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Abstract

Universities’ commitments to internationalization have intensified over the past twenty years. However, most research that looks critically at internationalization in higher education is conducted outside of the U.S. In order to address this gap, Foucault’s framework of biopower and governmentality were applied to a discourse analysis of the ways in which Big Ten universities’ internationalization planning documents allow for both the reproduction as well as the challenging of neoliberal economic rationalities that permeate university internationalization efforts, and higher education more generally. Various discourses that shape the conduct of universities and university subjects were identified. However, the hegemony of neoliberal governmentality within internationalization efforts identified in the documents suggests that efforts to resist the dominance of economic rationality require pointed political economic critique. Further, critical engagement with the position of higher education within the blurred, shifting binaries of public and private, and local and global, would enable envisioning new subjectivities and transnational obligations that both eschew neoliberal economic imperatives and challenge the reproduction of the alterity produced by these imperatives.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Since the mid-1990s, administrators of many U.S. universities have charged task forces and working groups with the creation of a vision for the internationalization of their institution (Biddle, 2002). According to Knight (1994), internationalization plans are a crucial element of any university’s internationalization strategy, identifying “the reasons for internationalizing, the intended outcomes, the unique features, resources and needs of the organization” (p. 13). In addition to stand-alone internationalization documents, these plans may sometimes be folded into a university’s broader strategic plan, or arise as part of a university’s self-assessment in preparation for a reaccreditation process (Childress, 2009). These documents serve as both practical blueprints of institutional goals and rhetorical justifications of universities’ efforts to achieve the kind of internationalization to which a particular university’s administration aspires. Because discourse is one of the primary means “through which economic, social, and cultural processes transpire,” (Ayers, 2005, p. 529) the documents not only describe but also at least partially constitute internationalization within a university by outlining what is possible and circumscribing what is not.
Yet there exists a dearth of scholarship that critically examines U.S. university internationalization planning documents in particular, and the processes of U.S. university internationalization more generally. The internationalization efforts of higher education maintain a utilitarian focus (Matus, 2006), and that focus is also found in the research on internationalization, much of which is framed as a resource for practitioners rather than as part of a cohesive body of scholarship (Huisman, 2007). Dolby and Rahman (2008) argued that because of this, discourses that focus, for example, on the importance of internationalization for economic competition or national security go largely unquestioned.

**Purpose of the Study**

Currently, most scholarship about the internationalization of higher education in the U.S. asks the question of how universities can and should internationalize. This research largely takes for granted the presumption that the need for internationalization is obvious and/or desirable. For example, Childress’s (2009) study of U.S. university internationalization described the types of plans that existed and assessed the factors that enabled or hindered their successful implementation, but did not address the rationales or motivations underlying the plans. I therefore approached my study of internationalization with the intention of exploring not just how U.S. universities internationalize, but also why U.S. universities are so eager to do so and what might be the consequences of their internationalization efforts, both intended and not. In particular, I illustrate the common discourses in the Big Ten universities’ internationalize planning documents, and how
these discourses potentially shape the conduct of universities as a whole, as well as the conduct of individual university subjects.

Fairclough (1995) and Allan (1996) both argued that recognition and critique of the ways in which dominant discourses naturalize a particular perspective, while silencing or discounting other perspectives, can produce new, or strengthen existing, oppositional discourses that posit alternative ideologies and subjectivities. Similarly, according to Foucault (1990), “discourse can be both an instrument and effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of resistance, and a starting point for an opposing strategy” (p. 101). By applying Foucault’s frameworks of biopower and governmentality (1977–1978/2007; 1978–1979/2008) to discourse analysis, this study follows a body of scholarly work that seeks to provide a space “in which to think about how it is possible to do things in a different fashion, to highlight the point at which resistance and contestation bring an urgency to their transformation, and even to demonstrate the degree to which that transformation may prove difficult” (Dean, 1999, p. 36).

Through this study I therefore excavate the discourses of internationalization that are available in the planning documents, and examine the disparate power relations with which they are deployed in the texts. Ultimately, this provides a means through which to reconsider the larger role of internationalization for a university in state, national, and global contexts. I also suggest potential areas for furthering a political economic critique of higher education in ways that thoughtfully and critically engage sites of alterity, and
may provide a means for re-envisioning higher education and its internationalization efforts beyond that which is conducted by neoliberal governmentality.

**Guiding Research Frameworks**

My approach to this study of university internationalization planning documents is situated within constructivist, post-structural, and critical epistemologies. These paradigms informed the selection of discourse analysis as my methodological approach and the application of Foucault’s notion of biopower and governmentality as my conceptual frameworks. Broadly, constructivism presumes that individuals make meaning of the world through interpretation of their experiences and observations. According to Creswell (2007), constructivism emphasizes the processes of interaction that help shape the meaning that an individual makes of a certain situation. Although often this leads researchers to emphasize analyses of interactions between individuals, discourse analysis suggests that individuals’ interactions with texts (be they written, illustrated, or spoken) also affect and inform individuals’ self-construction and meaning-making. Thus, a constructivist paradigm suggests that a text “does not describe social processes and structures, but creates and supports them” (Saarinen, 2008, p. 719). University internationalization planning documents may therefore be understood as texts that construct the practice of internationalization by drawing borders around what is (and is not) considered real and legitimate practice.

However, discourse does not simply structure a fixed reality and create passive subjects, nor merely reproduce power relations. Post-structuralism recognizes the role of individual agency and suggests “each of us is continually engaged in a process of locating
ourselves within discursive fields and drawing upon discourses to represent ourselves” (Allan, 2010, p. 15). Therefore, post-structuralism suggests that discourse acts as an open site for active negotiation of socially constructed meanings rather than acting as a strict determinant of those meanings. By conducting a discourse analysis situated in both constructivism and post-structuralism, I accept the premise that texts simultaneously provide the means for individuals to construct meaning for themselves but also serve to set limits on what meaning may be made, thereby placing boundaries (fluid as they are) around what is both possible and desirable in the process of subjectification.

Foucault’s concepts of biopower and governmentality are broadly situated in a post-structural perspective. Foucault identified biopower as the primary form of power in contemporary Western society. Biopower is enacted through the production and management of subjects and populations, rather than through repressive or disciplinary means. Biopower is deployed through government, which here should be understood not as the state, but as “any more or less calculated means of the direction of how we behave and act” (Dean, 1999, p. 2), although the state may indeed direct the apparatuses that make this government possible. Hence, governmentality indicates a mentality, or a way of thinking about, the means for directing how we behave and act. Texts, particularly officially sanctioned texts like university internationalization planning documents, can be understood as tools of various technologies of governmentality. Indeed, according to Rose (1999), “language is not secondary to government, it is constitutive of it” (p. 28). Those individuals and institutions that govern will deploy technologies, through the use of tools, as a means of biopower. Thus, as a tool of internationalization in its role as a
technology of neoliberal governmentality, texts like planning documents therefore represent efforts to discursively rationalize certain conducts (of both individuals and institutions) that are deemed to be desirable for the benefit of a university population.

According to Foucault (1990), sovereign institutions and individuals (e.g. a university administration), do not represent power; rather “these are only the terminal forms power takes” (p. 92). Power is primarily the “multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization” (p. 92). Returning to the role of agency in both post-structuralism and governmentality itself, in the process of what Rose (1999) called “translation” from the governors to the subjects they seek to conduct (and who they ultimately hope will conduct themselves), there is space for distortion and fracture. Power contains the possibility for resistance at every site in which power is enacted, because “it is produced from one moment to the next, at every point, or rather in every relation from one point to another” (Foucault, 1992, p. 93). Thus, when subjects engage with and interpret a text they may either enact the conducts rationalized through a hegemonic ideology, or they may engage in counter-conducts that press against and puncture the boundaries of what is possible and desirable, as per some other, marginalized ideology. However, in order to do the latter they must first recognize, even if only implicitly, the range of potentialities that exist within the heterogeneity of biopower and governmentality.

Despite the ever-present possibility of resistance, in contrast to a purely critical theory approach, a poststructural approach to internationalization does not presume that
universities or university actors can be “liberated” either from or by biopower and
governmentality. This is because, according to Dean (1999),
government works through forms of subjection \textit{and} forms of
subjectification. It sometimes takes the form of coercion and, at other
times, seeks consent...It presupposes and even creates forms of
unfreedom and equality as it seeks to create various kinds of equality
and to foster the exercise of certain types of liberty. (p. 34)
The Foucaultian concepts of biopower and governmentality therefore reject the idea that
subjects can stand outside of relations of power; rather, they suggest that subjects and
their freedom are created and shaped \textit{through} power, and therefore \textit{by} and \textit{within}
governmentality. Because of this, I do not frame my study as an emancipatory project,
because to do so would suggest that it is possible for one to be “free” from power, when
in fact biopower creates and frames freedom.

At the same time, Foucault (1990) argued that sites of power are always
accompanied by the potential for resistance. Each action and interaction is a negotiation
between external subjectification and internal self-determination; the two are inextricably
linked, and governmentality requires both sides of this equation. I therefore understand
this as a project that problematizes internationalization by identifying the sociohistorical
contingency of certain rationalities in higher education generally, and the ways that
power is discursively deployed through university internationalization specifically. I
nonetheless work from a perspective that is critical of what Boden and Epstein (2006)
described as the colonization of universities by neoliberal rationalities, whereby
universities are so deeply embedded within neoliberal rationalities that economic considerations determine the knowledge that will be produced, how that knowledge will be distributed, and how faculty and staff will be managed.

I approach this study with the assumption that there are varied rationalities circulating in university internationalization efforts, and in the documents that discursively construct them. I utilize discourse analysis as a means to identify these rationalities and the ways that, based on power relations, certain rationalities are more likely to be naturalized through discourse than others. Two primary rationalities that circulate commonly in internationalization discourse and indeed in the documents within this corpus are economic rationality, and developmental rationality. For the purposes of this study, economic rationality refers to the notion that the conduct of individuals and institutions are best determined according to calculations of the relative value of particular courses of action, and their expected outcome with regard to expansion of capital. Under neoliberalism, this is particularly meant to indicate efforts to increase the value of oneself on a global market. In the context of internationalization, developmental rationality refers to a commitment by one party (generally, a university in the global North) to assist in the creation and maintenance of changes or infrastructural improvements, broadly conceived, to an external party (often an institution or social group in the global South).

I concur with Fairclough (1995) that it is “vital that people should become more aware and more self-aware about language and discourse” (p. 140). In fact, he argued that awareness is a prerequisite for democratic citizenship. Curtis similarly suggested, “the
goal of democratic action is to contest continuously not the government, but the truths and rationality upon which the government relies for its techniques and strategies of governing the population” (as cited in Suspitsyna, 2012, p. 66). My general agreement with Fairclough and Curtis about the need for more widespread awareness of the role of discourse in shaping and constraining what is possible is what prompted me to undertake this study of Big Ten universities’ internationalization planning documents. Nonetheless, because I believe that all discourse is involved in the relations of power, the aim of this study is not to propose specific alternatives to existing discourses (whether dominant or not) within constructions of university internationalization. Instead, I concur with Foucault (1983) “not that everything is bad, but that everything is dangerous, which is not exactly the same as bad. If everything is dangerous, then we always have something to do” (pp. 231-232).

To further develop my abstention from proposing rigid alternatives or “solutions” to hegemonic discourses of internationalization, I again follow Foucault (1990) in his suggestion that points of resistance are multiple and omnipresent. This means “often one is dealing with mobile and transitory points of resistance” (p. 96). Although Foucault acknowledges that radical shifts can and do occur, he emphasized both the prevalence and the importance of small, localized, dispersive points of resistance. Thus, I identify the ways in which the texts of the internationalization planning documents provide discursive material that may be deployed at dispersed points of potential resistance. These minor resistance efforts may eventually codify, or be codified into, a wider transformation
through strategic political action and alliance (much as the dispersive techniques of
government are often integrated and institutionalized by the state).

In addition, my reluctance to prescribe a totalizing vision for resistance is partially
due to the fact that I believe the impulse to improve existing conditions, (i.e. to have,
following Foucault [1983] “something to do,”) is as potentially dangerous as anything
else. In conducting this research, I therefore understand myself to be engaging in what
Owen called “exemplary criticism” (as cited in Dean, 1999, p. 38). According to Dean,
engaging in an analysis of government according to the principles of exemplary criticism
is “practicing a type of criticism that demonstrates the contingency of regimes of
practices and government, identifies states of government within such regimes and allows
us to experience a state of domination as a state of domination” (p. 38). In other words, I
believe that any consideration of ways in which we might conduct universities that run
counter to the economic rationalities of neoliberal governmentality requires critique of
the rationalities of resistance itself, and of the consequences that might result from those
resistance efforts. Yet while I do not take it as my role to determine a specific
codification of resistance to neoliberal governmentality in higher education, I nonetheless
provide suggestions for means of approaching internationalization that do not adhere to
the hegemony of neoliberal governmentality.

Research Questions

Approaching discourse analysis of the Big Ten universities’ internationalization
planning documents through the conceptual frameworks of biopower and
governmentality, as situated in constructivist, poststructuralist, and critical paradigms,
recognizes both the potential for, and limitations of, reproduction and resistance that may be enacted as part of an individual or institution’s engagement with a text. In order to understand this potential and its attendant limitations, the following research questions guided this study:

- What rationales for university internationalization are presented in the documents?
- What objectives for university internationalization are presented in the university internationalization planning documents?
- How do the documents frame the means by which the university can achieve these objectives for internationalization?

**Significance of the Study**

For most of its history, the internationalization of higher education has been framed primarily as a field of practice rather than as the object of research. Even as research on internationalization has proliferated in the past 20 years, the chief audience has remained practitioners (Dolby & Rahman, 2008), such as those working in study abroad offices or in international student services. Thus, practical and applied research, rather than critical or theoretical scholarly work, dominates internationalization literature (Huisman, 2007). Practice-oriented studies of university internationalization examine organizational readiness for change (Agnew & VanBalkom, 2009), evaluate approaches to internationalizing curriculum (Hanson, 2010; Svensson & Wihlborg, 2010), and suggest means for improvements of, and increased participation in, study abroad programs (Salisbury, Paulsen, & Pascarella, 2011; Vande Berg, 2007).
Yet as universities continue to pledge considerable philosophical and financial commitments to internationalization and its implementation, more scholars have begun to turn a critical eye to universities’ internationalization efforts. Instead of identifying best practices or case studies of successful strategies, this line of inquiry seeks to understand what drives internationalization and how it has come to be a relatively unquestioned good in higher education. Much of this research suggests that university internationalization is largely driven by economic concerns (e.g. Dixon, 2007; Stier, 2004; Turner & Robson, 2007), mirroring trends in the higher education landscape as a whole. Boden and Epstein (2006) studied the effects of neoliberalism on research agendas related to globalization and concluded that “universities, as prime knowledge producers, have been largely colonised by neo-liberal regimes of truth and practice” (p. 234). However, most research that looks critically at the internationalization of higher education is conducted outside of the U.S. (Dolby & Rahman, 2008), particularly in Europe, leaving a gap in the literature on internationalization in U.S. higher education that this study addresses.

At least two studies have previously combined discourse analysis with a framework of Foucault’s governmentality in the review of higher education policy. Suspitsyna (2012) used this combination to examine speeches by the U.S. Department of Education, and Nokkala (2006) applied this methodology and this framework to documents and interviews at universities in Finland and the Netherlands. However, the present study is among the first studies to join discourse analysis of internationalization at U.S. universities with Foucault’s concepts of biopower and governmentality. In addition to the specifics of my findings about Big Ten university internationalization planning
documents, it is my hope that this research will demonstrate the potential for all members of a university community— not merely academics – to play at decentering hegemonic discourses at their institutions through the deployment of alternative discourses as counter-conducts.

**Overview of Chapters**

In the chapters that follow, I first conduct a review of the literature on internationalization in higher education, with consideration of some of the key facets of common internationalization efforts, as well as research that interrogates the ideologies underlying these efforts. Next I outline Foucault’s concepts of biopower and neoliberal governmentality, and suggest how they may be applied to university internationalization. I then explain how I use Fairclough’s discourse analysis as a means to interrogate the ways in which the discourses of Big Ten university internationalization planning documents normalize or marginalize certain rationalities. I suggest that the processes of internationalization enacted at these universities act as technologies of neoliberal governmentality in higher education, while internationalization planning documents act as tools of those technologies. Next, I explain the results of my coding, and present my discourse analysis of three text samples. Finally, I discuss these results, and their implications for future research and practice around internationalization.

Ultimately the aim of my analysis, like the model for an analytics of government formulated by Dean (1999) and Rose (1999), is not to critique the internationalization of higher education, nor even to critique neoliberal governmentality, as ends in themselves. Rather, it is my intention to mark “out a space to ask questions about government,
authority and power, without attempting to formulate a set of general principles by which various forms of the ‘conduct of conduct’ can be reformed” (Dean, 1999, p. 36).

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

According to Callan (2000), the term “internationalization” in higher education is subject to ongoing redefinition, as influenced by “the varying rationales and incentives for internationalization, the varying activities encompassed therein, and the varying political and economic circumstances in which the process is situated” (p. 16). However, Knight’s (2004) characterization of the internationalization of higher education as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” is widely cited (p. 11). More critical scholars have resisted a firm definition of internationalization altogether, pointing to the varied, often conflicting, ideologies and social contexts that surround its implementation, and incorporating this tension into a more fluid, open-ended negotiation of the term and its meaning (Stier, 2004; Turner & Robson, 2007). For the purposes of this study, the use of “internationalization” rests largely on Knight’s definition while also maintaining openness to other constructs.

Efforts to internationalize universities have intensified over the last two decades (e.g. Altbach & Knight, 2007; Biddle, 2002), but according to Kerr (1991) the process has been in progress since the world’s first formal institutions of higher education were
founded. When defined most broadly, the internationalization of higher education has ebbed and flowed for centuries with sociohistorical circumstances. For example, the establishment of institutions following the model of European universities was a significant emphasis of many colonial powers, and the development of higher education in the U.S. can be described as process of internationalization, inspired as it was by both the English Oxbridge colleges and German research universities (Dolby & Rahman, 2008). Later, during the Cold War both the U.S. and the Soviet Union used higher education as a means by which to grow their spheres of influence (de Wit, 2002).

In order to elucidate some of the rationalities that surround internationalization as it is approached and implemented in universities today through the review of literature, in this chapter I first explore the contested relationship between internationalization and globalization in higher education. Then I consider three primary facets of university internationalization: global competency, competition, and collaboration. After providing a general overview of these overarching themes, I review more critical studies that address the ideas that underlie and justify university internationalization. The results of this review suggest that university internationalization is largely driven by strategies and calculations based on economic rationality. Next, I introduce Foucault’s concepts of biopower and governmentality, specifically neoliberal governmentality, which serve as the frameworks for this study, and reconsider the literature on internationalization to understand how internationalization might function as a technology of neoliberal governmentality within higher education. To conclude the literature review, I consider Dean (1999) and Rose’s (1999) vision for an analytics of government, and address the
ways in which planning documents, as tools of internationalization (given internationalization’s role as a technology of neoliberal governmentality), allow for exploration of discourses contained therein.

Internationalization and Globalization

Although internationalization is sometimes confused with globalization (Altbach, 2004), more commonly the internationalization of higher education is framed as a response to globalization (Kalvemark & van der Wende, 1997; van der Wende, 2007). For example, Altbach (2004) argued that globalization is made up of the “broad economic, technological, and scientific trends that directly affect higher education and are largely inevitable,” whereas “[i]nternationalisation includes specific policies and programmes undertaken by governments, academic systems and institutions, and even individual departments or institutions to cope with or exploit globalization” (pp. 5-6). A more general definition for globalization is suggested by Dodds (2008), who posited that globalization can be understood in two ways: 1) increased “global flows” or pressures of people, culture, and information; or 2) as particular policy trends, especially those that incentivize and accept the growth of market mechanisms.

Much like internationalization, globalization comes with its own set of contested meanings and nuanced interpretations. Appadurai (1996) argued that while globalization does indicate global flows, it is “a deeply historical, uneven, and even localizing process” (p. 17, emphasis in original), contrary to those who suggest that globalization is a distinctly new, or merely a one-way, homogenizing process. In this construction of globalization, specific individuals and groups both engage and resist global flows in
diverse, distinct, and dynamic ways that cannot be generalized or predicted, and therefore cannot be understood as unavoidable. Some argue that rather than merely serving as a descriptor, globalization as a concept is wielded as a tool to legitimate transnational capitalism as “inevitable and benign” (Gaffikin & Perry, 2009, p. 118). According to Medovoi (2007), the narrative of globalization that developed following the Cold War and Samuel Huntington’s pronouncements regarding the “clash of civilizations” universalized economic liberalism, suggesting an “inexorable (if somewhat uneven) integration of the earth’s population into a geosocial order that would overcome the propensity for civilizational clashes” (p. 67). Davies and Bansel (2007) suggested that as the inevitability of globalization grew to be taken for granted, the “introduction of institutional and workplace changes, which deprived students and workers of previous freedoms, were accepted as the acts of responsible governments introducing measures necessary for individual, institutional and national economic survival” (p. 250).

As is evidenced by Altbach’s (2004) framing of globalization vis-à-vis internationalization, globalization is indeed frequently understood as inevitable and may therefore be used to justify certain policy and economic adjustments in higher education (Dodds, 2008). Thus, framing globalization as inevitable may set up internationalization as a response to globalization that is also inevitable, even as internationalization manifests differently depending on the goals, resources, and other contextual factors of the universities that implement it. In order to better illuminate the connections between globalization and the internationalization of higher education, I consider in further depth the practices and trends in university internationalization that are often framed as
responses to globalization, including: development of students’ global competency, competition, and collaboration.

**Internationalization for Global Competency**

A 2002 report by the American Council on Education, framed by the events of September 11, 2001, suggested that the United States was facing a shortfall of individuals trained with global competency, noting that the forces of globalization had intensified over the past several years, resulting in increased demand for these skills. The report noted that global competency entails skills related to national security needs, international relations, and foreign language abilities. In other literature, the concept of global competency is termed intercultural or cross-cultural competency. Meanings of global/cross-cultural/intercultural competency vary, but Deardorff (2006) found that the following definition provided by Byram was rated most highly by university administrators: “knowledge of others; knowledge of self; skills to interpret and relate; skills to discover and/or to interact; valuing others’ values, beliefs, and behaviors; and relativizing oneself” (p. 247).

