepresented. Both of these reviews will take less than 30 minutes.

Risks and Benefits:
There are no risks anticipated for your participation in this study besides those you normally encounter in daily life or during performance of routine physical or psychological tests or examinations. Once I finish my interview session with you, I will e-mail you a letter of
appreciation. Information obtained from the survey will be used to understand issues related to internationalization efforts at your university, and generate recommendations that will address those issues. Internationalization can be of great benefit to your university by enhancing the international profile of your university, which will eventually benefit all research participants and the university at large. Moreover, you can also benefit through understanding better the role you can play in developing internationalization at your university. Another benefit to you is that I will e-mail you the summary of the findings after the completion of the main study, if you so desire.

**Privacy and confidentiality:**
Information you will provide will remain confidential and your identity will not be revealed. I will protect confidentiality and your responses throughout the study and publication of the report. Your university will remain anonymous by using a pseudonym. You will also remain anonymous to all but myself, who will have access to the data / information you provide. Moreover, your identity will not be revealed in any published results unless by your written consent. Your title will be mentioned in a generalized form. In addition, I will store your information in a very secure manner by: locking all research material in locked office, using password protected computer database, and presenting results in summary report form or using a pseudonym if I quote you directly.

**Voluntary Participation:**
You are free to decline to participate in this study, or you may withdraw your participation at any point without penalty. Your decision whether or not to participate in this research study will have no influence on your present or future status at your university.

**Rights and Complaints:**
If you are not satisfied with the way this study is performed, you may discuss your complaints with me, Mr. Jason “JR” Ratliff, using my telephone (801-636-0589) or through my e-mail (rjason@bgsu.edu); or write a letter addressed to Mr. Jason “JR” Ratliff using above given address. In addition, you may reach the office of Dr. Rachael Reinhart, who is my advisor, using her telephone (419-372-0451) or e-mail (rvanna@bgsu.edu). Furthermore, you may contact the Chair, HSRB at BGSU for concerns about your rights as a research participant through 419-372-7716, or hrsb@bgsu.edu.

**Participant Certification:**
By signing this form you are indicating your consent to participate in this study. Remember that you have the right to refuse to continue with the interview at any point of the study.
Signature of the research participant _________________________________________
Date _________________________________________
APPENDIX E: APPROVAL LETTER

DATE: December 27, 2012
TO: Jason Ratliff, EdD
FROM: Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board
PROJECT TITLE: [375558-3] Internationalization Planning and Implementation at Mid-Western University: A Mixed Method Study
SUBMISSION TYPE: Revision
ACTION: APPROVED
APPROVAL DATE: December 25, 2012
EXPIRATION DATE: November 12, 2013
REVIEW TYPE: Expedited Review
REVIEW CATEGORY: Expedited review category # 7

Thank you for your submission of Revision materials for this project. The Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board has APPROVED your submission. This approval is based on an appropriate risk/benefit ratio and a project design wherein the risks have been minimized. All research must be conducted in accordance with this approved submission.

The final approved version of the consent document(s) is available as a published Board Document in the Review Details page. You must use the approved version of the consent document when obtaining consent from participants. Informed consent must continue throughout the project via a dialogue between the researcher and research participant. Federal regulations require that each participant receives a copy of the consent document.

Please note that you are responsible to conduct the study as approved by the HSRB. If you seek to make any changes in your project activities or procedures, those modifications must be approved by this committee prior to initiation. Please use the modification request form for this procedure.

You have been approved to enroll 576 participants. If you wish to enroll additional participants you must seek approval from the HSRB.

All UNANTICIPATED PROBLEMS involving risks to subjects or others and SERIOUS and UNEXPECTED adverse events must be reported promptly to this office. All NON-COMPLIANCE issues or COMPLAINTS regarding this project must also be reported promptly to this office.

This approval expires on November 12, 2013. You will receive a continuing review notice before your project expires. If you wish to continue your work after the expiration date, your documentation for continuing review must be received with sufficient time for review and continued approval before the expiration date.

Good luck with your work. If you have any questions, please contact the Office of Research Compliance at 419-372-7716 or hsrb@bgsu.edu. Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence regarding this project.
This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within Bowling Green State University Human Subjects Review Board's records.