Often university internationalization efforts are framed as responding to what administrators perceive as forces of globalization by addressing and attempting to eliminate a perceived intercultural competency gap through programs like study abroad and curriculum internationalization. Working from the presumption that global competency is a probable and desirable outcome of study abroad, considerable research focuses on ways to enhance universities’ study abroad offerings and increase student participation, particularly students who are a part of groups that have historically
participated in study abroad in what are understood to be low numbers. For example Salisbury, Umbach, Paulsen, and Pascarella (2009) looked at the factors that affected students’ decisions to study abroad, and suggested that universities should take into consideration students’ precollege social and cultural capital in formulating their efforts to attract non-traditional students to study abroad. Salisbury, Paulsen and Pascarella (2011) and Goldstein and Kim (2005) evaluated the causes of disparate study abroad participation rates amongst White and racial/ethnic minority students, while Wielkiewicz and Turkowski (2010) suggested improvements to the study abroad experience that might lessen students’ difficulties with reentry.

Other studies have focused on the role of internationalizing curriculum in the development of intercultural competency, whether inside or outside of the classroom. For example, Hanson (2010) examined the effects of two global health courses with internationalized curricula and found that transformative pedagogies helped foster students’ identification with “global citizenship” (p. 84). Norohna (1992) and Fowler (2006) both suggested that synergies of international and diversity/multicultural education could help universities address gaps in intercultural competency and collaboration. Outside of the classroom, Ping (1999) and Dalton (1999) argued that student affairs professionals can play important roles in fostering intercultural dialogue to serve the needs of both domestic and international students in the development of intercultural skills, while Weigl (2009) suggested that students should be encouraged to undergo a process called “cultural-self study,” which involves reflection to enhance intercultural awareness of both oneself and others (p. 346).
There is some literature critiquing current practices aimed at achieving intercultural competence as a means of internationalizing. For example, Sakuragi’s (2005) research suggested that although language study is often touted as having intercultural benefits for students beyond knowledge of the language itself, attitudes toward language study are not necessarily linked to cross-cultural attitudes. Vande Berg (2007) critiqued the gap between what study abroad professionals intend for their students to learn while studying abroad and what students actually learn, suggesting that more attention be paid to students’ learning outside of the classroom while abroad, for example by means of active participation in guided reflection. Finally, in discussing study abroad programs Roshanravan (2012) critiqued “hegemonic representations of the United States as a unified ‘modern’ white/ Anglo nation against which the culturally Other terrain of the ‘global’ becomes understandable” (p. 1). In this way, people of color within the U.S. maintain a position as subordinate outsiders to the U.S. imaginary.

In many cases, however, despite the critical angle of some work on internationalization, the underlying necessity of these programs goes relatively unquestioned. The question most often asked is “how can we improve programs to increase participation and achieve greater intercultural competency?” rather than “what are we trying to accomplish with these programs and why?” Thus, the literature on university internationalization rarely critiques cultural competency as incisively as Roshanravan. However, when explicit arguments are made about the need for intercultural competency, they often emphasize the market demand for these skills. For example, King and Kohler (as cited in Hansen, 2002) argued that internationalization
efforts “have special importance to our local communities not only because they support current needs for our economic development, but also because they lay a foundation for the coming changes in the American workplace that will demand cross-cultural sensitivity and improved interpersonal skills” (p. 9). Although the two imperatives cited here in support of these skills (local economic development, and changes in the American workplace) are presented as different, in fact they are both related to market demands. Thus, for example, the potential for intercultural competency to cultivate students’ respect for others’ differences is valued not (exclusively) as an end in itself, but rather as means to ensure that individuals will use these skills to their economic advantage, which in turn creates an economic advantage for their community and nation. There are exceptions, such as Svensson and Wihlborg’s (2010) suggestion that the internationalization of university curriculum must go beyond merely serving as an “adaptive reaction” to globalization and consider how intercultural knowledge and knowledge within a discipline might be related (p. 611), or De Vita and Case’s (2003) suggestion that more open-ended pedagogical styles can challenge ethnocentricity and recognize culturally variant learning styles.

The development of students’ intercultural competency is a common element of many universities internationalization efforts, and the literature about intercultural competency is illustrative of the pragmatic, utilitarian approach taken by many studies of university internationalization. In an effort to consider internationalization in greater depth, and how it is situated in the context of higher education more generally, in the sections that follow I explore the ways in which universities’ internationalization efforts
can broadly be categorized as either competitive or collaborative. Significantly, even collaborative internationalization efforts are often pursued according to economic rationality.

**Competition in Internationalization**

Miller (2003) argued that although commodification and corporatization have been forces in U.S. higher education since the growth of partnerships between industry and universities in the 1850s, with points of intensification after the two World Wars and during the Cold War, these forces have intensified significantly since the 1970s. Since coming to the fore in America and Western Europe in the 1970s, neoliberal economic policies have naturalized the idea that society will benefit most from self-regulating markets, meaning that free trade should be maximized and government regulation minimized (Gaffikin & Perry, 2009). Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) argued that although universities did not play a primary role in the creation of neoliberal states, they did endorse and benefit economically from the changes that followed, such as the Bayh-Dole Act in the U.S., which enables universities to gain financial benefits from research conducted by their faculty using federal research dollars. The Bayh-Dole Act exemplifies the principles of academic capitalism described by Slaughter and Rhoades: knowledge is privatized and “institutions, inventor faculty, and corporations have claims that come before those of the public” (p. 29).

Following the logic of academic capitalism a market ethos is enacted at universities, through means like the casualization of faculty (i.e. more part-time and adjunct faculty, fewer tenured faculty), copyright and commercialization of intellectual...
property and inventions by faculty, and enhanced management of faculty following a corporate model, in place of evaluation by their professional peers. Given faculty members’ increased focus on obtaining research funding and producing research that will generate further profit has also been accompanied by a decline in public service. Despite the fact that service is considered a core function at many institutions, service is understood as neither profit-producing nor prestige-enhancing (Jaeger & Thornton, 2005). Faculty members are also compelled to pursue service in areas deemed priorities by grantors, just as they are compelled to pursue research in areas deemed priorities by federal agencies, foundations, corporations, and other external funding sources.

Universities understand and frame themselves as competitors not only in a national but also in an international higher education marketplace. This, combined with rising costs and declining public funding for higher education, means that university activities are increasingly driven by the imperative to obtain direct funding or ongoing revenue streams. In fact, the idea of a university serving “the common good” or “the public good” has been resignified to mean that it contributes to its national or state economy through the creation of jobs and profits, rather than through cultivation of public service, civic engagement, and participation in government (Jaeger & Thornton, 2005). Academic capitalism also “explains the process of college and university integration into the new economy” (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004, p. 1), which is frequently characterized as a knowledge economy. The concept of a knowledge economy is that the world, or at least the global North, has moved away from an economy built on industry and toward an economy built on “knowledge intensive production and services”
(Nokkala, 2006, p. 176). In the framework of a knowledge economy and academic capitalism, universities are expected to produce workers who have business and technology skills, and whose consumer purchases will drive the national economy (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).

Government funding for education has declined as students are increasingly framed as consumers of education “who must manage their own lives, and invest in their own human capital” (Miller, 2003, p. 901). Students are not only understood as products and consumers of education, however; they are also constructed as resources for which universities compete. This encompasses students’ tuition dollars and future alumni donations, but also what their presence may do for the reputation of a university. If, as those who argue the inevitability of globalization suggest, individuals and institutions compete in an international higher education market, then the student-as-resource construct extends to international students as well, which is indeed what Rhee and Sagaria (2004) found in their analysis of international student depictions in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Appadurai (1996) suggested that one of the primary cross-border flows of globalization was “ethnoscapes,” or flows of people (p. 33). In the “global marketplace” of higher education, over 1.5 million students are studying outside of their home countries, the majority of them moving from the global South to the global North (Altbach, 2004, p. 11). These students are often understood by U.S. university administrators to represent a significant source of potential tuition income and future alumni donations, for which a university presupposes it must compete with other
universities. The presence of international students may also enhance an institution’s prestige (Bolsman & Miller, 2008), prompting others to see the school as a good investment and thereby improving its ability to secure further resources.

In response to the perceived pressures of an increasingly global education environment, competition is also evident in the movement of scholars: the permeability of borders means that there is a greater, more accessible pool of talented faculty, but there are also more universities with which to compete in recruiting the “stars” of each academic discipline (Altbach, 2004). According to Kim (2009), faculty mobility today is largely influenced by policy frameworks that facilitate the migration of highly skilled workers and cooperative supranational and international university networks, but little research has been done to assess daily practice or long term effects of interaction between “local students and international academics and the interactions between international academics and international students” (p. 403).

**Collaboration in Internationalization**

Despite the emphasis by many institutions on the need to internationalize as a means for economic competition, some institutions also pursue collaborative international efforts. This, of course, does not mean that they are devoid of political or economic motivations. Altbach (2004) argued that many of the scholarly exchanges undertaken in the U.S. and the Soviet Union during the Cold War were framed as collaboration, but in fact were political and economic struggles on a higher education battlefield. Today, for example, expanding host country options for U.S. students studying abroad is framed
both as a means for U.S. universities to have more places to send their students and for host countries to benefit from an influx of funds (Gutierrez, Bhandari, & Obst, 2008).

Another means of collaboration are twinning programs, which link two institutions, typically one each from the global North and South. Students in these programs, who tend to be native to a country in the global South, complete their schooling at a combination of the two institutions and receive joint degrees (Altbach, 2004). Universities in the global North have also set up branch campuses or exchange programs in the global South, which may be seen as a continuation of colonial trends wherein colonizers set up universities in the metropoles of their colonies. As the colonial undertones of branch campuses suggest, international collaboration does not necessitate equal exchange between all collaborating institutions. Indeed, an organization often has influence over organizations that have fewer resources than it, or more control over the same shared resources (Pfeffer & Salanick, 2001). For instance, in an academic partnership between a university in the global North and South, the pedagogic models of the former tend to prevail (Altbach, 2004).

Further, although international students often have difficulty adjusting to a new academic environment once they arrive on campus, universities largely shift responsibility for their success onto the students themselves, and do not attempt to address how the school’s environment might be unwelcoming or hostile (Lee & Rice, 2007). Yet these asymmetries of power and resources may be masked through the construct of higher education as a free global market characterized by individual choice based on economic calculations. For example, Dixon (2006) found that Thai students
participating in an Australian exchange program were characterized as free to choose whether or not to accept knowledge through a Western lens, despite the students’ expressed belief that in order to make Thailand and its economy competitive internationally they must accept Western knowledge constructs.

Given their relative influence, universities in the global North may also take advantage of their position in relation to their partner(s) in the global South. For instance, there is often a lack of accreditation or other requirements when setting up partnerships with universities or governments in the global South, which can lead to poor quality control, neglect, or malpractice (van der Wende, 2007). At the same time, when quality control is enacted, it may be used as a disciplinary tool to promote particular conceptions of educational practices and knowledge that are considered useful to the entity doing the assessment (Ninnes & Burnett, 2003), thereby discounting the value of non-Western forms of knowledge or pedagogy. Woolf (2007) also noted that communities in the global South may not be prepared to host an influx of students from the North, many of whom expect infrastructure and levels of service that go beyond that which is provided to local students. In addition, these communities may come to rely on income from the programs, which may become problematic if the more powerful partner unilaterally terminates the relationship. International competition and international collaboration in higher education may therefore serve as means for the advancement of broader economic control and cultural imperialism or influence by countries in the global North (Bolsmann & Miller, 2008).
Finally, given the high cost of international study, access to these opportunities is often limited to the elite class of students in both the global North and South (van der Wende, 2007). Marginson and van der Wende (2007) argued that this contributes to a widening of the disparities between the global North and South, as the education of the elite from the global South creates a brain drain of educated individuals from their home countries to the global North. However, Lee and Kim (2010) pointed out that many international students do return to their home countries after studying in the U.S., creating not a static brain drain but rather brain gain, brain circulation, and brain adaptation. This suggests that, per Appadurai’s (1996) ethnoscapes, global flows of people are dynamic and multi-directional. Nonetheless, framing globalization as inevitable normalizes aspects of internationalization that tend to favor elite institutions in the global North, and elite individuals in the global South (Marginson & Sawir, 2005).

**Ideologies of Internationalization**

Presuming globalization’s inevitability, as so many internationalization efforts do, lays the groundwork for higher education to dedicate considerable energy and resources toward the production of knowledge that may be commoditized, and to focus on training students as workers who will be disciplined, productive contributors to their national economies within a global knowledge economy (Dodds, 2008). These outcomes are favored over education for other, non-commoditized ends, e.g. the promotion of civic engagement and democratic participation. The complex character of internationalization efforts made in the name of a response to globalization evidenced above suggests that rather than exclusively examine the effects of globalization on universities, it is also
necessary to consider the effects of universities on globalization. Dodds (2008) argued that, for example, if globalization is understood in part to mean the international spread of marketization, that universities have taken it upon themselves to marketize (e.g. adopt corporate operating practices) and thereby perpetuate the competitive ethos.

Despite the close relationship between globalization and university internationalization, to explain universities’ internationalization efforts as simply being driven by the forces of globalization, or by competition and collaboration, belies the complexity of overlapping and contested internationalization ideologies and motivations. In fact, Stier (2004) argued that part of the reason it is often difficult for people to provide a clear definition of internationalization is the very fact that its necessity is taken for granted, while at the same time its exact character is vague and sometimes contradictory. He proposed therefore to explore ideologies that underlie internationalization, which may be “partly or completely, conscious (e.g. as manifested in educational doctrines) or make up a set of taken-for granted assumptions about internationalization, manifested as an unconscious frame of reference for the individual” (p. 85).

In the section that follows, I review a number of studies, including Stier’s, that critically examine the ideas undergirding universities’ internationalization efforts. Although the authors use a variety of terms to describe these ideas - ideologies, philosophical traditions, discourses, motivations – for the purposes of this review, I group them under a similar line of critical inquiry aimed at characterizing some universities’ rationales for internationalization. Notably, only one of these studies is set in the U.S., which reflects the fact that most research critical of university internationalization
originates from Europe, and that internationalization research produced in the U.S. is dominated by practice-oriented inquiry.

In an attempt to interrogate the often unquestioned value of university internationalization, Stier (2004) drew on his own experience as a practitioner as well as various theoretical discourses, and identified three primary normative ideologies that undergird the drive toward internationalization: 1) the idealistic notion that international cooperation will contribute to a more democratic, equal world (which he found more commonly among faculty than administrators); 2) the economically pragmatic idea that internationalization will maximize a school’s profit and transmit desirable ideologies abroad as part of education’s position as a commodity in an increasingly capitalist, global, multicultural world; and 3) the notion that internationalization enriches the academic experiences of students and staff, and cultivates greater appreciation for varied perspectives as a means to achieve personal and professional growth.

In some cases, multiple ideas exist at a university around a single aspect of internationalization, such as international students. International students occupy various subject positions as members of U.S. university culture. Even as they are socialized as members of the university community, both Tierney (1997) and Holvino’s (2010) work on institutional socialization would predict that international students bring with them the norms and values of their home culture. (Of course, like any other culture, it may be presumed their native culture is not monolithic, but rather made up of various contested elements and identities.) International students are also shaped by their position in the university as non-native outsiders. In their study of articles published in the *Chronicle of*
Higher Education on the subject of institutional policies, practices, and behaviors regarding international students, Rhee and Sagaria (2004) found three primary constructions of international students in the U.S.: 1) international students as capital, i.e. exports of the American economy; 2) international students as replaceable and inferior Others (in contrast to their normative American counterparts); and 3) international students as self-identified imperial subjects. These three discourses homogenize the diverse international student body, construct international students as exotic Others, erase the agency inherent in (amongst other things) their choice to attend school in the U.S., and ignore their various other subject positions, such as members of the elite in their home countries. Nonetheless, as was the case with Stier’s work, economic value was only one of three constructions circulating about the position of international students.

Bolsmann and Miller (2008) also considered the position of international students, but in the context of British, rather than American, universities. Like Rhee and Sagaria, Bolsmann and Miller found that more than one construction of international students was present within each university. They found that three major philosophical traditions motivated the recruitment of international students, including: 1) a "Republic of Letters or of Science” tradition of universities as places of learning, research and scholarship that attract students, scholars and teachers irrespective of their national origin; 2) an "Economic Competition” tradition, wherein international students are seen as an economic resource for the institution; and 3) a “Developmental” tradition, wherein universities are constructed as agents of civilization, training, and development, which dates back to the colonial colleges created during the British empire (p. 80).
Unlike Rhee and Sagaria and Stier, who did not specify that any of the multiple ideologies they found was particularly dominant, Bolsmann and Miller (2008) found that “Economic Competition” was the prevailing tradition motivating international student recruitment. Whether or not they agreed with it, faculty and administrators interviewed in the study consistently emphasized their understanding that international students represented economic value to the university, both in regard to their tuition and fees as well as the prestige that they brought to the institution. The prominence of this economic rationality effectively made the other traditions of secondary importance. Similarly, Dixon (2006) found in her study of Thai students participating in an Australian university program that the dominance of economic imperatives and market-driven motivations were evident, despite efforts by both the Australian faculty and the Thai students to obscure these motivations by portraying Australia as a benevolent educational benefactor. Furthermore, the perspectives of the Thai students were marginalized in favor of grand narratives of progress in education and Western pedagogical styles projected by the Australian faculty. Finally, in their case study of a single university in the UK, Turner and Robson (2007) found that faculty felt frustrated by what they perceived as the dominant institutional vision (driven by the administration) of internationalization as market-based and competitive, which contrasted with the faculty’s stated preference that international engagement be driven by intellectual reciprocity and sustainable partnerships.

Collectively, these studies suggest that there exist multiple meanings and purposes of university internationalization in the global North, economic rationality tends to be
most dominant. This is not to say that the other concerns are not important, particularly given that the most highly valued ideas about internationalization will vary depending on who is asked. For instance, Turner and Robson’s (2007) findings about faculty perceptions suggest that economic imperatives tend to represent a managerial, administrative bias, and exclude the subjectivities of the academic community, including both faculty and students. Although writing in the context of corporations, Ashcraft and Allan’s (2003) argument that scholarship about organizational culture tends to normalize the concerns and motivations of individuals at the managerial level may be fruitfully applied to research about universities and their internationalization efforts.

Market-based motivations for internationalization may also coexist with other concerns held by university actors. Similarly, just because these non-market concerns might be marginalized does not mean they are free from ideology, nor above critique. For example, the idealism that internationalization will “create a better world” (identified by Stier [2004]), the “Developmental” tradition of Western universities as civilizing entities, (identified by Bolsmann and Miller [2008]), and the construction of international students as both subjugated Others and objects of American imperialism, (identified by Rhee and Sagaria [2004]), constitute a fairly unified idea about the academic and intellectual superiority of the global North. This developmental approach to internationalization by the global North can be implemented in ways that meet the needs of institutions in the global South, and therefore may have a progressive or social justice orientation. However, given the potential power imbalances between different institutions and the resulting effects on
implementation, this developmental approach may also be critiqued as paternalistic, imperialistic, and ethnocentric.

It is possible, too, that developmental rationality for internationalization may be incorporated into economic rationality in a way that emphasizes the cultivation of entrepreneurial logic by individuals and higher education institutions in the global South. The ways that this economic rationality operates in the internationalization of universities can be further developed using Foucault’s concepts of biopower and neoliberal governmentality, which I will now introduce.

**Foucault’s Biopower and Governmentality as Conceptual Framework**

When Foucault (1977-1978/2007) outlined the idea of governmentality in his lecture series “Security, Territory, Population” at the College de France, he traced its origins from 14th century Western Europe, when states began to transition away from (although not abandon entirely) sovereignty as a juridicial notion and toward a notion of sovereignty enacted through the governing of populations and their natural processes. This transition, which may be called the governmentalization of the State, entailed creation of alternative ways of being governed and governing oneself than that which was prescribed by the Christian pastorate, and occurred alongside the development of novel economic, social, and political structures. Around the 18th century a new governmentality emerged wherein the state began to evaluate its appropriate function vis-à-vis private interests of its population (Foucault, 1977-1978/2007).

It is in response to this evaluation that the State became interested in its population as an end in itself rather than just as a collection of individual subjects. It is
here that Foucault traced the birth and expansion of biopower. Rather than enact power as a repressive force, biopower is a productive force that manages life both on the level of the individual and the population. The State is particularly interested in governing in order to manage the economy by ordering and regulating the exchange and circulation of goods, but also of disease, procreation, and other physiological, population-level processes (Foucault, 1977-1978/2007). Spade (2011) described these processes, which operate in the U.S. today in areas such as taxation, welfare programs, education and legal systems, as means of “population management,” that “operate through purportedly neutral criteria aimed at distributing health and security and ensuring order” (p. 110).

In short, through the construct of biopower the State or other sovereign entity understands populations, and the individuals that make them up, to be the object of governing techniques. According to Foucault (1990), biopower was necessary for the development of capitalism, which “would not have been possible without the controlled insertion of bodies into the machinery of production and adjustment of phenomena of population to economic processes (p. 141). However, it was also necessary to a have means for “optimizing forces, aptitudes, and life in general without at the same time making them more difficult to govern” (p. 141). This is where biopolitics comes in. Biopolitics are the technologies through which biopower is enacted and produced within a population, and which effectively produce ideas of what constitutes a population and what constitutes its dialectical Other (Spade, 2011). These technologies are “present at every level of the social body and utilized by very diverse institutions…operat[ing] in the
sphere of economic processes, their development, and the forces working to sustain them” (Foucault, 1990, p. 141).

As a means of biopolitics, the State justifies its government of a population through the use of scientific knowledge, to which it grants legitimacy while theoretically granting it autonomy. Circuitously, the State draws on that very knowledge to rationalize its own population management techniques. Knowledge is instrumentalized by the State as a means of characterizing certain processes, particularly economic, as natural. Thus, “the coupling of a set of practices and a regime of truth form an apparatus (dispositif) of knowledge-power that effectively marks out in reality that which does not exist and legitimately submits it to the division between true and false” (Foucault, 1978-1979/2008, p. 19). The State thereby enacts policies and procedures in order to maintain a homeostasis of conditions and ongoing processes that have been defined as natural. The workings of knowledge-power nexus are evident in higher education, where (to varying degrees) States compel universities to produce knowledge and regimes of truth that align with State-sponsored ideologies, which States then draw upon as evidence in support of their decisions and policies (Boden & Epstein, 2006).

However, according to Foucault biopolitics can only be fully understood once governmentality is understood, since it is governmental reason or mentality that undergirds the regimes of truth (Foucault, 1978-1979/2008). In the process of outlining the historical emergence of a governmentality and biopolitics specific to early modern Western Europe, Foucault provided the framework for a general meaning of governmentality as literally the mentalities of government, which Dean (1999) described
as “the way in which the thought involved in practices of government is collective and relatively taken for granted” (p. 16). In this way, government refers not literally to any specific State, but rather government understood generally as the “conduct of conduct,” which encompasses both the conduct of a population by the State (or other sovereign power), as well as the conduct of oneself through internalization of social norms (Suspitsyna, 2010). To view government as the conduct of conduct is to suggest that freedom is not something that individuals inalienably have and is limited by oppressive external forces. Rather, governmentality simultaneously and continuously produces, organizes, and limits freedom, so that although the governed may determine their own actions, the field of potential action has already been circumscribed (Dean, 1999; Foucault, 1978-1979/2008). Thus, governmentality can be understood as a biopolitical means of deploying and managing biopower in the population.

Through its constitution of the means by which reality can be conceived and processed, government therefore enables a problem and then provides strategies for solving that problem through its own intervention (Lemke, 2001). In order to establish its legitimacy as that which conducts the conduct of individuals, and asks individuals to conduct themselves, for the benefit and prosperity of the collective population, government is underpinned by political rationalities which “are morally coloured, grounded upon knowledge, and made thinkable through language” (Rose & Miller, 1992, p. 277). Power, and biopower in particular, is rationalized within the discursive field of government (Lemke, 2001); these rationalities do not merely describe or reflect government: they constitute it via technologies that embody governmental ambitions,
many of them through tools like quotidian documents and procedures (Rose & Miller, 1992).

The processes of university internationalization can be understood as governmental technologies, while the internationalization planning documents can be understood as tools of these technologies. The documents analyzed in this study are examples of the discursive deployment of rationalities of neoliberal governmentality. As instances of official rhetoric, the documents also serve as seedbeds for additional policies and plans for internationalization that reproduce neoliberal governmentality in higher education. The hegemony of U.S. higher education systems and structures in the global field of higher education makes this a particularly relevant topic for inquiry. Marginson (2008) argued that there are at least four aspects of U.S. hegemony in higher education, including: “research concentration and knowledge flows, the global role of English, and American universities as people attractors and as exemplars of ideal practice” (p. 308).

Neoliberal Governmentality

According to Foucault (1978-1979/2008), the governmentalization of the State that began in the 1800s necessitated liberalism, a political rationality that claims, “I am going to see to it that you are free to be free” (p. 63). Liberalism is not freedom itself, but rather “the management and organization of the conditions in which one can be free…[liberalism] must produce freedom, but this very act entails the establishment of limitations, controls, forms of coercion, and obligations relying on threats, etcetera” (pp. 63-64). In order for liberal government to produce and regulate the freedom that it provides, it must presume areas of existence that are governed by processes outside of its
limited authority, and require a division between the State and that outside of it (Dean, 1999). In requiring this division, liberal government identifies a social domain that the government seeks to manage without appearing to threaten the autonomy of the social domain, or overreaching its own authority (Rose & Miller, 1992).

Because of this separation of spheres in liberal government, the state relies on biopower to manage its population, i.e. to conduct the conduct of individuals. Biopower is a more subtle means of power than disciplinary power, influencing individual actions by enacting the regulation of broad processes and systems rather than enacting direct regulation on individuals. Instead of direct discipline, the combined forces of liberalism and biopower prompt individuals to engage in self-discipline that enables the reproduction of processes presumed by the state to be necessary for the good of the population as a whole.

Liberal government during the 19th and 20th centuries led to the rise of the social sphere and creation of social welfare agencies (Dean, 1999). Liberalism is premised on the constant critique of the State’s role, and eventually the welfare State itself became the object of that critique, which gave rise to a new kind of liberalism known as neoliberalism. Foucault traced neoliberalism to debates amongst economists that occurred after WWII, but there is considerable consensus that the present form of neoliberalism took shape during the 1970s, with intensification in the 1980s during the decline of Keynesian welfare States (Brown, 2003; Olssen & Peters, 2005). Unlike many who use neoliberalism to describe a particular set of political and economic policies that enact free trade, privatization of formerly public enterprises, and deregulation, for Foucault (1978-
1979/2008) neoliberalism did not merely refer to a type of market economy. Rather, it referred to the means by which the principles of a market economy are generalized and applied to an entire social system, so that areas previously thought to be non-economic are subject to economic interpretation.

As compared to classical liberalism, neoliberalism is not “laissez-faire, but rather...permanent vigilance, activity, and intervention” (Foucault, 1978-1979/2008, p. 132). Although the interventions of neoliberalism are not necessarily more intense than those of any other form of government, neoliberalism does have particular biopolitical intentions and effects: namely, “a general regulation of society by the market” (p. 145). According to Lemke (2001), neoliberalism’s generalization of market concepts to social life enables both the use of economic categories for investigation of previously non-economic areas and actions, as well as the application of market concepts in the evaluation of governmental processes. Hence, the state no longer supervises the market, as was the practice in classical liberalism; instead, the market is the state’s organizing and limiting principle. The economic analyses of neoliberalism seek to understand previously non-market social behaviors in market terms not in an attempt to make sense of those processes but rather to justify the permanent criticism of public authorities’ actions according to economic principles (Foucault, 1978-1979/2008).

Because neoliberalism presumes that the market embodies the rules of conduct that guarantee freedom (Dean, 1999), non-market individual behavior and social relationships are subject to economic analyses. However, according to Brown (2003), neoliberalism “does not simply assume that all aspects of social, cultural and political life
can be reduced to such a calculus, rather it develops institutional practices and rewards for enacting this vision” (para. 9). Thus, she describes neoliberalism as an active, constructive project, through which government technologies of discourse and policy produce “rational actors and imposes market rationale for decision-making in all spheres” (para. 9). Neoliberal governmentality, via economic rationalities deployed through technologies enacted through the bodies and minds of its subjects, compels populations and institutions, including universities, to be economically “‘lean,’ ‘fit,’ ‘flexible’ and ‘autonomous’” creating a “new topography of the social” (Lemke, 2001, p. 203). At the same time, Foucault (1978-1979/2008) was careful to point out that neoliberal governmentality attempts to (re)produce not a society regulated by the “exchange of commodities,” but rather a society regulated by “mechanisms of competition” (p. 147), i.e. an entrepreneurial society.

In neoliberalism, just as society is conceived as entrepreneurial so too are individuals conceived as entrepreneurs. Generalization of the market form to all aspects of the individual and the social spheres rests on the assumption that choice is a fundamental human faculty, which can be influenced by environmental adjustments (Gordon as cited in Dean, 1999). Neoliberal governmentality not only governs directly but also attempts to govern by having individuals regulate themselves. Davies and Bansel (2007) argued that, “Through discourses of inevitability and globalization, and through the technology of choice, responsibilized individuals have been persuaded to willingly take over responsibility for areas of care that were previously the responsibility of government” (p. 251). Foucault called the techniques of this self-regulation “technologies
of the self,” wherein an individual is not only held responsible for conducting themselves according to certain rationalities, but also must take on social risks that were once more collectively imagined (Lemke, 2001).

Thus, neoliberal governmentality requires transformation of the classic liberal \textit{homo economicus}. In classical liberalism \textit{homo economicus}, in pursuing their own interest, is understood to also benefit the collective. In neoliberalism, however, the \textit{homo economicus} is understood to be responsive to environmental modifications, i.e. to be the subject of government. In both cases, the actions of the individual are understood to be voluntary; however, unlike the liberal \textit{homo economicus}, the neoliberal incarnation is no longer conceived of as a partner of exchange in a \textit{laissez-fair} system, but rather an “entrepreneur of himself” in a highly managed system (Foucault, 1978-1979/2008, pp. 225-226). As the subject of neoliberal government, this revised \textit{homo economicus} is dedicated to its own production and consumption, but rather than consumption understood as the result of exchange of money for products, in this case consumption is “an enterprise activity by which the individual, precisely on the basis of the capital he has at his disposal, will produce something that will be his own satisfaction” (p. 226).

The choices made by \textit{homo economicus} based on economic calculations, in order to maximize their own satisfaction, can be understood as “rational” in so far as their conduct is “sensitive to modifications in variables of the environment and which responds to this in a non-random way, a systematic way” (Foucault, 1978-1979/2008, p. 269). One way that this rational conduct is managed is by moralizing technologies of the self: the morality of \textit{homo economicus} is based on evaluation of how well they exhibit
entrepreneurial and competitive behaviors through assessment of possible choices and actions. Individual and institutional entrepreneurial behaviors are also managed through fear, as they are discursively linked to economic, and therefore national, success or failure (Davies & Bansel, 2007). Furthermore, according to Davies and Bansel, the neoliberal governmental technologies that have inculcated entrepreneurial desires “include a heavy investment in mechanisms of surveillance, which are tightly linked to mechanisms through which economic survival or demise are secured” (p. 251). In this way, neoliberal governmentality provides a means for directing the actions of individuals and institutions by rationalizing their self-regulation and economic calculations, while shifting all responsibility for any risks and outcomes from the state to the subjects and institutions themselves. Thus, the state’s apparent withdrawal from social life is actually a technique for government and a technique of power (Lemke, 2001).

Neoliberal Governmentality in Higher Education

Neoliberalism is described, by Foucault (1978-1979/2008) and Brown (2003), as having a political rationality because neoliberal rationality is not merely confined to the economy, but rather extends market value to all areas of life. In this way, the State not only operates in response to the market needs that it itself has helped to secure through policy, but also operates according to economic calculation. This is in part because the political economy in neoliberalism, as it was in liberalism, is framed as a critique of government (Foucault, 1978-1979/2008). Thus, according to Dilts (2011), neoliberal governmentality “subsumes the political order, the notion of sovereignty itself under a grid of economic analysis and market intelligibility” (p. 139). Market calculations therefore
become what Foucault (1978-1979/2008) calls “a regime of truth,” that rationalizes governmental practice (p. 38). Davies argued that schools and public services were among the first sites in which neoliberal governmentality was deployed (as cited in Davies & Bansel, 2007). Indeed, according to Brown (2003), the rationality of neoliberalism has permeated American universities, “from admissions and recruiting to the relentless consumer mentality of students in relationship to university brand names, courses, and services, from faculty raiding and pay scales to promotion criteria” (para. 15).

Olssen and Peters (2005) suggested that the central elements of neoliberal governmentality in higher education include: “flexibility (in relation to organizations through the use of contracts); clearly defined objectives (both organizational and personal), and a results orientation (measurement of and managerial responsibility for achievement of)” (p. 324). Faculty feel acutely the results of enhanced emphasis on “results orientation,” which brings about enhanced administration oversight of academic employees and a move away from the professional authority of faculty and peer evaluation, a trend known as “new managerialism,” (Suspitsyna, 2010). Faculty are increasingly evaluated in their performance by non-academic administrators, granted less autonomy in their work and research, and feel an emphasis on activities that will generate measureable outputs for the university (Olssen & Peters, 2005). Neoliberal rationality holds that if teaching or research has value, the market will indicate as such. This coincides with an enhanced emphasis on competition for limited funding, which is thought to induce in faculty “productivity, accountability, and control” (p. 326). Boden
and Epstein (2011) argued that neoliberal governance has transformed “the overwhelming majority of universities into highly managed and controlled spaces that produce docile bodies with compliant imaginations” (p. 478), thereby “transform[ing] universities from scholarly collegiate communities to knowledge corporations that purposively direct the knowledge creation process” (p. 482).

A question arises, however: how does increased managerialism square with the neoliberal emphasis on self-regulation and entrepreneurialism? Faculty, subjectified by neoliberal governmentality as *homo economici* like everyone else, are presumed to act as entrepreneurs of the self, a moral accountability that, at least according to administrators, trumps previous notions of professional accountability. According to Suspitsyna (2010), “accountability in education replicates the neoliberal political rationality that underlies new managerialism; it facilitates production of new subjectivities that are steeped in business ethics; and it regulates people’s behavior through a new kind of bio-politics that is directed at forming and stimulating the individual’s need and desire to make consumer choices” (p. 578). But this accountability goes beyond the workplace: faculty are accordingly expected to apply market rationality not only to their work as educational professionals but also to the other areas of their life, including the private sphere, effecting a transformation of “the individual’s understanding of the self, and his/her needs, desires, obligations, and freedoms” (p. 572). This follows Weeks’s (2012) argument that in the post-Fordist era, employees are expected to demonstrate a commitment to their work that goes beyond mere compliance to demonstrate active “subjective investment” (p. 70).
According to Boden and Epstein (2011), accountability in the university is driven by “aspirational discourses of organizational and individual ‘excellence’” which “shapes behavior in a number of ways” that when performed appropriately is rewarded by “a kind of quasi-parental ‘love’, which entices and induces [faculty] to perform as ‘excellent academics’” (p. 490). Beyond increased managerialism over faculty activities and the cultivation of faculty entrepreneurialism, neoliberalism in the university also aligns more broadly with the academic capitalism described by Slaughter and Rhoads (2004). The results of neoliberal restructuring on the university include the shift of governing boards toward more corporate models and de-emphasis on faculty governance and emphasis on quantity (particularly as it related to financial remuneration) of research over quality of scholarship (Marginson as cited by Olssen & Peters, 2005).

One can also understand the steadily increasing amounts of student debt as tied to neoliberal reforms (Giroux, 2009). As government funding for university education decreases, universities increasingly rely on student tuition to make up what is lost in public funding. Students are framed as rational decision makers who will evaluate the landscape of higher education and make the appropriate investment for themselves. According to Meister (2011), when public higher education comes to be understood as a purely private good for an individual, the cost of tuition becomes detached from government contributions. Even for students attending public universities, much of the investment in their education is privatized, as is the risk they take that they will be able to secure a job upon graduation – specifically, a job that will enable them to pay off their debt.
Even as U.S. state and federal governments reduce the funding of public education, they continue to govern educational institutions through financial means. Specifically, the federal government manages the flows and processes of even private student debt, most significantly through the student loan program. Not only does the U.S. government guarantee postsecondary student loans, it also determines which students and which institutions are eligible to receive them (Meister, 2011). Meister argued that declining governmental financial support for institutions and increased private debt for individual students has benefited for-profit institutions most. This is because low-income students, who are no longer able to access community colleges as middle-income students move from elite public universities to less expensive public universities and community colleges, borrow significant funds for these institutions, despite their high tuition rates and low graduation rates. Operating according to neoliberal governmentality the State manages the conditions and processes by which higher education, even public higher education, can operate according to an entrepreneurial market, thereby abdicating responsibility for the market while simultaneously enabling it to function smoothly according to capitalist logic.

Neoliberal governmentality is also tied to the rise of the concept of a global knowledge economy, which frames knowledge as deterritorialized capital and obscures significant disparities and cultural differences between particular regions of the world in favor of a totalizing view of globalization as a homogenizing flow of wealth and ideas. Nonetheless, according to Olssen and Peters (2005) the idea of a knowledge economy popularized by the World Bank and OECD understands education as “a massively
undervalued form of knowledge capital that will determine the future of work, the organization of knowledge institutions and the shape of society in years to come” (p. 331). This emphasis on the economic importance of knowledge production adheres to neoliberal governmentality wherein market rationality is applied beyond the market itself to all spheres of the social, including education. The perceived borderlessness of knowledge capital, and thus the enhanced pressures of competing not only locally and nationally but also globally, may be understood as one of the factors motivating universities’ internationalization efforts.

Olssen and Peters (2005) raised the question of how and why national education systems are still part of the public sector at all, given the emphasis and effects of neoliberal reforms, especially privatization. They describe the purposeful blurring of the boundaries between public and private as part of an incremental move toward full privatization. In this intermediary phase, however, as “world governments have successfully eased themselves out of the market, often substituting market mechanisms for the allocation of scarce public goods and services, governments find themselves as the major owners and controllers of the means of knowledge production in the new knowledge economy” (p. 340). Suspitsyna (2010) also noted the paradox of neoliberal governmentality that the commitment to a reduction in the role of the State has been concomitant with the increased implementation of government-sponsored accountability measures and administrative managerialism in education. This paradox is nonetheless consistent with the fact that in neoliberalism, the state’s ostensible withdrawal from
social spheres is actually a biopolitical technique of government (Lemke, 2001) even though the State becomes the object of market-based economic assessment.

**Neoliberal Governmentality in University Internationalization**

As per the construct of *homo economicus*, neoliberal governmentality configures individuals as entrepreneurs who are morally obliged to make purely rational market-based choices in all areas of their life. Given the blurring of the lines between private and public, in education and other social spheres, any conflict between individual self-interest and citizen responsibility is excised and pursuit of economic ends is understood to fulfill both personal and civic obligations (Davies & Bansel, 2007). As a result of an emphasis on the importance of knowledge for economic productivity, higher education is increasingly understood as vital to a country’s global competitiveness, in that it prepares a knowledgeable future labor force, i.e. university graduates, and produces value-added knowledge through its faculty members’ scholarship and inventions (Nokkala, 2006). Furthermore, a global knowledge economy is commonly understood to be deteritorialized so that a university must compete not only locally and nationally but also globally for resources, including student tuition and research funding. When economic rationality drives the value and purpose of education “productivity is seen to come not from government investment in education, but from transforming education into a product that can be bought and sold like anything else” (Davies & Bansel, 2007, p. 254).

According to this rationality, university administrators can argue that due to increasing international economic competition, the institution must embrace entrepreneurial methods of governance (Rhoads & Rhoades, 2005). I argue that, by
framing students, faculty, and staff as entrepreneurial subjects in a global knowledge economy, university internationalization acts as a biopolitical technology of neoliberal governmentality in higher education. For example, intercultural competency is pursued as a means of university internationalization because of the competitive economic advantage that it might give an individual student, and thereby, their local or national economy; faculty members are encouraged to pursue research abroad because it will enhance the reputation of their institution and therefore aid the institution in obtaining more resources, e.g. through research funding, alumni donations, or recruitment of students paying full tuition; international students are recruited for their full tuition dollars and for the perceived market value that their diversity brings to the university; and international students themselves, particularly those from the global South, attend institutions in the global North in order to secure a better-paying job, either in their home country or in the country where they attended university.

As frameworks that rationalize certain conducts within a university, and therefore certain subjectivities, internationalization planning documents act as tools of neoliberal governmentality, fostering the discursive formation of self-governing entrepreneurial university subjects who will make rational economic choices about their education and beyond, and in so doing, contribute to a common economic good of the university population and other interested parties (e.g. the state, if it is a public university). These documents are necessary for the deployment of neoliberalism, because neoliberalism does not understand economic rationality to be “natural”; rather, this rationality must be constructed through institutions, orchestration, and socialization (Brown, 2003). For a
university, as previously discussed, there is more than one neoliberal imaginary at work, since higher education simultaneously operates in local, state, national, and global spheres. These are not mutually exclusive units, but nor are they able to be collapsed into a single rationality. As Hartmann (2010) argued, “we can understand the internationalization of higher education as a bundling of very different, often conflicting strategies at local, national and post-national levels whose specific rationales, intentions and also institutional settings are still identifiable” (p. 170). I suggest that the strategies of these different units, as they are enacted in the context of U.S. universities, are nonetheless permeated by neoliberal governmentality, but that this governmentality may manifest in diverse means and ends, depending on particulars of an institutional setting.

**Counter-conduct and Analytics of Government**

With regard to university internationalization, Gaffikin and Perry (2009) argued that despite "structural pressures toward a convergent neoliberal and market-driven framework for institutional decision making, there remains political space for the agency of staff, students, community, and state to intervene with an alternative agenda" (p. 138, emphasis theirs). Indeed, despite the relative hegemony of neoliberal governmentality in higher education, like any other governmentality it does not have totalizing effects. This may be due in part to the fact that rationalities from different authorities may seek different, potentially conflicting ends. More crucially, however, it is because any governmentality, even a dominant one, purposefully leaves space for subjects to conduct themselves according to their own will, despite acting on those subjects to shape the boundaries of that will. Every individual agent or institution within a governmental...
network “is the point of intersection between forces, and hence a point of potential resistance to any one way of thinking and acting, or a point of organization and promulgation of a different or oppositional programme” (Rose & Miller, 1992, p. 288).

In other words, within the concept of governmentality any conduct of conduct (either the conduct of others or the conduct of oneself), will be accompanied by potential counter-conducts. This aligns with Foucault’s (1990) argument that power is always accompanied by potential resistance. According to Foucault (1977-1978/2007), counter-conducts are struggles that are enacted by individuals and institutions in opposition to those procedures that attempt to conduct those individuals and institutions. Framing the appropriate sphere of what something can be also frames what it cannot be, i.e. it points to how things may be done differently. Because government itself presupposes the potential for conducting differently by presupposing individuals’ freedom even as it limits that freedom, counter-conduct is neither external nor inferior to conduct; rather, it falls within conduct itself, albeit at the margins. To illustrate this dynamic, discussing the history of the (European) Christian church, Foucault (1977-1978/2007) described counter-conducts as border elements of conduct that “have been continually reutilized, reimplemented, and taken up again in one or another direction” (p. 215). Although a critical mass of counter-conducts eventually resulted in the Protestant Reformation, these counter-conducts were later appropriated by both sides of the divide: for the Catholic Church, this was done as part of the Counter Reformation, while Protestant churches incorporated the counter-conducts into their new systems. Thus, Foucault argued that
counter-conducts are not “conducted in the form of absolute exteriority, but rather in the form of the permanent use of tactical elements” (p. 219).

To return to the example of enhanced intercultural competency as an objective of internationalization, individual students may view the development of intercultural skills as an end in itself, or perhaps as a means to help their country achieve greater national security, rather than a means to an economic end. However, the economic rationality of academic entrepreneurialism may nonetheless dominate the structure of intercultural programs offered by a university, thereby limiting the ability of the individual students to resist cooptation of their experience into the framework of neoliberal governmentality. Therefore, although individual subjects may intervene with an agenda for internationalization that provides an alternative to economic determinism, counter-conducts do not usually challenge the ends of government, but rather suggest different means for achieving those ends (Suspitsyna, 2010). For example, Turner and Robson (2007) concluded that the university in their internationalization case study was unsuccessful in meshing “a commercial revenue-generating approach with value-based internationalist rhetoric,” and therefore suggested that the school’s internationalization efforts, including those based on market value, might be more successful if administrators paid greater heed to the faculty’s desire for reciprocity and cooperation (p. 80).

Dean (1999) argued that if, as Foucault suggested, regimes of government both give rise to and are dependent on forms of knowledge, then they have a reality that must be understood according to their own logic through an analytics of government. According to Dean, the purpose of an analytics of government is not to propose reforms
for certain kinds of government that are deemed bad, nor indeed to label them bad in the first instance. To do so would be to co-opt the supposition made by government itself that there is a desirable end goal to its programs and practices, a utopian ideal. Rose, O’Malley and Valverde (2009) called a similar process “analysis of governmentalities,” wherein one “seeks to identify these different styles of thought, their conditions of formation, the principles and knowledges that they borrow from and generate, the practices that they consist of, how they are carried out, their contestations and alliances with other arts of governing” (p. 3). Neither type of inquiry requires a specific methodology; my choice of Fairclough’s method of discourse analysis in order to conduct an analytics or analysis of government will be explicated in Chapter 3.

Application of Discourse Analysis and Governmentality to Higher Education Policy

Discourse analysis has been previously applied in numerous educational contexts (Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui, & Joseph, 2005). However, here I will confine myself to review of work that applied discourse analysis to higher education policy specifically. Allan (1996) utilized discourse analysis to examine reports authored by university women’s commissions, arguing that discourse “can be characterized as dynamic constellations of words and images that legitimate and produce a given reality” (p. 47), and that therefore discourse analysis can be a useful means to analyze policy. Allan found that the discourses she identified in the documents might have had the unintended consequence of perpetuating women’s unequal status in the academic workplace. For example, she found that discourses addressing women’s safety were potentially disempowering because they constructed women as vulnerable and reified
rather than challenged popular misconceptions about sexual violence. Allan did not argue that violence experienced by many women was unimportant, but rather that the way the issue was discursively framed in the documents suggested that the issue was “women’s concerns about safety…rather than the violence itself” (p. 53). Because Allan argued, “at any given moment, individuals assume or inhabit multiple, shifting, and sometimes contradictory subject positions that are supported by social institutions and discursive practices that shift over time and place” (p. 48), she suggested that it is possible to strategically draw on the insights of discourse analyses like hers in order to destabilize the status quo. Returning to the example of sexual violence, Allan suggested that alternatives to the dominant, disempowering discourse might include “discourses of gendered violence, violent masculinity, and women as survivors rather than victims” (p. 56). She also noted, however, that it is not possible for one to “stand outside” of discourse, nor to predict the outcome of one’s attempts to disrupt dominant discourse (p. 65).

Following closely to Allan’s work, Iverson (2005) conducted a discourse analysis of university diversity action plans at land-grant universities, and suggested that the dominance of a market-centered discourse may undermine the documents’ stated goals of equity. Specifically, she found that diversity is characterized by discourses of excellence and marketability, ultimately “shaping the diverse individual as a commodity for achieving the goal of elevated institutional standing within the marketplace” (p. 156). Discourses of managerialism suggested that diversity could be achieved through quality assurance and accountability, rather than through assessment of the ways that an
institution’s own policies and practices may perpetuate unequal educational outcomes. The net result of these discourses may be, Iverson suggested, to “better serve the existing structures and constrain efforts to enact social change” (p. 229). She therefore explored possible options for confronting the “dilemma of how to work within the system [diversity council policy-makers] are trying to change” (p. 229), including refusal to participate in such councils and instead organizing through alternative communities, increasing awareness of the discourses that commonly circulate in these documents, and including in the diversity councils’ activities exploration and discussion of power and privilege.

In applying discourse analysis to community college mission statements, Ayers (2005) also found that a neoliberal, market-centered discourse subordinated learners to future employers and put business representatives in charge of curriculum design instead of faculty. Ayers argued that his findings suggest that community colleges operate in the interests of businesses rather than serving their students. Despite the hegemony of an economically functionalist discourse, Ayers found other discourses within the mission statements, such as commitment to democracy and social justice. Thus, Ayers suggested that neoliberalism may be “only one ideological discursive formation” within the community college as institution, which would suggest, “the evolution of the community college mission is both a semiotic endeavor and an ideological struggle between competing discourse regimes” (p. 547).

Suspitsyna (2012) conducted a discourse analysis of speeches made by representatives from the U.S. Department of Education about higher education. Like
Ayers, Suspitsyna found that the discourse of the speeches reflected Fairclough’s observation of the colonization of higher education discourse by neoliberal economic concerns. The emphasis of this discourse on market-value and individuals’ entrepreneurialism had the effect of reimagining educational inequities as economic issues, thereby absolving universities from engaging in the search for “political, social, and moral solutions” (p. 59). However, Suspitsyna went beyond Ayers’s suggestion that official higher education texts may contain multiple potentially contradictory discourses to explore how “the meaning of one purpose or idea of higher education could be subverted and re-interpreted to support a different, if not antagonistic, purpose” (p. 67).

In the case of the Department of Education speeches, “the support of equality and preparation for citizenship, is re-signified as promotion of national competitiveness and the global market,” (p. 67).

According to Davies and Bansel (2007) neoliberal discourse “both competes with other discourses and cannibalizes them in such a way that neoliberalism itself appears more desirable, or more innocent than it is” (p. 259). By highlighting the potential for resignification of discourses that are marginalized to serve the ends of the discourses that are dominant, Suspitsyna (2012) illustrated the complexity of efforts to destabilize discourse, echoing Allan’s (1996) suggestion that it is difficult to predict the outcome of destabilizing efforts. Ultimately, this supports Foucault’s (1990) argument that discourses are not in themselves of or against power, but rather, they are “tactical elements or blocks operating in the field of force relations; there can exist different and even contradictory discourses within the same strategy” (p. 102).
The findings of Allan (1996), Iverson (2005), Ayers (2005), and Suspitsyna (2012) suggest that the hegemony of certain discourses within official university and government documents may limit the ability of those documents to affect the changes on institutional inequities they were supposedly meant to address. In the case of Iverson and Ayers in particular, their analyses illustrated the colonization of neoliberal, market-driven discourse within official university documents. At the same time, all authors found that the discourses that undermined the documents’ potential for addressing inequities were not the only discourses present in the documents; nor were the discourses present in the documents the only possible discourses that might be deployed in future iterations of such documents – certainly other alternatives exist outside these texts. Thus, even as hegemonic discourses affect potential limitations, there is a space for alternative discourses that may be enacted by authors of such documents or general members of the university community. Although the space for discursive dissent might be limited, particularly given the potential for resignification of an initially subversive discourse, it is never fully closed. According to Ayers (2005), “To the degree that alternative discourses are available, hegemony dissipates into choice, and this invites resistance to domination and oppression” (p. 547).

Similar to my research on internationalization planning documents, Gaffikin and Perry (2008) reviewed strategic documents of the largest research universities in the U.S., using discourse analysis to identify institutional priorities, particularly as universities represent themselves as adapting to globalization. Through their analysis of these plans, they found that neoliberal globalization is a highly contested concept in higher education,
and despite the hegemony of a global entrepreneurial logic in the documents, there was space for alternate agendas to be enacted by university subjects. Marttinen (2011) conducted a critical discourse analysis of Finnish universities’ internationalization documents based on her assessment that, much as is evident in the U.S., internationalization is often constructed in Finland as both inevitable and necessary. Drawing on Fairclough’s work, Marttinen looked at European Union (EU), state, and university documents, as well as documents created by Finnish students regarding internationalization. She found a considerable variety of discourses about university internationalization, and noted that internationalization in Finland was significantly shaped by the EU’s Bologna process. In particular, the logics contained in EU documents appeared to migrate to Finnish state documents, and eventually into university documents. Marttinen found that one of the largest points of ideological struggle between the different documents was the definition or description of internationalization itself; further, the position of the stakeholders represented by and through the documents strongly influenced which discourses were drawn upon in their creation. Of the different authors, the university students provided the most challenging position vis-à-vis hegemonic discourses, in spite (or perhaps because) of the fact that their position in the structure of a university is often marginalized.

At least two studies have utilized both a discourse analysis methodology and a conceptual framework of governmentality in the review of higher education policy. When Suspitsyna (2012) examined speeches by the U.S. Department of Education in order to analyze both the economic and social conceptualizations of higher education contained
therein, she did so using the framework of Foucault’s governmentality. Her analysis revealed that not only did constructions of the market-oriented purposes of higher education predominate, but also that the more democratic and social purposes of higher education were discursively subverted in the service of an economic rationality. This was achieved largely through the resignification of good citizenship to indicate economic contribution, rather than civic engagement. Suspitsyna suggested that the effect of this resignification is that schools “are starved of political imagination that does not conform to neoliberal governmentality,” and that in order to imagine universities as “both economically responsive and socially responsible” (p. 67), it is useful to debate the ways they operate in and negotiate networks of power and knowledge. This suggests the potential fruitfulness of discussion about the appropriate means and motivations of internationalization, a discussion to which I hope my study will contribute.

Nokkala (2006) applied governmentality to her discourse analysis of interviews with both university administrators and government officials in Finland and the Netherlands, as well as policy documents from these nations. She found that the hegemonic narrative was one of a “competitive knowledge society in the age of globalization” (p. 179), which suggested that higher education and internationalization contribute “both to the economic development of individuals, countries and regions, and to the international peace, friendship and understanding between individuals and nations” (pp. 180-181). Even as much of this discourse framed higher education as a means to achieve national economic competitiveness in global markets, the underlying rationality was one shared across national borders, which indicates a governmentality that conducts
university subjects similarly across the world. The notion of this kind of globalized neoliberal governmentality and the ways that it functions in specific, localized higher education contexts represents a rich area for further inquiry, and it is my intention to contribute to this body of research through the findings of this study.

**Summary of the Literature Review**

In this chapter I reviewed the literature on internationalization, as well as the conceptual framework for the study, based on Foucault’s concepts of biopower and neoliberal governmentality. I also considered prior work in higher education policy that used a methodology of discourse analysis, and in particular work that has combined discourses analysis with a governmentality framework. I was thus able to identify gaps in research that looks at internationalization from a critical perspective, specifically gaps in the usage of the combined method of discourse analysis and conceptual frameworks. The review of literature suggests that internationalization specifically and higher education more generally are strongly infused with neoliberal governmentality, whereby individuals and universities conduct themselves as entrepreneurs of the self according to assessment of economic value driven by market-based rationality. These rationalities are undergirded by the growing dominance of academic capitalism (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) and the idea of a global knowledge economy (Dodds, 2008; Nokkala, 2006), which provide a basis for administrators to present internationalization as a neutral and necessary response to the influences (particularly economic) of globalization. Given the considerable influence, both direct and not, that the structures and policies of U.S. higher education
have on education systems throughout the world (Marginson, 2008), awareness of the ideologies present in these frameworks are especially worthy of inquiry.

According to Davies and Bansel (2007), neoliberal discourse “impacts not only on the terms in which subjects are governed, but also on the terms in which they understand and articulate themselves, their lives, the opportunities and desires,” while “discourses of common sense, inevitability and naturalness obscure the ambitions, policies and practices of government through which they both emerge and circulate” (p. 253). Discourse analysis therefore represents one means for analyzing the rationalities of internationalization, and indeed discourse analysis has been utilized to examine university policies and other official texts. Often discourse analyses reveal that some discourses are more commonly deployed than others, and therefore emerge as hegemonic in a specific text or set of texts (Allan, 1996). Hence, Iverson (2005), Ayers (2005), and Suspitsyna (2012) all found that a market-centered neoliberal discourse dominated the official higher education texts that they examined. This echoes scholarship that suggests internationalization efforts tend to be enacted according to a specific, economic rationality. At the same time, Allan (1996) qualified that despite the outsized influence of a certain discourse or set of discourses, “at any given moment, individuals assume or inhabit multiple, shifting, and sometimes contradictory subject positions that are supported by social institutions and discursive practices that shift over time and place” (p. 48).

Despite its ascendency to a position of hegemony over the past 40 years, neoliberal governmentality does not have a totalizing hold on discourse, and thus, the
entrepreneurial subject is not the only available subjectivity (Nairn & Higgins, as cited in Davies & Bansel, 2007). For example, discourses about commitment to the idea of intercultural competency (e.g. Deardorff, 2006; Weigl, 2009), national security concerns (American Council on Education, 2002), or ideals of universal access to knowledge (e.g. Bolsmann & Miller, 2008; Stier, 2004) are all evident in the internationalization literature. At the same time, these may be marginalized and/or co-opted by economic rationality through by discursive means. I also do not mean to suggest that the range of rationalities currently driving higher education represent the only available options. Indeed, according to Marginson (2008), “[e]specially in the global field, any structural dynamic must be considered partial, relativised by the other parts of the field, provisional and in continuous transformation” (p. 314). By examining the internationalization planning documents of the Big Ten universities, using Fairclough’s method of discourse analysis, I intend to identify the discursive power struggles through which the hegemony or marginality of certain rationalities are negotiated. In doing so, I illuminate the potential for different modalities and subjectivities to be enacted, recognizing that “the primary source of this ontological openness is the imagination and will of agents” (Marginson, 2008, p. 314).
Chapter 3: Methodology

Research Questions and Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the assumption that university internationalization is an inevitable and desirable response to globalization. In order to do so, I identify the rationalities that underpin higher education internationalization efforts outlined in Big Ten universities’ internationalization planning documents. My intention is to identify in the planning documents specific discourses that support or drive internationalization, and the rationalities that function in the service of these discourses. I aim to illustrate how biopower is enacted, managed, and resisted in a university through the inherent heterogeneity of discursive technologies of governmentality. In other words, I seek to understand how the discourses of internationalization function to create regimes of truth that rationalize neoliberal governmentality in education, and to identify other available orders of discourse that may be deployed to rationalize the enactment of counter-conducts in university internationalization efforts.

Rose (1999) insisted that Foucault did not provide a general theory of government, but rather suggested that his work should be applied to an “ethos of enquiry” to address particular questions (p. 5). Following Dean’s (1999) framework for an analytics of government, I therefore bring this ethos of enquiry to my research questions about the internationalization planning documents of Big Ten universities:
What rationales for university internationalization are presented in the documents?

What objectives for university internationalization are presented in the university internationalization planning documents?

How do the documents frame the means by which the university can achieve these objectives for internationalization?

Guided by Foucault’s ethos of inquiry and through the use of Fairclough’s discourse analysis methodology, I apply these questions to the planning documents in order to examine the ways that officially sanctioned university discourses about internationalization both represent and create reality and are shaped by reality in turn, as well as the ways in which these and other discourses both provide and limit opportunities for imagining different realities.

This chapter provides an overview of Fairclough’s discourse analysis design and a discussion of how it serves as an appropriate methodology and method for examination of the way that Foucault’s concepts of biopower and neoliberal governmentality function in universities’ internationalization efforts. I also elucidate the method of data collection and analysis, as well as information about the ways that trustworthiness and researcher positionality were taken into consideration in the design and execution of this study.

**Methodological Approach**

Fairclough (1995) suggested that the trend toward marketization of previously non-market domains (e.g. universities) is largely constituted through discursive
processes, such as the colonization of those institutions by discourses previously found primarily in market domains (e.g. corporations). According to Davies and Bansel (2007), “neoliberal discourse constitutes a set of relations among government, society and the individual,” which in turn affects how subjects are governed and the ways in which they understand and conduct themselves (p. 254). However, because this discourse is generally framed as “common sense,” its specific political and ideological effects and intentions are often obscured (p. 254).

According to Fairclough (1995), Foucault’s work on governmentality and the functioning of biopower in modern societies was suggestive of the functioning of discourse and language in modern societies. This is because technologies and techniques of power normalize certain ideologies that are embedded within the everyday practices of social institutions and in turn are productive of social subjects. Foucault’s concept of biopower means not the domination of subjects, but rather, the incorporation and production of those subjects to fit its needs through the deployment of discourse and language in various social practices and processes (Fairclough, 2011). However, Fairclough also argued that Foucault did not provide a clear methodology by which his own theory of discourse could be operationalized in the analysis of actual texts. This limitation identified by Fairclough also led to his critique that, because Foucault did not examine specific instances of discursive practice, he did not sufficiently recognize the extent to which discourse may be contested in practice, and therefore, the means by which individual subjects can either reproduce or resist structures of power. Therefore,
while acknowledging a debt to Foucault, Fairclough drew on Gramsci’s concept of hegemony as a means of understanding power relations in and around discourse.

According to Gramsci (1971), hegemony is an expression of the prevailing conception of the world in a given time and place. However, hegemony is more about strategic alliance and struggle than direct domination, as it is not static, but rather dynamic and never achieves unchallenged authority. Hegemony can serve as a useful means for illuminating governmentality. Just like the diverse mentalities that govern them, subjects draw on a set of heterogeneous ideologies as they interpret and engage in specific instances of discursive practice. However, the degree to which subjects have freedom to negotiate and strategically deploy these ideologies, or even recognize them as ideologies, depends on the power relations that are evident in an individual instance of discourse and its material contexts. Thus, although it can and may always be resisted, the varied existing ideologies ultimately coalesce in support of a single hegemonic position.

It must be noted, however, that Foucault (1990) argued against the concept of dominant versus subservient discourses, or a discourse of power versus a discourse of resistance, and rather suggested “a multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies” (p. 100). The ways that these elements are constructed and deployed in an individual discursive event, according to Foucault will depend on the subject(s), their position, and the context the event. Thus, he argued that “[discourses] are not once and for all subservient to power or raised up against it,” (p. 100) since the very same discourse may either produce or undermine power. Ultimately, a Gramscian conception of hegemony is not fully reconcilable with a Foucaultian conception of
biopower, but unfortunately, is not within the scope of this study to exhaustively review the debate between Gramscian and Foucaultian concepts of power. Therefore, I proceed working off three assumptions: 1) counter-conducts, as described by Foucault, are enacted to achieve different means to an end, rather than to achieve different ends, than the conduct deployed through biopower by way of governmentality (Suspectsyna, 2010); 2) regardless of the exact character of Foucault’s understanding of the potential of resistance in discourse, Gramsci’s idea of hegemony is useful for conceptualizing the struggles between different orders of discourse in a specific instance of discursive practice, in particular the fact that not all discourses are imbued with the same degree of power as others; and 3) the extent to which power may be resisted may be fruitfully explored through excavation of available discourses using Fairclough’s discourse analysis, although identification of these discourses is never an exhaustive index of potentialities for resistance in practice, and the effects of strategically deployed discourse as a means of counter-conduct can never be fully predicted.

Three Dimensions of Discourse

Fairclough (2011) developed a type of discourse analysis called “Textually Oriented Discourse Analysis” (TODA), which he described as: 1) multidimensional (specifically three-dimensional, the dimensions being: text, discursive practice, and social practice.); 2) multifunctional, i.e. it understands that discourse both represents and creates reality and social relations and identities, and is also shaped both those in turn; 3) a means for historical analysis through intertextuality; and 4) critical, as it attempts to
uncover and make transparent that which is often hidden or taken for granted, through analysis of hegemonic struggles.

Per his understanding of discourse as multidimensional, according to Fairclough (2001), each instance of discourse simultaneously consists of three dimensions: text, discursive practice, and social practice. Analysis of the first dimension, text itself, hews closely to traditional linguistic analysis of elements such as vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, text structure, and use of metaphor. The second dimension is discursive practice, which includes processes of production, distribution, and consumption, and the effects of social context on these processes. Fairclough suggested that one must conduct both micro- and macro-level analyses of discursive practice: micro-analysis to uncover individual participants’ resources (internalized social norms and practices), and macro-analysis to uncover the ways in which diverse discursive resources are drawn upon and possibly intersect in the given instance of discourse (the social context), as well as the ways in which those resources are used (creatively or normatively). The second dimension of discursive practice therefore serves as the interface between the dimensions of text and social practice. According to Fairclough, social subjects that act and are constituted in this interface “are not merely passively positioned but are capable of acting as agents, and among other things of negotiating their relationship with the multifarious types of discourse they are drawn into” (p. 61).

Governmentality is inherently heterogeneous and strategic (Lemke, 2002), and therefore provides a certain, albeit circumscribed, amount of room for individuals to act freely. Neoliberal governmentality, in particular, is dependent on the assumption that
subjects will have significant freedom of choice, namely, choices that will maximize their own satisfaction (Foucault, 1978-1979/2008), which is thought to ultimately benefit the population as a whole. Although this construct of freedom allows for the deployment of power by more dispersive and less overt means, individual subjects do not passively internalize rationalities deployed through discourse. Rather, governmental rationalities are translated and negotiated by those subjects at each instance of discourse, thereby providing the opportunity for an individual subject to either adhere, subvert, or reinterpret.

It is crucial to also consider the role of power in the process of subjectification. This leads to the third and final dimension of an instance of discourse: social practice. Ideology is situated within the structures of social context, as well as in discursive events themselves. Although they are often embedded in social norms, ideologies must perpetually reproduce themselves in practice, and in the process, open themselves up to challenge and potential transformation, for example through resignification. Thus, discourse is not merely the site of power struggles but also the object of those struggles, because of its ability to constitute and naturalize certain meanings and truths over others.

The qualified dynamism of the struggle for meaning in an instance of discourse is usefully illustrated through intertextuality, which in turn is central to the understanding of the way that discourse constitutes subjects and subjectivities. Fairclough (2011) emphasized the fact that all texts are “intertexual,” meaning that they are made up of diverse, contradictory elements (pp. 102-104). He identified two kinds of intertextuality: manifest intertextuality, and constitutive intertextuality, also known as
“interdiscursivity.” Manifest intertextuality refers to the way in which a text overtly draws on other text, whereas interdiscursivity refers to the ways that an instance of discourse is made up of elements of different “orders of discourse” (pp. 117-188). Orders of discourse can be understood as the “totality of discursive practices of an institution or society, and the relationships between them” (p. 43). According to Fairclough, local and social orders of discourse may be experienced by individuals as being contradictory, and “thereby open to having their existing political and ideological investments become the focus of contention in struggles to deinvest/reinvest them” (p. 70).

Combining Fairclough’s idea of discourse and Foucault’s concepts of governmentality, I suggest that hegemonic orders of discourse deploy certain political rationalities in order to subjectify individuals so that they conduct themselves in particular ways. However, intertextuality and its attendant ambiguity, as well as the ongoing struggle for discursive hegemony, enable subjects to produce new kinds and combinations of text – and therefore, new subjectivities and new kinds of conduct (counter-conducts). According to Fairclough (2011), “[i]ntertextuality entails an emphasis upon the heterogeneity of texts, and a mode of analysis which highlights the diverse and often contradictory elements and threads which go to make up a text” (p. 104). Because governmentality is heterogeneous and strategic (Lemke, 2002), and because power is productive, recognition of the intertextuality of an instance of discourse may make evident discursive tools with which individuals can rationalize counter-conducts and consider how they might act contra dominant political rationalities.
Data Collection and Analysis

Although he did not presume that there is a single process for conducting discourse analysis, Fairclough (2011) provided a general guide for data collection and analysis, which I largely followed in my own data collection and analysis procedures. Broadly, the steps of Fairclough’s method are as follows: select a corpus of texts; code and select samples within the corpus; analyze discourse practice; analyze text; and analyze social practice. I elaborate on each of these steps as I describe in detail the method used for my analysis of Big Ten universities’ internationalization planning documents.

Corpus

My corpus of documents come from the twelve members schools of the Big Ten conference: The Ohio State University, University of Iowa, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Indiana University at Bloomington, University of Michigan, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, Northwestern University, Pennsylvania State University, Purdue University, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. My choice of these schools is not merely based on the fact that they share common characteristics, it is also based on the characteristics themselves. The schools are all large, public (except for Northwestern) doctoral-granting research institutions located primarily in the Midwestern U.S.; all are categorized by the Carnegie Classification System as having very high research activity; and eight were founded as part of the Morrill Land-Grant Act during the late 1800s (Thomas, 2009). Land-grant universities made higher education “more accessible and
sought to educate the masses to ensure the strength and competitiveness of America’s human capital” (Iverson, 2005, p. 17), and maintain today continued obligations to serve the needs of their state, albeit in evolving ways.

I also selected Big Ten schools due to their sheer size, and thus, the extent of their potential influence both in the U.S. and abroad, as well as the considerable international endeavors already in place at these institutions. Organizations like the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, of which most Big Ten schools are a part, have identified internationalization as a priority for their member schools (2004). A number of Big Ten schools have gained national recognition for their dedication to internationalization. For example, in 2011 President Gee of The Ohio State University was invited to give the keynote address at the Institute for International Education’s Best Practices Conference (Gee, 2011). In 2008, the University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign received the Senator Paul Simon Award for Campus Internationalization, and in 2012 The University of Michigan received the same award (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign News Bureau, 2008; NAFSA, 2012). Ten of the twelve Big Ten schools offer at least one international collaborative degree, “an umbrella term for dual degree programs offered by partner institutions from two or more countries,” with nearly 40% being collaborations with Chinese universities (CIC Global Collaborations: Executive Summary, 2011, p. 1). In 2009-2010, a total of 21,296 students from the Big Ten schools studied abroad (CIC Open Doors Data 2009-2010, n.d., p. 1). Thus, these institutions are not only (largely) the flagship public universities in their
respective states, but given their existing efforts they also serve as potential models and national, and even international, leaders in higher education.

I gathered the most recent internationalization planning document from each of the twelve Big Ten schools that were available publically on the website(s) of the respective school. I define an “internationalization planning document” as the most recent version of a publicly available university document whose authors are a group, task force, committee, or subcommittee of university professors, staff, and administrators, and that articulates some structured, reasoned set of priorities, policies, objectives, goals, and/or (strategic) plan that pertains to the university’s engagement related to international or global issues. I first searched for a document on the website of the school’s international affairs or global programs office, most of which had differing names but generally addressed issues and programs related to study abroad, international students, and international partnerships. If no planning document was found on this website, I next searched on the university’s website of the academic affairs office. Finally, if no document was found here I searched the general university website with the key words “international” or “internationalization” and “plan” and “global” and “plan.” If still no document was found, I searched for the university’s latest general strategic planning document(s), and treated any sections of the strategic plan related to international or global issues as effectively serving as that university’s “internationalization planning document.” I did not to contact universities to request which document(s) could be most accurately considered their internationalization document, as I believe that universities make intentional choices about what is made publically available via their websites.
Although the identified texts held a cohesive general purpose, they include a variety of formats, lengths (ranging from three to nearly sixty pages), and to some degree, uses, depending on the context in which they were produced. A full listing of the documents identified and analyzed for each school is included in Appendix A.

Fairclough (2011) described a genre as a particular text type, as well as “particular processes of producing, distributing and consuming texts” (p. 126). In selecting the genre of reports and planning documents for my corpus of texts related to university internationalization, I relied on two related considerations. The first is that because internationalization is often a diffuse and decentralized process within a university, frequently committee reports and planning documents are the only centralized document on the subject of internationalization that exist. Childress (2009) found that doctoral institutions, such as the Big Ten universities, are more likely to have an institution-wide strategic plan related to internationalization than other institution types.

The second reason that I selected these documents is because as official, “top-down” papers, they are examples of public discourse, which, as Fairclough (1995) noted, tend to:

- have a complex distribution - perhaps an immediate audience of political supporters, but beyond that multiple audiences of political allies and opponents, multiple mass-media audiences, international audiences and so forth. Anticipation of the potential polyvalence of the texts that such complex distributions imply is a major factor in their design. What the
multiplicity of readings underscores is that strategies are inevitably pursued in circumstances of contestation and struggle. (p 128)

Although Fairclough was emphasizing primarily discourse in a political context in the above excerpt, the same general principles apply to discourse in educational contexts, particularly at the level of university administration. Most of the Big Ten internationalization planning documents were authored by taskforces or committees made up of administrators, faculty, and staff that were appointed by the President, Provost, or other administrator. Presumably administrative approval was granted to the final versions. Given their nature as a publicly available documents that serve as general frameworks for the creation of more localized policies and procedures, these texts are likely to contain a more heterogeneous range of discourses than that of specific policies of individual schools, colleges, or departments. Not only do the documents provide a rich source of discourses, they also provide insights into the ways that universities reconcile (or not) competing discourses within a single document. The public availability of these documents also underscored my decision to seek out the documents on my own, rather than contacting the university to ask for the document they deem most representative of their internationalization plans.

In her study of university internationalization plans produced by 31 institutions, Childress (2009) found that internationalization plans serve as roadmaps, a way to develop stakeholder buy-in, a method for deploying the meaning and goals of internationalization for a particular institution, and a means for fundraising. Childress also created a typology of three internationalization plans, including: 1) institutional
strategic plans (plans that were one part of a broader institutional plan), 2) distinct
documents (documents specifically devoted to outlining the universities
internationalization plan[s]), and 3) unit plans (connected to a single school, department,
or college). Four of the documents in my corpus were part of an institutional strategic
plan, two of which were created for reaccreditation, and the remaining eight were stand-
alone plans, three of which were housed in an international programs office. Despite the
diversity of plan types included in the corpus, all documents were analyzed together.

I conducted my analysis in three parts: coding of the documents, selection of text
samples for discourse analysis, and discourse analysis of those samples.

Coding and Selecting Samples

After identifying a university internationalization planning document for each
school, I uploaded each to Dedoose, a research analysis software program. Prefatory
letters for the documents were analyzed, but appendices were not. I first read through
each plan once and made analytic notes in my research journal. Using Dedoose, I then
engaged in open coding of the documents, reading them sentence-by-sentence to identify
categorical themes that occur frequently and in common across the corpus. Next, I
reviewed each document to code for themes that responded to my research questions. For
the third phase of coding, I uncovered the ways in which the responses to the three
research questions are rationalized in the discourse, by examining the cohesion of the
themes identified in the first and second phases of coding. In examining textual cohesion,
one can see how segments of texts are linked to form larger units, and therefore identify
what Foucault called “rhetorical schemata” (as cited in Fairclough, 2011, p. 77). Textual
cohesion may be achieved in numerous ways, frequently through the use of conjunctions, repetition, or vocabulary from a common semantic field. Segments of text can be combined into these various schemata, which may be discursively deployed by those who both create and consume the text, in order to support particular rationalities, e.g. the economic rationality that predominates in neoliberal governmentality. Schematas were largely identified in linkages of two or more themes that emerged in response to the three research questions.

After my initial coding phases, in order to conduct a discourse analysis according to Fairclough’s TODA method I selected three text samples. Samples were chosen that developed a complete thought, responded to at least two of the three research questions, captured at least four of the ten dominant rhetorical schemata, and contained at least one additional notable feature, which is elucidated before each analysis. Also, because domestic students, faculty, and international students are the three most commonly addressed subject positions in the corpus, I chose one sample that primarily addressed the role of each.

**Discourse Analysis**

I analyzed each sample first on a linguistic level, with an emphasis on vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, text structure, and use of metaphor (Fairclough, 2011). I then considered the discursive practices of each sample, including the norms presumed by the text (which Fairclough called micro-analysis) as well as the processes of production, distribution, and consumption of the texts, and the effects of social context on these processes (which Fairclough called macro-analysis). Lastly, I considered the samples as
social practice, by analyzing them in terms of the ideologies and power relations that operate as part of the hegemonic struggle within the discourse. Ideologies, according to Fairclough, are accumulated orientations that may either be reproduced or transformed in individual instances of discourse. Recognizing that ideologies are most effective (and therefore, more likely to be reproduced rather than challenged) when they achieve a degree of common sense, I identified those ideologies which are naturalized, and those which are marginalized.

Thus, I isolated different “orders of discourse,” the power relations of the social practice within which the discourse occurs, and the extent to which these power relations might reproduce, restructure, or challenge existing orders of discourse, and thereby allow or limit rationalizations for certain conducts of university internationalization efforts.

**Trustworthiness**

Fairclough’s discourse analysis is premised on the idea that there are multiple, if not infinite, possible readings of a single instance of discourse. Furthermore, it is not possible to stand “outside” of discourses in order to conduct discourse analysis, because the analysis itself is a discursive process of constructing meaning of the texts being examined (Rogers et al., 2005). Those who engage in analysis of discourse operate within, not apart from, the social practice that they analyze, which means that they must “be as self-conscious as possible about the resources they are drawing upon in interpreting discourse, and about the nature of the social practice of analysis itself” (Fairclough, 2011, p. 199). Thus, my role as a researcher conducting discourse analysis is closer to serving as a data collection instrument than a text analyst. The idea of
“researcher as instrument” is accepted practice in qualitative research (Guba & Lincoln as cited in Iverson, 2005, p. 54), and is crucial for discourse analysis.

I acknowledge my role as an active participant in a dynamic and subjective research process, and I committed to self-reflection throughout the process of data coding and analysis. However, the purpose of this reflexivity was to trace my process and track my conclusions, not to prove that my interpretation is “accurate.” To attempt the latter would betray a basic premise of discourse analysis that there is no objective reality out there to be “found” by a researcher (Rogers et al., 2005, p. 382), as well as contradict the larger constructivist and post-structuralist paradigms in which this study is situated. As part of my commitment to self-reflection, in addition to my formal research notebook, I kept another notebook in which I recorded personal thoughts. This enabled me to monitor the development of my ideas and constructions (Shenton, 2004). I also held frequent discussions with my advisor so as to gain critical feedback and benefit from her significant experience with discourse analysis methods.

Despite rejecting the idea that a discourse analysis can be more or less accurate, Fairclough (2011) proposed a number of means by which one can justify interpretations, for example, by ensuring that the analysis addresses the details of the sample, particularly those that seem at odds with dominant themes. Therefore, I consider segments that seem to contradict my primary findings and discuss what these mean for my larger conclusions. Fairclough also suggested that justification of an analysis might come from the extent to which it opens up avenues and/or serves as a model for further analysis, a possibility I discuss in Chapter 5.
Researcher Positionality

As a researcher approaching this study, I agree with Boden and Epstein’s (2006) suggestion that universities may be so deeply embedded with economic rationality that university subjects are often unable to be “sufficiently imaginative of different futures” (p. 225). I further agree with them that “it is incumbent on the critical social scientist not only to analyse and monitor these processes and social dynamics, but to rethink, even re-imagine, possibilities for different futures” (p. 224). According to Oscar Wilde (1891),

*A practical scheme is either a scheme that is already in existence, or a scheme that could be carried out under existing conditions. But it is exactly the existing conditions that one objects to; and any scheme that could accept these conditions is wrong and foolish.* (p. 315, emphasis his)

This study is meant to trouble the existing conditions of university internationalization that are often taken to be practical and obvious. Although I am largely driven by a critique of the dominant rationales of neoliberal governmentality, the intent of this research is not to say that the existing conditions are themselves “wrong and foolish,” but rather to suggest that researchers would be to wrong and foolish to accept these conditions without question. In other words, in this study I decline to take the means and ends of university internationalization for granted and instead interrogate the assumptions upon which its policies and programs are based. Thus, I frame this study as a contribution to the body of research that is dedicated to questioning what Wilde might call the “practical schemes” of higher education in both theory and practice.
Chapter 4: Findings

In this chapter I describe the findings from my coding and analysis of the twelve internationalization planning documents of the Big Ten universities. First, I present and discuss the most commonly occurring themes, and then proceed to conduct the discourse analysis proper of the illustrative samples.

As described in Chapter 3, I conducted my analysis in three parts: coding the documents, selection of text samples for discourse analysis, and discourse analysis of those samples. After an initial round of line-by-line open coding of the documents, I reviewed each document to isolate larger themes that responded to each of my research questions. The most commonly occurring themes are identified in Table 4.1; a full accounting of all identified themes that occurred more than 20 times throughout the corpus are presented in Appendix B.

The frequency with which I site and discuss certain documents is largely reflective of the disparate length between the plans identified. In particular the plans identified for the University of Michigan, Penn State University, and Indiana University, all consisted of over forty pages, whereas the plans identified for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, University of Iowa, University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, Ohio State University, and Michigan State University all consisted of less than ten pages.
Next, I identified common rhetorical schematas. Table 4.2 includes the rhetorical schematas that summarize the bulk of the arguments for and about internationalization that were developed throughout the documents. Frequency of occurrence is not listed, and schemata are not listed in any hierarchical order, because there were not always clear boundaries between different occurrences of a single schemata, as some were developed across multiple pages.
1) The world, including the economy and higher education landscape, is rapidly changing and increasingly connected, and the university must adapt if it wishes to be a leader instead of a follower.

2) The university must compete with schools not only in the U.S. but also around the world to attract the best students and faculty, and maximize its external funding.

3) Part of the university’s mission is to serve the state, particularly its economic needs, by creating valuable research, working with businesses, and preparing productive citizens.

4) In order to compete and collaborate in the global knowledge economy, the university must be a global leader and prepare its graduates to be global citizens and leaders.

5) Domestic students should study abroad, study internationalized curricula, and interact with international students to develop (cross-)cultural competency skills necessary to be successful in a globalized world.

6) Mutually beneficial partnerships with countries, institutions, and organizations around the state, country, and world will enable the university and its graduates to succeed in the global knowledge economy.

7) The university must attract the best international students so they may bring their diverse backgrounds and perspectives to the campus, enriching the university environment and enhancing its reputation.

8) Faculty should expand their international knowledge, internationalize their curricula, and conduct research abroad for professional development and to further the university’s internationalization mission.

9) The university must manage centralized, strategic internationalization efforts in order to maximize the potential of the university’s human and other resources.

10) The university will promote, incentivize, and remove barriers to internationalization, but will not dictate the exact form of those efforts in order to maximize student and faculty entrepreneurialism.

Table 4.2: Commonly occurring rhetorical schemata

Schematas were largely identified in linkages of two or more themes in response to the three research questions (i.e. why internationalize, what are the objectives of internationalization, and how can these objectives be achieved). For example, in the case of schemata 7, about international students: because of their diverse backgrounds and perspectives, international students are a valuable resource to a campus (why), and
therefore the university must maximize enrollment of international students (what).

Schematas were furthered analyzed by a particular rationality (or rationalities). Thus, for example, schemata 7 was animated by economic rationality. A visualization of the relationships between themes, schematas, and rationalities are illustrated in Table 4.3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schemata</th>
<th>Related Theme(s)</th>
<th>Rationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) The world, including the economy and higher education landscape, is rapidly changing and increasingly connected, and the university must adapt if it wishes to be a leader instead of a follower. | • The university must be a global leader in higher education  
• The university must respond to increasing global economic competition | Economic Developmental |
| 2) The university must compete with schools not only in the U.S. but also around the world to attract the best students and faculty, and maximize its external funding. | • The university faces greater competition from higher education institutions  
• Secure external grants and contracts | Economic |
| 3) Part of the university’s mission is to serve the state, particularly its economic needs, by creating valuable research, working with businesses, and preparing productive citizens. | • The university has responsibilities to help meet the state’s needs  
• Foster relationships with partners external to the university | Economic |
| 4) In order to compete and collaborate in the global knowledge economy, the university must be a global leader and prepare its graduates to be global citizens and leaders. | • The university must respond to increasing global economic competition  
• The university must be a global leader in higher education | Economic |
| 5) Domestic students should study abroad, study internationalized curricula, and interact with international students to develop (cross-)cultural competency skills necessary to be successful in a globalized world. | • Maximize the number of students who study abroad  
• Eliminate barriers to studying abroad  
• Maximize the number of international students who enroll | Economic |

Table 4.3: Rhetorical Schemata, Themes, and Rationalities
Table 4.3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6) Mutually beneficial partnerships with countries, institutions, and organizations around the state, country, and world will enable the university and its graduates to succeed in the global knowledge economy.</th>
<th>• Foster relationships with partners external to the university • The university must respond to increasing global economic competition</th>
<th>Economic Developmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7) The university must attract the best international students so they may bring their diverse backgrounds and perspectives to the campus, enriching the university environment and enhancing its reputation.</td>
<td>• Maximize the number of international students who enroll</td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Faculty should expand their international knowledge, internationalize their curricula, and conduct research abroad for professional development and to further the university’s internationalization mission.</td>
<td>• Faculty will be highly engaged in internationalization efforts • Offer incentives and rewards for faculty participation in international efforts • Create more centralized processes for administration of international efforts</td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) The university must manage centralized, strategic internationalization efforts in order to maximize the potential of the university’s human and other resources.</td>
<td>• Create more centralized processes for administration of international efforts • Utilize technological tools in innovative and strategic ways</td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) The university will promote, incentivize, and remove barriers to internationalization, but will not dictate the exact form of those efforts in order to maximize student and faculty entrepreneurialism.</td>
<td>• Eliminate barriers to studying abroad • Offer incentives and rewards for faculty participation in international efforts</td>
<td>Economic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Review of Themes in Response to Research Question 1**

In the following subsection I review the themes that occurred most commonly in response to the research question, “What reasons for university internationalization are presented in the documents?”
The university has responsibilities to help meet the state’s needs. The most commonly occurring response to this research question was that the university has a responsibility to meet the needs of the state, and internationalization was framed as a means to meet those needs. All but one school in the Big Ten are public state institutions, many of them land-grant institutions. In the case of the Northwestern University, the one private institution, there was discussion of an obligation to serve the city of Chicago. The significance of this theme cannot be fully appreciated without drawing upon the schemata with which it was frequently deployed, schemata 3, which suggests that part of the university’s mission is to serve the state, particularly its economic needs, by creating valuable research, working with businesses, and preparing productive citizens.

For example, the University of Wisconsin-Madison (2008) suggested that its internationalization efforts will better enable the school to engage with alumni who have left or will leave the state, thereby taking advantage of “powerful latent opportunities to address the net out-migration of young college-educated citizens, (the so-called “brain drain” challenge for Wisconsin and other Great Lakes region states) by more actively engaging this pool of human resources” (pp. 30-31). In framing these distant alumni as potential resources to the school and the state, the university seeks to harness their “current real-world experience as global citizens and leaders which can be shared, thus contributing to the command of global cultures and practices as they evolve in real time,” and supposes that “each can become purchasers of service, donors of time and donors of dollars” for the state and the school (p. 30). Thus, rather than resist forces of globalization and the resultant dispersion of its alumni base, the university embraced these human
flows in order to turn them to its advantage. This in turn is framed as providing potential economic benefits to the state, so that its graduates are considered potential sources of capital.

Indiana University (2008) directly framed its internationalization as a benefit for the economy of Indiana, arguing that by “making Indiana citizens more knowledgeable about international business, trade, and political events, Indiana University thus helps to make the state more competitive internationally and more attractive to foreign investors” (p. 29). Circularly, it also suggested that “the state’s investment in international education,” is dependent on these efforts benefiting Indiana’s citizens (p. 29). Taken together, it is suggested that economic growth and foreign investment result in positive outcomes for Indiana’s citizenry, and further, that this is an important motivation for internationalization. The university thus situated itself primarily as a driver of state economic growth.

**The university must contribute to solving global challenges.** Another commonly occurring theme in response to the research question of how the reasons for internationalization are framed in the documents is the idea that internationalization efforts fulfill a university’s obligation to solve what might be generally grouped as “global challenges.” Many of the schools testified to their commitment to solving such challenges. For instance Purdue University’s document (2008) suggested that its development of “future leaders, responsible and engaged citizens of the world” would result in their ability to address “global challenges that will have far-reaching socio-economic effects on the global scale” (p. 10). This commitment to solving global
challenges must be put in context regarding the motivation underlying the perceived need for the university’s interventions, leaving open a breadth of potential explanations. In the case of Purdue University (2008), the “socio-economic effects” of the university’s involvement in solving these issues were explicitly framed as being an economic benefit to the citizens of the state of Indiana, thereby placing Indianans “at the forefront of global activities and thus beneficiaries of the results” (p. 10).

In addition to the presence of this economic rationality, in some cases the university’s contribution to addressing global challenges was also framed using a more developmental, even social justice, orientated rationality. For example, the University of Wisconsin-Madison (2008) suggested that it seeks to cultivate globally-prepared citizens. Such a citizen “measures conduct of individuals and governments by effect on others, seeks win-win opportunities, demonstrates honesty and fairness, recognizes unequal distribution of resources, engages in public service to make the world a safer and better place” (p. 11). The potential incommensurability of simultaneously addressing global challenges through public service and seeking “win-win opportunities” while also meeting another of the university’s expectations for globally-prepared citizens, “Economic competitiveness and the ability to thrive,” is never explored.

The university must be a global leader in higher education. Many of the universities framed their reasons for internationalization as an effort to position themselves as a leader in the now-global field of higher education. Implicit (and sometimes explicit) in this commitment is the idea that the university will serve as a model for other institutions pursuing similar ends. For example, at the University of
Michigan (2010) “A campus-wide effort as part of a presidential internationalization initiative that includes educational, research, and engagement elements has great potential to quickly elevate the University of Michigan among the leaders in this important area” (p. 153). Further, these recommendations are “based on the premise that the University should be a leader in internationalization, consistent with a priority established by the president, provost, and the deans” (p. 132). The University of Wisconsin-Madison (2008) document declared “we, as a campus community must lead change at local (individual, school/college, campus, state), national and global levels” (p. 11).

What emerges through many of these framings is the idea that internationalization serves as a means to an end – i.e. positioning the university as a leader – rather than the university’s leadership being a welcome side effect of its internationalization. For example, Purdue University (2008) suggested that through its internationalization efforts the university was striving to “be recognized as a leader in solving global problems and in producing students experienced and capable of contributing to a global common good” (p. 7). One may understand leadership and international recognition as a means to exert positive influence on other institutions, but whether internationalization or leadership is seen as the primary objective in these efforts will likely shape the types of international initiatives that are enacted.

The instrumental purposes of the university becoming and being a leader are illuminated by the final two most prominent themes that occur within the documents in response to the question of the reasons for internationalization: the university must respond to increasing global economic competition, and the university faces greater
competition from higher education institutions. In fact, schemata 1, that the world, including the economy and higher education landscape, is rapidly changing and increasingly connected and the university must adapt if it wishes to be a leader instead of a follower, ties together the themes of the university as a global leader and the demands of economic competition. This schemata suggests that the world, including the economy and higher education landscape, is rapidly changing and increasingly connected, and thus, the university must adapt through internationalization if it wishes to be a leader instead of a follower.

The university must respond to increasing global economic competition.

Another of the primary reasons provided for why the university must internationalize was that there exists increasing global economic competition. How this economic rationality is understood to impact the university and its role in society varied amongst and also within the documents. For example, it may simultaneously be argued that this increased competition requires that the university produce students who are more capable of competing for jobs with people around the world, given the mobility of the capital, but also that the university must equip the state to deal with this economic competition (as was identified in the first theme in response to this research question). Indeed, often the two are framed as being one in the same, when students are framed as part of the state’s human capital. This line of argument was identified in schemata 3, the idea that part of the university’s mission is to serve the state, particularly its economic needs, by creating valuable research, working with businesses, and preparing productive citizens. This suggests that the
university must serve the state, particularly its economic needs, by creating valuable research, working with businesses, and preparing economically productive citizens.

For instance, Indiana University (2008) suggested that the university must develop its students’ global competencies, because “Without such competencies, Indiana’s businesses and communities, as well as IU itself, risk being marginalized by the growth of global competition that is already sweeping across the U.S.” (p. 9). Similarly, Purdue University (2008) positioned its international translational research as the “engine of Indiana’s economic growth in the global environment” (p. 11). The Ohio State University (2009) specifically referenced its responsibilities as a land-grant institution, presenting as one of its internationalization goals to “Advance our land-grant mission by assisting the State of Ohio in developing its international economy” (p. 1), while Northwestern (2011) declared its commitment to “contribute to Chicago’s reputation and competitiveness in the global marketplace for talent, capital, and ideas through University-based initiatives and individual efforts” (p. 21).

The University of Wisconsin-Madison (2008) identified economic stagnation, as caused by changes in the global economy, as a primary reason for dwindling state support of the university, and subsequently emphasized the need to internationalize as a means for the state of Wisconsin to compete in an international market. It thus appears that the university seeks to turn to its advantage the global character of the “growing 21st century knowledge-based economy” and away from “a contracting, labor-based manufacturing economy,” within which Wisconsin had previously thrived (p. 1). It is less clear whether the university expects the economic benefits that will apparently result from
internationalization to find their way back to the university itself through greater state support, or perhaps whether it expects to receive benefits directly from its students, either through tuition and/or alumni support.

Although the primary emphasis in the documents was about the effects of greater global economic competition on states, in some cases a more national framework was utilized. For example, Indiana University (2008) noted that “Manufacturing and service industries will increasingly outsource their work to skilled, low-wage workers in other countries, so U.S. producers will have to develop new products and services to remain competitive” (p. 9), while the University of Michigan (2010) suggested that “As other nations emerge as economic powers and our society grows more international, so, too, must a student’s education” (p. 143).

The university faces greater economic competition from higher education institutions. In addition to trickle-down effects of generalized global economic competition, many of the documents also framed higher education itself as an increasingly competitive arena. According to Michigan State University (2006), “Just as businesses and corporations learned that survival depends on engagement in the global marketplace, so must higher education and particularly MSU see itself in such a marketplace” (p. 1). This is exemplified by schemata 2, the idea that the university must compete with schools not only in around the U.S. but also around the world to attract the best students and faculty, and maximize its external funding. This economic competition may be primarily experienced and enacted as a form of competition for limited research
funding opportunities, students (through tuition and other revenues), star faculty, or other limited resources.

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln (2006) identified the need to better staff its sponsored program office, because it competes for grants with better staffed institutions and non-governmental organizations, while Penn State University (2008) emphasized the need to “enhance our recruitment activities so as to remain competitive in the increasingly fierce global competition for the most talented students” (p. 3). Several schools, including the University of Michigan (2010), Michigan State University (2006), Ohio State University (2009), and Penn State University (2008), emphasized in their planning document the importance of university rankings in enhancing their competitiveness.

In many cases, the universities framed themselves as somewhat passively reacting to international competition in higher education, as when Penn State University (2008) proclaimed “Internationalization of universities has become a world-wide phenomenon as global economic integration continues to make its way forcefully into higher education” (p. 5). In this way, universities construct themselves as merely taking the necessary steps to respond to economic pressures, rather than positioning themselves as active participants and even drivers of global economic competition, both in higher education and beyond, as Dodds (2008) has suggested may be the case. Michigan State University (2006), arguing the growth of universities around the world, particularly the global South, has resulted in an increasingly competitive field of higher education to which the university much respond. Yet later in the document, it is suggested that Michigan State
University has for sixty years engaged in development efforts in these same areas of the world, including “education and human capacity building” (p. 6), thereby potentially fostering its own competition. This is one of many instances throughout the corpus where universities’ diverse aims and objectives with regard to internationalization appear to be potentially at odds with another, a contradiction, which can largely be encapsulated and evidenced by the simultaneous deployment of economic and developmental rationalities. Such contradictions, however, do not result in negation of either rationality, but rather reflect the relative heterogeneity of ideologies and objectives in single instances of discourse, particularly in public documents (Fairclough, 2011).

**Review of Themes in Response to Research Question 2**

In the following subsection I review the most commonly occurring themes in response to the research question “What visions for university internationalization are presented in the documents?”

**Maximize the number of students who study abroad.** The most commonly occurring theme in response to this research question was to maximize the number of students studying abroad. Specific areas of the world are mentioned as target study abroad locations, in particular East and South Asia. Given this strong emphasis on study abroad, it is worth noting the relative lack of attention given to justifying its benefits. Indiana University (2008) suggested that study abroad would lead to new career paths, helps students develop an appreciation of global interdependence, and make them more desirable job candidates. The University of Michigan (2010) emphasized the ways in which studying abroad would help enhance foreign language proficiency, and Penn State
University (2008) emphasized study abroad as a means to transform students into global citizens. Yet overall, explications of the benefits of study abroad were rare in proportion to how often the need for study abroad was emphasized. Furthermore, even when these benefits were noted, they were rarely operationalized. For instance, rarely was a clear definition given of exactly what qualifies someone as a “global citizen.”

Thus, the documents focused on the need to increase study abroad participation, but not why. Some care was given to identifying and addressing the perceived impediments to increasing participation. For example, there is an emphasis in a number of documents on low participation rates of minority students, first generation students, and low-income students (Penn State University, 2008; University of Iowa, 2006). However, little consideration is given for why their participation rates are lower than other students, and it is assumed that providing greater funding opportunities will induce their participation. Emphasis is also given on the need to provide additional study abroad opportunities to graduate students (Penn State University, 2008; University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2008). Perceived impediments to students’ increased participation included difficulty in transferring credits, lack of financial resources, insufficient awareness, language barriers, a need to increase the diversity of students who study abroad, lack of programs for students to choose from, and faculty reluctance to lead programs. Proposed means of addressing these perceived impediments are captured in the theme “Eliminating barriers to study abroad,” which emerged in response to the third research question.

**Foster relationships with partners external to the university.** After study abroad, fostering external partnerships with countries, institutions, and organizations
around the state, country, and world was the most commonly occurring theme within the corpus. These efforts were frequently framed as a cost-effective means for a university to internationalize without having to make large, long-term investments. In many cases, specific “strategic” regions of the world were targeted, most commonly East and South Asia, followed by the Middle East. Partnership possibilities discussed primarily emphasized study abroad exchanges and other benefits that will make students more competitive in a global knowledge economy, as emphasized by schemata 6, the idea that mutually beneficial partnerships with countries, institutions, and organizations around the state, country, and world will enable the university and its graduates to succeed in the global knowledge economy.

Partnerships were also framed as a means to encourage collaborative international research for faculty. As part of these discussions, the importance of centralized university administration was emphasized. In particular, many documents recognized that faculty have often developed ad-hoc relationships with colleagues or even institutions abroad, and suggested that the university should maximize the “benefits” of these relationships, and minimize areas of perceived waste, by formalizing, tracking, and evaluating collaborations in an ongoing basis. For example, the University of Michigan (2010) advocated to “Create a database of the University’s currently active (and perhaps inactive) international partnerships and develop criteria for assessing the benefits and costs of these associations” (p. 147). Thus, the university conceptualized the benefits of international partnerships as a collective good for the university population.
Less formal relationships previously established by faculty may therefore be subject to careful cost-benefit analyses by administrators. This is captured by schemata 9, the argument that the university must manage centralized, strategic internationalization efforts in order to maximize the potential of the university’s human and other resources. Such an emphasis is evident in the theme about increasing centralization that emerged in response to the research question about the proposed means to internationalize, and is indicative of a neoliberal governmentality in which the value of an activity is based on its economic benefit to the university population. This deemphasizes the importance of autonomy of inquiry in faculty members’ individual research, in particular, research that may be viewed by university administrators as economically inefficient.

Further, some of the same potential contradictions as appeared in the theme about increased competition from other universities appear in the theme about partnerships as well. For example, the University of Michigan (2010) raised the following questions:

How should the University think about partnerships that enhance research and academic capacity at universities in countries that are important economic competitors of the United States? How should the University think about partnerships with non-peer institutions in other countries? Are there some countries or world regions in which such partnerships might undermine the University of Michigan brand? (p. 146)

In an attempt to displace and harmonize these potential conflicts, the university summarized its commitment to partnerships with the following statement: “the University’s interactions with internationals and with international partnerships should be
guided by the principles of reciprocity and mutual value, of maintaining academic quality and scientific and ethical integrity, and of the projection and protection of the University of Michigan brand” (p. 146). Whether it is possible to achieve each of these objectives simultaneously is a question that will presumably be addressed by those individuals enacting these partnerships in earnest.

Maximize the number of international students who enroll. A primary theme for the vision of internationalization presented in the documents was to maximize the number of international students who enroll. For example, Michigan State University (2006) suggested the need to identify specific goal numbers in order to achieve “the diversity of students’ countries of origin and majors of destination” (p. 2). The University of Iowa (2006) also identified a specific target number of international students, with a goal of having them make up 9% of the student body. As was the case with the theme around developing external partnerships, specific areas of the world were also identified as prime locations for international student recruitment efforts, in particular East and South Asia (e.g. Indiana University, 2008; University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2007; University of Lincoln-Nebraska, 2006).

Despite the emphasis by many documents on the perceived “value” to the university brought by international students, there was evidenced a range of stances as to whether these students would bring in additional revenue, or would actually require the university to provide or otherwise raise funds in order to successfully recruit them. For example, the University of Lincoln-Nebraska (2006) identified the expansion of its English as a Second Language program as a means to generate additional tuition,
suggested “in the sciences and applied sciences the majority of international graduate
students bring a net financial benefit to the University through the implementation of
major grants” (p. 3). International student presence was also framed as a means to
enhance a school’s reputation around the globe, which may also result in the successful
recruitment of additional international students. For example, Penn State University
(2008) suggested, “Former international students who cherish their positive experience at
Penn State will be an important resource for promoting the University” (p. 18).

In some cases universities suggested that in order to attract the highest caliber of
international students, some level of financial support may be offered. Yet the need to
identify sources of support for international student recruitment was often accompanied
by identification of funding originating outside of the university’s own budget. For
instance, Penn State University (2008) suggested that “In order to recruit top students
from developing countries (such as Saudi Arabia and Malaysia) one possibility is to forge
stronger partnerships with corporate and government sponsors who fund students’
schooling in exchange for later employment” (p. 18). Similarly, Indiana University
(2008) identified as a goal the “recruitment of more sponsored international students” by
individual countries and multinational corporations (p. 19), as well as for the university to
set up a process of non-U.S. cosigner loans for international students. The University of
Iowa (2006) considered the need to “Develop financial incentives for graduate and
undergraduate international students to attend” (p. 4), and suggested that such funding
come from alumni fundraising. Finally, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
(2007) identified as a goal to “increase the number of international students at Illinois through innovative University-industry partnership agreements” (p. 63).

Whatever the origin of their funding, international students were consistently framed as bringing value to the campus, specifically the value of their diversity. This is captured by schemata 7, that the university must attract the best international students so they may bring their diverse backgrounds and perspectives to the campus, enriching the university environment and enhancing its reputation. For example, the University of Wisconsin-Madison (2008) claimed to derive its “strength from the diverse groups represented in its staff and student body with different histories, regional and group affiliations, and diverse experiences in the USA and around the globe” (p 15). According to The Ohio State University (2009), “Increasing the percentage of international faculty and students at Ohio State will increase the interaction with, and knowledge of, foreign perspectives, cultures, and languages” (p. 4). Several schools (e.g. University of Michigan, University of Iowa) suggested the importance of creating opportunities for international and domestic students to interact meaningfully beyond the classroom.

Whether the benefit of exposure to individuals different from oneself is of equal benefit to international and domestic students may be considered in light of the fact that many international students experience racism on U.S. campuses (Lee & Rice, 2007). Although some of the planning documents suggested the need to create a welcoming environment for international students, only one (obliquely) acknowledged that international students many not always experience the campus in this way, as when the University of Michigan (2010) suggested that international Graduate Student Instructors
may have “difficulties” because of a “lack of sensitivity on the part of the students being instructed” (p. 147).

**Faculty will be highly engaged in internationalization efforts.** One of the primary internationalization objectives identified by the documents was increased faculty engagement in internationalization efforts. According to Michigan State University (2006), the university must therefore “enhance [faculty] competency in foreign languages; support the development of new or revised courses with international content; expand faculty exchange programs with partner institutions abroad; mentor mid-career faculty to retool; and promote faculty engagement in international entrepreneurship” (p. 5). Penn State University (2008) suggested, “The University should strongly encourage all faculty members to incorporate an international element to their regular teaching curriculum” (p. 20), while Indiana University (2008) suggested that “Faculty who go abroad on such programs establish new academic networks, test theories developed in the U.S. in an international context, develop new language and teaching competencies, and bring the benefit of their learning back to Indiana University classrooms” (p. 31). These arguments are summarized in rhetorical schemata 8, which suggests that faculty should expand their international knowledge, internationalize their curricula, and conduct research abroad for professional development and to further the university’s internationalization mission.

In many cases, the need for enhanced faculty involvement was tied to other themes. For example, the most commonly occurring theme, the need to increase study abroad participation, was tied to faculty involvement by Indiana University (2008), in the idea that “Achieving significant growth in study abroad numbers and increased diversity
in geographic destinations will require the active participation of faculty in a wide variety of disciplines” (p. 14). The Ohio State University’s (2009) goal to “Markedly increase the number of college/faculty collaborations with internationally active businesses in Ohio” (p. 7) corresponds with themes regarding the need for the university to serve the state, and the need for the university to respond to increasing global economic competition.

**Enhance language learning opportunities.** Increased study of foreign language was framed by many of the documents as a necessary element of internationalization. Learning a foreign language was tied to better understanding of different cultural perspectives (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2008), or framed as a way to meet national security needs, which in turn creates the possibility for federal funding. For example, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (2006) noted that “President Bush’s National Security Language Initiative] report may prove to be a turning point in federal support for international linkages at major universities, and we trust that UNL will be well positioned to take advantage of this positive change” (p. 6), while both Indiana University (2008) and University of Wisconsin-Madison (2008) noted that they would like to expand their Title VI language funding.

Increased language study was also frequently tied to other internationalization themes. For example, according to Michigan State University (2006) “graduates must effectively cooperate, negotiate, and compete with counterparts who are multilingual at home and abroad, foreign language competency is an essential part of internationalizing student life on campus as well as serving faculty and student research needs” (p. 4), suggesting that foreign language offerings constitute part of the university’s response to
increasing global economic competition by preparing highly-skilled graduates. Language learning was also tied to expanding study abroad participation, as the University of Michigan (2010) suggested that foreign language preparation “makes students’ education abroad experiences more satisfying, expands and deepens their opportunities for learning while overseas, and allows them to more fully realize the benefits of an education abroad experience” (p. 145). Finally, related to the theme of positioning the university as a leader, Michigan State University (2006) framed its increased foreign language programming as a means to “Provide national leadership in the area of second language acquisition, pedagogy, and foreign language program development” (p. 3).

Review of Themes in Response to Research Question 3

In the following subsection I will review the most commonly occurring theme in response to the question “How do the documents frame the means by which the university can achieve these objectives for internationalization?”

Create more centralized processes for administration of international efforts.

The most commonly occurring theme in response to the question of how the university can achieve its internationalization objectives was the idea of centralizing the administration of international efforts. For example, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (2006) asked, “What would it take to identify and support a set of coordinated international initiatives that leverage UNL strengths, placing these squarely in the pathway of emerging trends and priorities at state, national, and international levels?” (p. 3). This same document suggested “Decentralization also involves insufficient communication, which in turn has led to inefficiency and duplication of efforts” (p. 3),
while the Indiana University (2008) suggested, “The university should establish a centralized mechanism and criteria for evaluating proposed external funding initiatives based on the costs and benefits to IU” (p. 32). As was suggested in the theme regarding external collaboration as a primary objective, many of the universities in the corpus suggested that centralizing their internationalization efforts would enable the maximization of resources in order to obtain the greatest benefit.

Thus, what is framed as primary in the use of this theme is the idea that what is good for the university as a whole – in particular, it’s finances — takes precedence. This is illustrated by schemata 9, which suggests that the university must manage centralized, strategic internationalization efforts in order to maximize the potential of the university’s human and other resources. Notably, centralized determinations of what is best for the university is often framed as best taking place in administrative offices. This may have the effect of limiting the autonomy of individual faculty as well as academic departments, increasing the role of administration in the management of and influence in areas of academic instruction once more exclusively the role of faculty. For example, Michigan State University (2006) suggested the need to “Identify and address strategic faculty hiring needs in the international arena in dialogue with deans, chairs, directors, and key faculty” (p. 4). However, this centralization can be framed as a benefit to university faculty, as a means of decreasing their administrative burden, as in the case of the University of Michigan (2010), which suggested that centralized administration of internationalization “enables the schools and colleges to focus their energies on academic issues” (p. 150).
Utilize technological tools in innovative and strategic ways. Enhanced utilization of technology was framed in the documents as one of the primary means by which universities can achieve their diverse internationalization objectives. For example, Penn State University (2008) suggested that Geographic Information Systems could help the university map and track its various efforts around the globe. Penn State also suggested electronic advising will streamline international student services and education abroad systems; the University of Michigan (2010) described a similar plan for advising. Indiana University (2008) suggested that technology could enable the instruction of courses, particularly language courses, which are not physically offered on the campus but could be offered through external partner schools.

Technology was also framed by many universities as a way to enhance their “global presence” without building physical campuses abroad. For example, Purdue University (2008) suggested “we should leverage our cyber community leadership to expand our global presence even further and in more unique and cross cutting ways” (p. 8), while the University of Wisconsin-Madison (2008) emphasized the continued development of its “eCampus,” as opposed to focusing on development of “the less agile, more expensive, and more risky ‘bricks and mortar’ paradigm” (p. 19).

Remove barriers to participation in study abroad. The most commonly occurring internationalization objective through the corpus was the need to increase participation in study abroad (in response to research question 1), so it follows that one of the primary responses to research question 3 of how to achieve internationalization objectives was the need to minimize barriers to studying abroad. Some of the barriers to
studying abroad identified included a lack of clearly articulated and consistently implemented policies and procedures regarding the application of study abroad credits, and most commonly, the lack of adequate funding (e.g. Indiana University, 2008; University of Michigan, 2010).

One of the primary means of reducing barriers outlined in the corpus was locating new funding sources (e.g. Indiana University, 2008; Purdue University, 2008; University of Michigan, 2010; University of Iowa, 2006), for scholarships and tuition waivers. Further, it was suggested that the universities must improve their outreach to racial minorities, first generation, and low-income student populations to increase their study abroad participation rates (e.g. Indiana University, 2008; Penn State University, 2008). One of the commonly identified means of increasing these students’ participation was to offer additional funding to these students. For example, Indiana University (2008) suggested the need to “Provide substantially increased financial assistance to students of modest means and to underrepresented minority students in order to boost the participation of these students” (p. 15). Little to no consideration was given in most documents to the fact that the reason for lesser participation amongst these students may not be attributable (or solely attributable) to financial constraints. It is presumed that all students would want to study abroad, and that the only reason they may not is either financial, lack of information, or inconvenience with regard to transfer credit.

**Offer incentives and rewards for faculty participation in international efforts.** The theme of incentivizing and rewarding faculty participation in internationalization was also common, and is tied to the theme regarding increased
faculty participation as a primary objective of internationalization. Thus, for example, according to Michigan State University (2006) “A comprehensive and systematic program to further internationalize MSU faculty and address barriers to their international involvement needs to be put in place” (p. 5). These incentives and rewards are primarily framed in the corpus as financial. That is, much as is the case with students’ study abroad participation, many of the documents presume that financial considerations are the determining factor in faculty participation. For example, Penn State University (2008) proposed the creation of fellowships that “will support individual faculty members with innovative initiatives that promote international engagement, enrich research and teaching, and have the potential to significantly and broadly impact the faculty member’s program” (p. 20).

Faculty incentives are also tied to reward and promotion in many of documents in the corpus. According to Indiana University (2008), it is necessary to “Reward faculty members who organize, direct, and teach in programs abroad by including the course work abroad as part of their normal course loads and recognizing their contributions during the tenure and promotion processes” (p. 15) Similarly, Michigan State University (2006) suggested “salary and promotion decisions need to give greater recognition to faculty contributions to international research, teaching, and engagement” (p. 5), while Purdue University (2008) said “Faculty and staff will be encouraged and rewarded for infusing global perspectives into all aspects of their work” (p. 2).

Both the theme of incentivizing faculty participation and that of removing barriers to increased student participation in study abroad are captured by rhetorical schemata 10,
which suggests that the university will promote, incentivize, and remove barriers to internationalization, although it will not dictate the exact form of those efforts in order to maximize student and faculty entrepreneurialism. This is also tied to theme of centralized administration of internationalization as a primary objective of many schools. For example, the University of Iowa (2006) suggested that it is necessary to “Work with the dean of each college to refine mechanisms for recognizing and rewarding faculty teaching, scholarship and service related to International Programs and international studies” and to “synchronize the appointments of [International Programs] faculty to leadership positions according to a mutually agreed upon timetable” (p. 6). This suggests the shifting of previously academic decisions to more administrative, managerial influence.

Further, faculty rewards for participation in internationalization efforts may be dispersed according to the calculated benefits to the university as a whole. Thus, Penn State University (2008) suggested one of the leading criteria for distributing faculty fellowships be “evidence that such a program has a very good chance of attracting external support to render itself self-sustaining, engendering a long-term internationalization commitment” (p. 20). Academic research or programs that are not fundable may therefore be eschewed in favor of their more profitable counterparts, which could result in the relative underfunding of projects in disciplines, particularly the humanities, which rarely receive external funding.

**Secure external grants and contracts.** Finally, it was suggested in many of the documents that securing external grants and contracts is a primary means by which the
university can achieve its internationalization objectives. Many of the documents recognized that the ambitious plans laid out by the university would require funding beyond that which is currently available to the university. For example, according to Purdue University (2008):

Clearly new monies are necessary, and the majority must come from new sources which we think are under-tapped by Purdue. These include gifts from alums and friends whose interest is activated by the global imperative, grants and contracts from foundations focused on global issues, US [sic] research funding targeted to global collaborations, etc. (p. 9)

Much of the emphasis was on securing federal grants and contracts in particular. For example, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (2007) noted that “With stronger connections in Washington D.C., we have significant potential to diversify and inflate our funding base, and to expand strategic learning opportunities for our students” (p. 62). Indiana University (2008), Purdue University (2008), University of Michigan (2010), University of Wisconsin-Madison (2008), and University of Nebraska-Lincoln (2006) all explicitly noted their desire to pursue enhanced funding from the U.S. government.

**Discourse Analysis of Three Text Samples**

After coding the documents and identifying the most commonly occurring themes and the dominant rhetorical schemata, in order to conduct a discourse analysis according to Fairclough’s textually-oriented discourse analysis (TODA) method (2011) I selected
text samples from three different internationalization planning documents. Samples were chosen that developed a complete thought, responded to at least two of the three research questions, and captured at least four of the ten dominant rhetorical schemata. Also, because domestic students, faculty, and international students were the three most commonly addressed subject positions in the corpus, I chose one sample that primarily addressed the role of each. Finally, each sample was selected for an additional notable feature, elucidated below.

The first sample is centered on international students at Indiana University, and was chosen for the contrast it provided in its explicit commodification of higher education paired with a more implicit commodification of international students. The second sample focused on domestic students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and illustrated many of the tensions involved in simultaneous deployment of state, national, and global citizenship subjectivities, especially when couched in potentially contradictory frameworks of economic and developmental rationalities. Such potentially conflicting roles are notable given Fairclough’s (2011) contention that discourses perceived by social actors as contradictory are “open to having their existing political and ideological investments become the focus of contention in struggles to deinvest/reinvest them” (p. 70). Finally, the third sample from Michigan State University was chosen because of its deftly synergistic deployment of the neoliberal discourses and phenomena already circulating within higher education with the specific demands of internationalization in the creation of faculty subjects, especially the themes of new managerialism and entrepreneurialism.
Sample 1: International students. The first sample comes from the “Indiana University International Strategic Plan” (2008). It answers the research questions of why internationalization is needed and what the objectives are by addressing the university’s need to compete for international students in a global higher education landscape. In doing so, the sample draws on rhetorical schematas 1, 2, 7 and 9. These schematas are: the world, including the economy and higher education landscape, is rapidly changing and increasingly connected, and the university must adapt if it wishes to be a leader instead of a follower; the university must compete with schools not only in around the U.S. but also around the world to attract the best students and faculty, and maximize its external funding; the university must attract the best international students so they may bring their diverse backgrounds and perspectives to the campus, enriching the university environment and enhancing its reputation; and the university must manage centralized, strategic internationalization efforts in order to maximize the potential of the university’s human and other resources.

Finally, the sample, which follows, was also selected because it illustrates the ways in which neoliberal economic rationality may be applied to student recruitment:

a) Having a comprehensive enrollment management plan that includes the recruitment and retention of highly qualified [international] students will require collaboration among these units. Close coordination across campuses is desirable to maximize effective use of university resources towards common goals. It must be kept in mind that the global demand for higher education is forecast to increase from 97 million students in 2000 to 263 million in 2025, and China
and India will account for more than half of the total growth during this period.

b) In order to capture IU’s share of this growing market, the university must remain strategic in its approach and provide prospective students with educational opportunities that are consistent with the changing goals and objectives for study in the U.S. The international higher education landscape is undergoing substantive transformation, and if the U.S. is to maintain its competitive edge, IU must develop new approaches. (p. 18)

The attention to the importance of attracting international students that is emphasized here occurred frequently throughout the corpus. On the dimension of text, this sample embraces market vocabulary with the use of “global demand,” “market growth,” “competitive edge,” and “growing market” to describe the landscape on which the university will develop its international student recruitment enrollment plan. Similar terminology infused many of the planning documents in the corpus of this study, and exemplifies the application of economic rationality to the higher education sphere. Specifically, the sample refers to a “growing market” of students seeking higher education, and exhorts the university to “capture IU’s share.” The sample provides a statistic that half of the growing “market” of potential students will come from China and India.

Implied here is that there are gains to be had in a burgeoning higher education market, in particular by attracting international students. Yet higher education is unlike
other commodities in that the university cannot merely grow indefinitely in order to meet the demands of students qua consumers. Even if the university intends to expand its enrollment over time, it will eventually reach a limit at which it can no longer grow its capacity. Producers of other kinds of commodities may be able to expand much more readily, if not indefinitely. Furthermore, the emphasis in this sample is on attracting international students, particularly those from Asia, without justification as to why the university could not merely admit more in-state or otherwise domestic students, whom are presumably also potential consumers within the global higher education market. Thus, framing higher education as a market place does not in itself account for the need to emphasize recruitment of international students in particular.

In this sample, then, international students are customers, but unlike customers in many non-academic markets the identities of the customer matter in an academic market. This is not only because international students often pay a greater price in tuition and fees for the same product than would other customers – i.e. greater than would a domestic out-of-state student customer, and certainly greater than would an in-state student customer (Bolsmann & Miller, 2008) – but also because students in higher education are not only customers, but also commodities themselves. Indeed, Rhee and Sagaria (2004) found that international student graduates are often framed as exports, and may also be important sources of alumni donations. In addition, international students may enhance a university’s reputation (Bolsmann & Miller, 2008), and are thought to bring “value” through their diverse backgrounds (as per rhetorical schemata 7). What matters to the university in this sample is thus not merely, as is claimed, to “capture IU’s share” of a
growing student market, but rather to capture a specific share of that market, i.e. international students. Therefore, the economic rationality deployed in this sample is of a neoliberal type, which considers *individuals* to have varying degrees of value to the university population as a whole. In mapping recruitment of international students onto a marketplace metaphor, the Indiana University document does not shy away from commodifying higher education; the implied commodification of higher education *students* is more subtle.

Nonetheless, the sample suggests that even as commodities, to be given entry to the university, international students are bound by the imperatives of neoliberal subjecthood. International students may still be subordinate to other members of the university population, but potential international students who may not be understood as capable of performing as a proper neoliberal subject may be left out of the university population entirely. Thus, the sample presumes that the pool of possible international students designated by the university (an unattributed figure of “263 million in 2025” in paragraph a), will be entrepreneurial subjects making rational economic choices about their education. This also suggests that in addition to calculations about the best educational investment, the construct of the desirable neoliberal international student subject has the financial means to be able to enter this higher education market in the first place, and the educational background and other resources to be qualified for entry into the university population.

Furthermore, some international students, even from this identified pool, are deemed to be more desirable than others, given the emphasis in paragraph a on targeted
recruitment from India and China, which suggested that “China and India will account for more than half of the total growth during [the period from 2000 to 2025]” (p. 18). Both of these countries have burgeoning middle classes, which undergirds the targeted recruitment of international students more likely to be able to pay full tuition, which is evidence of biopolitical population management. If creation of a diverse student body were a driving goal of internationalization, it would seem that recruiting students from a variety of locations would be indicated as a priority. Instead, it appears that the university is targeting students that they believe will come from particular class and ethnic backgrounds, thereby simultaneously contributing to the university’s cultural diversity while being able to pay for the full cost of tuition. Further, this sample echoed the fact that international students are largely constructed as coming from non-European countries. Thus, international students from Europe may be more or less (in)visible as non-U.S. outsiders, depending on their race.

There are multiple subject positions from which to approach this sample on the dimension of discursive practice. To a staff person or administrator, this text serves as a firm charge to develop new strategies and approaches for recruitment of international students in order to enable the university to succeed in the international higher education market. This imperative is emphasized by multiple uses of the word “must,” as in “It must be kept in mind,” “the university must remain strategic,” and “IU must develop new approaches.”

Illustrating student demand using exact numbers, as is done in paragraph a (“global demand for higher education is forecast to increase from 97 million students in
2000 to 263 million in 2025,” [p. 18]), is also a governing technique that utilizes scientific authority to add legitimacy to the claim that the need for international student recruitment is evident and inevitable. However, it is unclear whether it is international students who demand access to higher education in the U.S., or whether U.S. universities create the demand for higher education amongst international students. By framing the demand for higher education as preexisting, Indiana University elides the intentionality of its role in the creation of a globalized marketplace and international demand for higher education. Indeed, this is an effect of the biopolitics of governmentality, which naturalizes a set of inevitable and desirable characteristics of a population and its processes, and from there enacts certain conducts and controls in order to achieve and maintain them.

Specifically, paragraph b of the sample suggests that international student recruitment is necessary for the U.S. to “maintain its competitive edge,” thereby positioning the university with responsibilities not only to its own success and that of Indiana, but also to the U.S. as a nation. The theme of national economic responsibility occurred throughout this and other documents in the corpus, although economic responsibility to the state occurred more frequently. The sample also invokes the need “to maximize effective use of university resources towards common goals,” crafting the presumption that that all IU campuses and units have similar goals regarding international students. The theme of greater centralized management of international efforts for efficiency was popular throughout the corpus, and exemplifies the neoliberal tendency for governance based on a centralized calculation of what is deemed best for a population.
Such governance distributes opportunities according to a particular rationality – in this case, economic – and enables greater control over disparate parts of a population.

The sample constructs an imperative for the university to strategically attract more international students at least in part by offering “educational opportunities that are consistent with the changing goals and objectives for study in the U.S.” (paragraph b). In addition to providing educational opportunities that will attract international students, some of the documents also identified the need for more funding sources and improved experiences for international students on campus, particularly by providing an enhanced level of student services. Thus, on a discursive dimension, international students or potential international students may take advantage of these statements to demand the educational opportunities, funding, and services that they desire from their university experience.

However, the dominant rationality employed to justify improved services for international students is not merely an imperative to better serve them. That is, student satisfaction is the means not the ends of these efforts; rhetorical arguments are constructed in a way that justifies services to achieve the desired end of higher international student enrollment. For example, Penn State University (2008) stated that ensuring a positive experience for international students “is both an important goal in-and-of-itself, and also crucial for continued increases in international enrollment…If students enjoy their experience at Penn State, they will share this information with friends, family, and acquaintances—encouraging others to attend” (pp. 18-19). Thus, although international students may benefit from improved services, to the administration
their satisfaction is largely valued insofar as it causes additional students to enroll, thus bringing more tuition and donations from international alumni. This aligns with Foucault’s (1977-1978/2007) supposition that in biopolitical management of a population, “individuals are no longer pertinent as the objective, but simply as the instrument, relay, or condition for obtaining something at the level of the population” (p. 42).

**Sample 2: Domestic students.** The second sample comes from the section of University of Wisconsin-Madison’s Reaccreditation Self-Study entitled “Preparing Global Citizens and Leaders of the Future” (2008). It focuses on the need to prepare students as global leaders and global citizens in order to help them cope with global economic competition and solve the problems of the state and the world. These themes emerged frequently throughout the corpus in response to the research questions of why the university should internationalize, and what are the university’s objectives for internationalization. The sample draws on rhetorical schemata 1, 3, 4, and 5, the arguments that: the world, including the economy and higher education landscape, is rapidly changing and increasingly connected, and the university must adapt if it wishes to be a leader instead of a follower; part of the university’s mission is to serve the state, particularly its economic needs, by creating valuable research, working with businesses, and preparing productive citizens; in order to compete and collaborate in the global knowledge economy, the university must be a global leader and prepare its graduates to be global citizens and leaders; and, in order to compete and collaborate in the global knowledge economy, the university must be a global leader and prepare its graduates to
be global citizens and leaders. Finally, this sample was chosen for the fact that it demonstrates potentially conflicting local and global responsibilities, and thus suggests potentially openings for university subjects to enact discursive counter-conducts:

a) For its own part, the University of Wisconsin-Madison has accepted its responsibility as a leading public university by embracing the Wisconsin Idea. The Wisconsin Idea embodies the principle that education and research should be applied to solve problems and improve health, quality of life, the environment and agriculture for all citizens of the state, the nation, and the world. In the 21st century, fulfillment of this mission will require investing in programs, policies, and infrastructure that ensure we provide a world-class Preparation for Global Citizenship and Leadership for all learners, broadly-defined, both on campus and off.

b) The most obvious rationale for this mission is to prepare University of Wisconsin Madison (UW-Madison) graduates to thrive in the 21st century global marketplace. There are a diminishing number of professional career opportunities that will function in isolation or ignorance of global customers, markets, suppliers, and competitors. We all need to acquire skills to cope with a global economy in which expansion of employment opportunities and markets is accompanied by global replaceability of work-force [sic] through outsourcing and migration of labor. To intentionally remain unconnected to the globe will have severe
repercussions on the growth of the state’s economy and its citizens and future generations.

c) However, of equal or greater importance is the imperative for every UW-Madison-educated citizen to understand the increasingly interdependent world in which we live. Decisions made at local levels as individuals or communities have profound effects on other communities in other parts of the world.

d) Examples of how we are personally influenced by conditions and events across the globe that are, in turn, affected by local choices include:

- Consumption, distribution, availability, stability, and pricing of raw materials, food, and resources,
- Greatly increased human mobility, tourism, population changes, internal and trans-national migration, and the opportunities and challenges that these present for local economies, health care, environment, and education.
- The way in which local choices in any one region or country affect global economic, environmental, health, and security conditions.
- The internet-enabled flow of information and the potential this creates for empowerment, manipulation, economic opportunity, and vulnerability. (p. 3)

This sample develops the argument that the realities of the “21st century global marketplace” require that UW-Madison prepare its students with a global orientation.
Paragraph b posits that “the most obvious rationale” for developing this global orientation is to ensure that graduates can successfully compete for career opportunities. In the dimension of discursive practice, the text hails student subjects using an ambiguous “we” in the warning that “we all need to acquire skills” in response to the “global replaceability of work-force [sic] through outsourcing and migration of labor.” It is suggested that if students do not develop the appropriate skills, there will be “severe repercussions” for Wisconsin’s “citizens and future generations.” Obligations, particularly economic, to the state as a rationale for internationalization were common throughout the corpus. As social practice, this imperative is shaped by neoliberal discourses of fear and moralization of choice (Davies & Bansel, 2007). Because students’ entrepreneurial abilities are discursively linked to the state’s economic success, they are governed through assessment of their choices.

Repeated use of the word “we” goes further, however, in constructing the role of the university as a metonym for the state or the nation, by taking on their economic imperatives – and asking members of the university population to do the same. In this way, the university has framed the role of higher education as a means for students to develop their own human capital, eliding the potential importance of international education for other, non-financial ends. There is a double move here: the individual is subjectified as an entrepreneur of the self, but ultimately this self-interest is understood to serve the good of the population (population here may be variously understood as the university, state, or national population). Thus, the commitment evidenced in this sample to subjectifying appropriately neoliberal citizens through internationalization suggests
that these efforts are not merely a response to, but also a technology of, neoliberal
governmentality. While it was frequently suggested throughout the corpus that
internationalization was an inevitable, or at the very least a necessary, response to the
neoliberal economic conditions and the intensification of globalization, this sample and
other documents in the corpus suggest that the university itself has taken an active role in
the perpetuation of these modalities and mentalities.

At the same time, paragraphs a and c of the sample draw on a discourse of
responsibility not explicitly tied to economic rationality, nor to the state economy, but
rather more of a developmental rationality. Paragraph a suggests that “education and
research should be applied to solve problems…for all citizens of the state, the nation, and
the world,” while paragraph c calls for students to understand “the increasingly
interdependent world” and recognize that their decisions may have “profound effects on
other communities in other parts of the world.” The “However” that begins the paragraph
c suggests a potential contrast to the economic motivations outlined in the previous
paragraph. In fact, the theme that the university must help solve global challenges (e.g.
poverty, climate change, water access) occurred commonly throughout the corpus.

By neoliberal logic, individuals’ social responsibility is primarily framed as the
way in which their entrepreneurial actions affect a larger population, as it is in paragraph
b of the sample. This paragraph suggests “We all need to acquire skills to cope with a
global economy in which expansion of employment opportunities and markets is
accompanied by global replaceability of work-force [sic] through outsourcing and
migration of labor”, and that “To intentionally remain unconnected to the globe will have
severe repercussions on the growth of the state’s economy and its citizens and future
generations” (p. 3). Yet paragraph b presents a potential conflict with paragraphs a and c: the
imperatives of internationalization based on the need for a state and its citizens to
remain economically competitive (paragraph b) might result in negative outcomes for the
“other communities in other parts of the world” referenced in paragraphs a and c. For
example, the global expansion of Wisconsin businesses might result in additional means
of exploitation of workers in unregulated factories abroad. Conversely, creating jobs
abroad might result in job losses in Wisconsin. Further, the affects of interconnectedness
may be unevenly distributed. While some of the aspects of global interconnectedness are
outlined in paragraph d, the list does not acknowledge the considerable disparities
between the global North and South as regions, or between individuals within those
regions, vis-à-vis the connections listed. For example, it is suggested that “local choices
in any one region or country affect global economic, environmental, health, and security
conditions.” Presented in this way, it appears that the actions of people in any given place
may equally “affect”– a neutral verb – those in another areas, without acknowledging
histories of colonialism, ongoing neocolonialism, and economic exploitation that shape
and make possible (or not possible) these “local choices.” Similarly, many individuals are
unable or unwilling to participate in the “Greatly increased human mobility,” given
financial, familial, or immigration constraints. Although the apolitical tone of the list
provides numerous discursive openings, through which it is possible to historicize and
engage these connections more critically, it remains unclear exactly what are the
responsibilities of Wisconsin students and other members of the university, to
communities around the world and whether these are compatible with much more forcefully inscribed economic responsibilities to the state outlined in paragraph b.

Despite the potential conflict on the dimension of discursive practice for students in this sample that are called upon to serve varying constituencies (university, state, national, and global), both this sample and other documents in the corpus gesture toward activities that make various responsibilities potentially concomitant. For instance, if a university hosts research that addresses climate change, it not only helps to solve an issue that affects many communities across the globe, but it may secure external funding to support this work and therefore create jobs on campus and possibly in the local community, as well as potentially boost the university’s reputation. Within the theme of the university’s responsibility to help solve global challenges, more than one rationality may therefore be employed (economic and developmental). The interstices of these overlapping but potentially contradictory rationalities may also provide a space in which to enact counter-conducts. For example, discourses of global responsibility and interconnectedness may be drawn upon by university members wishing to enact international social justice programs that would draw upon rather than increase university and state economic resources.

Another intertextual discursive opening available in this sample is that of the responsibilities of citizens to the state. In fact, paragraph a of the sample directly invokes the “Wisconsin Idea,” which was developed in the late 1800s, and according to Gruber (1997) “was one of the earliest, most fully developed, and best publicized expressions of the service ideal” (p. 268). Although paragraph b quite forcefully situates students’
obligation to their state as economic, as it is a neoliberal tendency to equate public responsibility with economic responsibility, there are many means of service to a state and its citizenry that result in no tangible financial gains. Indeed, paragraph a suggests that the Wisconsin Ideal includes a collective responsibility to solve “problems and improve health, quality of life, the environment and agriculture.” This indicates that citizenship may also include a responsibility to create and enact programs and collective civic actions that do not have economic value as their primary goal, and may in fact require expenditure of resources. However, not all discourses are imbued with the same power. Given the hegemony of neoliberal governmentality, in particular its economic rationality, the effectiveness of successfully enacting a counter-conduct such as this may depend on whether there is a critical mass of Wisconsinites (whether members of the university community or not) committed to it.

Having considered what is demanded of a Wisconsin citizen, it is necessary to consider the notion of global citizenry, a discourse that appears not just in this sample, but also in many other documents throughout the corpus. Although the meaning of the term is generally underdeveloped, in this sample it is suggested that a global citizen recognizes the interdependency of all areas of the world. This necessity is also discussed using the construct of a collective “we.” What follows from such communal recognition, however, remains unclear. Is mere acknowledgement that “Decisions made at local levels as individuals or communities have profound effects on other communities in other parts of the world” (paragraph c) the end goal of global citizenry? What kind of ongoing engagement is demanded of the global citizen, and how might this conflict or coincide
with a citizen’s obligations to their state, in this case Wisconsin, or their nation? Finally, if the globe is so intimately connected, then who doesn’t qualify as a global citizen, and what kind of racialized or class-based exclusions might restrict the ability to claim global citizenship produce – in particular vis-à-vis those who do not have access to higher education, either domestically or abroad?

In many cases throughout the corpus, the legitimacy of one’s claim to global citizenship is framed as yet another requisite qualification for successfully securing a job in an increasingly competitive market. Thus, for example, in the themes around study abroad that emerged in the documents, almost no effort was spent delineating the benefits of studying abroad, or what makes a study abroad program effective; achieving increased participation was the primary emphasis. In other words, what matters most, according to the documents, is for students to have studied abroad at all, not what they gain from the experience. The experience itself serves as a mark of certification of their membership in a global citizenry. Thus, it is unclear that any particular ethical obligations follow from membership in a global citizenry as constructed by these documents. Little work is done, therefore, to construct an imagined global community within neoliberal governmentality and what it might entail. This is in contrast to one’s apparent obligations to a state or national community, which are more clearly defined as economic throughout the corpus. As was the case with the obligations of Wisconsin citizenship, it may be possible for a university subject to take up this discourse of global citizenry, and deploy it in a way that defines specific obligations. Fleshing out the meanings of these various roles may bring to the fore potential frictions entailed in simultaneous citizenships, providing a means for
challenging the discursively dominant economic rationality. In fact, the lack of explication in this area within the documents may be preferable to detailed outcomes, given that it leaves a space for students, staff, and instructors to engage in these conversations in a relatively uncircumscribed way.

The final element of note in the sample is the fact that although it addresses the need to prepare UW-Madison graduates generally, it is targeted toward preparing domestic students. When internationalization is framed as necessary for the benefit of “the state’s economy and its citizens and future generations” in paragraph b, these efforts are presumably not directed at international students, who are not U.S. citizens unless they hold dual citizenship. Indeed, it was popular throughout the corpus for universities’ rationales for internationalization and programs of action to refer to “students” when in fact the individuals implicitly referenced were domestic students, whereas international students were generally referenced as “international students.” The presumption that “student” refers to domestic students creates a normative subject so that international students are constructed as an outsider subject whom is welcome primarily insofar as they bring value to the campus through their diversity and/or their tuition monies. Paragraph b of this sample even sets up foreign individuals as potential competitors with Wisconsinites, suggesting another space of possible contradiction within the document. A similar tension was identified by Rhee and Sagaria (2004): accompanying the construction of international students as sources of capital is often a concern that they are “a bad U.S. public investment or, worse, that universities may be preparing foreign nationals to compete with the United States” (p. 85).
As in this sample and throughout the corpus, Big Ten universities’ internationalization efforts are largely framed as being driven by economic needs of the state, and to a lesser degree the economic needs of the U.S. as a nation. However, neoliberal governmentality is complicated by the fact that its effects are not tied to a particular territory, as “[m]arket rationalty knows no culture or country” (Brown, 2003, para. 27). Thus, when market or economic rationality dominates universities’ visions for internationalization, international students occupy the liminal position of being both a valuable asset to an institution, and potential competitors with U.S. citizens for spots in the university, and for jobs upon graduation. The position of the university as distinct from the state but still somewhat beholden to it also complicates its position as an institution embedded in a global higher education market. The contradictions identified above exemplify this complication, and provide opportunities for potential disruption of the dominant discourses and the enactment of non-economic counter-conducts.

Sample 3: Faculty. The final sample comes from the Michigan State University (MSU) document, “Recommendations of the Boldness by Design Internationalization Taskforce” (2006). In emphasizing the role of faculty involvement and research, the sample answers all three research questions. In addition to this, it was chosen for the fact that it touches on several of the commonly-occurring themes, and over half of the dominant rhetorical schemata (1, 2, 6, 8, 9, and 10 – see Table 4.2).

a) MSU must further internationalize its faculty and programs through expanded overseas research initiatives, strategically focused hiring related to university and college priorities, and internationally and globally
enhanced curricula. We should:

b) 1. Increase faculty involvement in international research through development of strategic partnerships with international and global institutions and universities in priority world regions.

c) 2. Encourage development of university, college and departmental incentives that recognize and reward international engagement, especially in research.

d) 3. Identify and address strategic faculty hiring needs in the international arena in dialogue with deans, chairs, directors, and key faculty.

e) 4. Enhance faculty engagement in curricular enhancement through course development grants, faculty exchange programs with partner institutions abroad, and opportunity for mid-career refocusing.

f) Rationale: A global university that rises in standing among its peer institutions must have a research mission at its core. And the realities of the global market place for ideas, research and learning make it imperative that our research activity and perspectives become global. The generation of new knowledge about international trends, problems and achievements is the signature activity of a global landgrant institution. To face 21st Century challenges, MSU must mobilize its best minds to address critical issues at the intersection of the natural sciences, social sciences and humanities, and of the local and global. (pp. 4-5).
The list numbered 1-4 in this sample (paragraphs b-e) lays out a set of internationalization objectives and the steps needed in order to achieve them, which respond to the research questions of what the internationalization objectives are, and how they may be achieved. Many common themes of the corpus are featured, including: incentivizing faculty engagement, the development of external partnerships, and more centralized direction of internationalization processes. Paragraph f that follows the list of steps provides an argument for why the university must take these steps to incentivize international faculty research.

The sample features the discourse of a global knowledge economy in its suggestion that “the realities of the global market place for ideas, research and learning make it imperative that our research activity and perspectives become global.” Nokkola (2006) argued that knowledge economy discourse is “materialized in practices of governing universities and embraced as subjectivities by universities and other higher education actors,” to the extent that they “act, talk, think and see themselves as actors of knowledge society” (p. 194). Thus, on the level of discursive practice, the sample calls on faculty to take ownership of their role in a global knowledge economy. Consistent with trends of neoliberal governmentality in higher education (Olssen & Peters, 2005), research and teaching are reconfigured to frame faculty scholarship and inventions as “value-added” to themselves, and therefore, to the university. Instead of pursuing their intellectual interests or furthering the scholarship in their field unfettered, faculty are expected to generate measurable outputs to enable the university to better compete in “the global market place.” Greater limits are placed on faculty autonomy, altering their
role in order to better fit with the economic needs of the university (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Since at least post-Civil War Reconstruction, the established role of faculty in U.S. higher education has been as professional employees of the university who are assessed and deemed qualified (or not) by their disciplinary peers (Gruber, 1997). However, as part of the neoliberal trend toward new managerialism, faculty are decreasingly held accountable by the standards of the peers in their profession, and instead assessed by managers. With the emphasis of assessment by administrators, faculty are increasingly evaluated based on their utility to the university, particularly as measured by their ability to generate research funding and student tuition fees. Many universities have also increased their reliance on adjunct faculty and decreased the hiring of tenure-track faculty, the former of which are even more vulnerable to the dictates and fluctuations of the university’s economic needs and capabilities in a global market (Giroux, 2002).

By laying out a plan to incentivize the production of research that will address “international trends, problems and achievements,” the sample also employed a discourse of entrepreneurialism. Instead of outright mandating increased faculty engagement, the university proposed to achieve this “through course development grants, faculty exchange programs with partner institutions abroad, and opportunity for mid-career refocusing” (paragraph e). Governmentality enacts and encourages certain individual conduct based on presumptions about the ideal conditions of a given population, and what measures are required to achieve it. That is, the actions of individuals are managed so as to achieve a particular collective outcome. Neoliberal governmentality in particular
presumes that by making economically rational choices in pursuit of “incentives that recognize and reward international engagement” (paragraph c), individual faculty will maximize their value to the university population.

Later in the Michigan State University internationalization planning document (2006) from which discourse sample 3 originates it is suggested that “salary and promotion decisions need to give greater recognition to faculty contributions to international research, teaching, and engagement” (p. 5). In fact, six of the twelve university internationalization planning documents in this corpus called for international activities to be considered an integral element of faculty promotion and tenure review, and many others discussed rewarding faculty for these activities in more general terms, making this a dominant theme throughout the corpus. This effort by administrators to gain greater control over the management of the academic areas of a university affects not only the linking of faculty’s future job security to their participation in the university’s internationalization efforts, it also compels the redefinition of faculty responsibilities by emphasizing the primacy of global market considerations.

In some cases, accountability goes beyond the workplace and faculty members are expected to incorporate their institution’s internationalization objectives into their private lives, which is illustrative of the unbounded effects of biopower in neoliberal governmentality. The University of Minnesota (2010) suggested “by understanding the interplay of global influences…faculty can better relate a global learning environment to their students. It is important for faculty to holistically embrace such a transformation, meaning such an outlook cannot be shut on and off whether in or out of the classroom”
Here, the transformation of faculty into global citizens goes beyond acting as a technology to govern teaching and research, and seeks to govern their conduct outside of the professional sphere as well. Whether or not this transformation is desirable, it nonetheless represents a biopolitical attempt to manage faculty subjectivity in order to achieve maximum benefit for the university population. This supports Boden and Epstein’s (2011) argument that neoliberal governance has transformed “the overwhelming majority of universities into highly managed and controlled spaces that produce docile bodies with compliant imaginations” (p. 478). At the same time, the relative vagaries of the “global learning environment” evoked in the University of Minnesota document represent a space in which the faculty-as-subject can create their own interpretation, if the principles of academic freedom are adhered.

Sample 3’s call in paragraph f for the university to “mobilize its best minds to address critical issues at the intersection of the natural sciences, social sciences and humanities, and of the local and global” may also provide an opening from which to enact counter-conducts through interdisciplinarity. Kamola and Meyerhoff (2009) argued that the creation of interdisciplinary spaces could enable faculty to engage in collective research and teaching that may subvert universities’ desire for economic value creation. Such collaboration may also be difficult for administrators to monitor and govern, because there is less clearly defined hierarchical oversight than in discipline-specific work. However, as with all counter-conducts, if individuals who participate in interdisciplinary collaboration have sufficiently adopted neoliberal technologies of the self, their work may nonetheless contribute to the university’s intended economic ends.
Further, a move toward interdisciplinarity does not address the administration’s effective alienation of the faculty member from their professional academic field.

In paragraph f, sample 3 draws on economic rationality by justifying the need for “new knowledge about international trends, problems and achievements” based on the “realities of the global market place,” and the competitive need for the university to rise “in standing amongst its peer institutions.” Research that addresses certain issues deemed “international trends” or problems will likely attract external funding and greater prestige for the university than others. Following a developmental rationality, international communities may also benefit from this research. Yet a tension exists which echoes some of the same tensions seen in discourse sample 2 from the University of Wisconsin-Madison (2008), regarding a university’s potentially competing local and global obligations: that which is demanded of the university vis-à-vis its local economic obligations to the state following the dictates of global markets may potentially have deleterious effects on communities throughout the world. Further, developmental efforts may themselves be understood as imperialist impositions.
Chapter 5: Discussion

This chapter provides a discussion of the broader implications for university internationalization, and higher education more generally, which may be drawn from the thematic coding and discourse analysis of Big Ten universities’ internationalization planning documents presented in Chapter 4. In my discussion, I consider the overarching discursive effects of the dominant themes and rationalities that were identified throughout the corpus. Then, I consider some potential means for reimagining those themes and rationalities within the space of the university, and suggest possible implications for policy. Finally, I discuss limitations of the study, before providing a conclusion.

In this study, I sought to identify what drives internationalization and how it has come to be a relatively unquestioned good in higher education. The primary themes identified in response to the research questions posed in this study – what rationales are presented in the documents, what objectives, and how do the documents frame the means by which the university can achieve these objectives – do not necessarily reflect neoliberal governmentality in and of themselves. However, they become so in being animated largely by economic rationality, and to a lesser extent, a developmental rationality, which are reflected in the rhetorical schemata identified throughout. These relationships are catalogued in Table 4.3. For example, the primary theme identified in response to the research question that sought reasons for internationalization was that of the university’s responsibility to the state. This theme is largely deployed throughout the
documents in a way that suggests that this is specifically related to the state’s economic need, as opposed to other needs that may have been identified with the state, for example, democratic engagement, community service, or even enhanced access to affordable higher education for state citizens underrepresented in universities.

Throughout the documents, discourses were most commonly animated by economic rationality, which moralized the entrepreneurial abilities of students and faculty, commodified international students, and generally aligned the university with the demands of the global capitalist market. At the same time, various sites of tension or contradiction and the presence of potentially subversive discourses suggest that neoliberal governmentality is neither natural nor neutral, and provide spaces of potential resistance. It is not possible to stand in a neutral place outside of discourse, but university subjects may make use of existing, marginalized discourses to challenge the hegemonic motivations and means of internationalization with which they disagree. For example, in discourse samples 2 and 3, from the University of Wisconsin-Madison (2008) and Michigan State University (2006) respectively, contradictions between economic responsibilities to state or national governments and responsibilities to a global good may be taken up by university subjects who seek a more developmental outcome to internationalization efforts. Thus, global responsibilities may be framed as a commitment to build educational capacity in developing nations in ways that respect the wants and needs of local communities, rather than in ways that merely imbricate those communities more deeply into a transnational economic system.
The potential for deploying many of the most common themes using a different rationality, and/or to use it toward different ends, always exists and is most evident in the case of conflicting (or potentially conflicting) ideologies identified in the documents. Nonetheless, overall the documents overwhelmingly reflect the hegemony of neoliberal governmentality, suggesting the difficulty involved in the task of resignifying discourse for use as counter-conducts.

In the following subsections of this chapter, I discuss the predominance of neoliberal discourse and economic rationality and the marginalized discourses and the deployment of developmental rationality, which were identified in the Big Ten internationalization documents. I also examine the ways in which the corpus constructs and assigns varying values to neoliberal university subjects, as well as other kinds of subjects who are either explicitly or implicitly constructed, or elided in the discourse entirely, and the potential contradictions of state, national, and global citizenship. Finally, I discuss the ways that university internationalization illustrates the contradictions of the increasingly deterritorialized nature of capital and the changing role of state and national governments, before presenting some trajectories for future research and practice.

Neoliberal Discourse and Economic Rationality

The predominance of economic rationality within the rhetorical schemata, and the neoliberal discourses through which this rationality is deployed throughout the corpus, suggests that the Big Ten internationalization planning documents are largely intended to construct university subjects who will make rational, market-driven choices in their university roles and beyond. Further, following neoliberal governmentality, these choices
are framed as contributions to the economic good of the university population and other interested parties, in particular the state and the nation. For example, the importance of global awareness is emphasized because of the competitive economic advantage that it might give an individual domestic student, and thereby, the state or U.S. economy in discourse sample 2, from the University of Wisconsin-Madison (2008).

This economic rationality is in part asserted through the neoliberal moralization of one’s ability to comply with it. If governance through biopower maps and manages a population with particular qualities and distributions, then each individual subject must do their part to contribute to its fulfillment. Failure to do so is configured as a personal failing, rather than a failure of governance or its demands. Compliance is achieved through other means as well. For instance, technically faculty may not be required to incorporate global perspectives into their curriculum and pursue research abroad. However, discourses of entrepreneurial self-governance (re)define and (re)orient two core elements of their professional identities – teaching and research – in ways that will make their university competitive in a global knowledge economy, as seen in discourse sample 3 from Michigan State University (2006). Thus, tenure and promotion may become increasingly linked to faculty’s ability to comply with the demands of a global knowledge economy, as was seen in the theme around incentivizing and rewarding faculty participation in internationalization efforts. This is an exemplar of what Foucault described as a technologies of the self, wherein individuals are held to be responsible for conducting themselves in ways that will benefit not only themselves but also a greater collective good (Lemke, 2001).
Although most Big Ten internationalization planning documents were collectively authored by various members of the university faculty and administration, frequently they were commissioned by administrators and were presumably subject to administrative review prior to being made publically available. Therefore, the documents are likely broadly aligned with the interests of the university administration. However, undoubtedly there was negotiation around the creation of the texts from its various contributing authors, which would have contributed to the polyvalence of the documents. Indeed, in cases where authors were cited in the documents, in most cases these included a mixture of both faculty and administrators. Fairclough (1995) suggested that the heterogeneity of such public types of texts might be intentional to their design, providing a necessary space for contestation around their application. Thus, even as a particular rationality operates to construct beliefs, values, identities, and practices in ways that make it appear natural and neutral, in every discursive instance individuals may reinscribe, subvert, or resignify.

For example, sample 1 largely framed its effort to recruit international as a means to capture a particular segment of students, deploying both market and diversity discourses. However, the university’s desire to attract and retain international students may also be taken up by international students or prospective international students themselves, to serve their own ends. An international student might therefore suggest that the university would improve its ability to attract international students if it addressed the instances of racism they often encounter (Lee & Rice, 2007). Although there were many
suggestions throughout the corpus that the university should improve international student experiences, rarely was discrimination or racism explicitly addressed.

However, when international students use existing discourses to their own ends, this does not necessarily entail rejection of economic rationality. According to Rhee and Sagaria (2004) international students may “voluntarily reconstitute their identities across national borders to actively engage in and enrich global capitalism,” for their own gains, thereby preserving “the elite status of U.S.-educated international students beyond its borders and the proud U.S. claim of being an educator of world leaders” (p. 91). Indeed, counter-conducts do not usually challenge the intended ends of government, but rather enact different means to achieve those ends (Suspitsyna, 2010). This suggests that even if they experience a subordinate positionality, international students are subjectified according to the same neoliberal governmentality as their domestic counterparts. Indeed, discourse sample 1 from Indiana University (2008) suggested that, as with any other member of the university population, prospective international students are also expected to adhere to the demands of neoliberal subjecthood, the first step being to make an economically rational decision about the higher education market.

**Marginalized Discourses and Developmental Rationality**

Despite the dominance of economic rationality, simultaneous use of non-economic rationalities – in particular, developmental rationality, or the commitment by higher education institutions in the global North to aid in the capacity building of the global South - in the documents suggests that universities balance competing commitments and motivations. Throughout the corpus, in addition to meeting campus
needs, universities recognized various obligations to the state, the nation, and an ambiguously defined global community.

Hartmann (2010) argued that the “current internationalisation strategy of higher education challenges [a] national orientation and highlights the role of higher education in building a global knowledge society as an imagined community” (p. 170). This global orientation aligns with a theme found throughout the corpus as one of the key motivations for internationalization: university responsibility to respond to global challenges. As part of the argument for international faculty research, sample 3 from Michigan State University (2006) called on the university to “mobilize its best minds to address critical issues at the intersection of the natural sciences, social sciences and humanities, and of the local and global” (paragraph f). Sample 2, from University of Wisconsin-Madison (2008), argued “that education and research should be applied to solve problems and improve health, quality of life, the environment and agriculture for all citizens of the state, the nation, and the world” (paragraph a). The use of developmental rationality in these samples suggests that through their international efforts universities may believe they will help create a more democratic, equitable world.

Stier (2004) and Bolsmann and Miller (2008) found a similar heterogeneity of ideologies in their studies of the motivations that drive internationalization. Using these rationalities, members of the university community can work toward non-economically-determined internationalization goals, such as activities that “enable a sense of global community and solidarity and prevent ethnocentrism, racism and self-righteousness” (Stier, 2004, p. 89). Although developmental rationality and economic rationality both
occur in the planning documents, it may be difficult to enact both equally in practice. For example, many documents in the corpus indicated a commitment to mutually beneficial partnerships as a part of a strategy to help address global challenges. However, the contingency of commitment to a certain issue and partnership can be gleaned from the repeated emphasis by universities in the documents that they must be a global higher education leader. How likely is it that a partnership will truly be reciprocal if one of the partners has preemptively declared itself the leader, and one party has more resources or other form of power than the other? Given the dominance of economic rationality in neoliberal governmentality, a developmental program may be more likely to be enacted by a university if it also offers economic benefits, and may be terminated once it is no longer financially expedient. Furthermore, developmental rationality may be interpreted by some to mean economic development, and therefore have little concern for other areas of development, such as improved health outcomes.

Hence, merely because the potential for marginalized discourses or rationalities to be deployed as counter-conducts exists does not mean it will always be possible to enact these. Despite Foucault’s emphasis on power being dispersive rather than wholly concentrated or enacted from above, power is nonetheless not evenly distributed. If maximization of economic resources is driving university internationalization, a single individual’s effort to draw on contradictory discourses in order to enact developmental counter-conducts will not necessarily create an effective disruption of economic rationality. In some cases, it may be deemed too risky to enact these counter-conducts at all. For example, even if international students feel their position at the university is not
only commodified but possibly a source of racial resentment, the means by which they are able to resist this position may be limited by the precarious fact that they must remain in good standing to remain in the U.S. on their student visa. As such, even if a single instance of text contains multiple potentialities and sites of contradiction, not all discourses may be equally enacted as counter-conducts; rather, particular discourses and conducts must also be understood as situated within certain differential material power relations.

Further, even “successful” outcomes from these counter-conducts will be imbued with their own contested ideologies, and may nonetheless end up serving the ends of the dominant rationality. Thus, in the case of developmental rationality, arguing that a university has an ethical responsibility to offer higher education to international students may perpetuate ethnocentrism and “lead to accusations of Western cultural imperialism and of claims of global hegemony” (Stier, 2004, p. 89). Indeed, some universities in the global North take advantage of their position in relation to partners in the global South (Altbach, 2004), even if asymmetries of power are masked through the construct of higher education as a global market characterized by individual choice. For example, Dixon (2006) found that Thai students in an Australian exchange program were characterized as free to choose whether or not to accept Western pedagogy, despite the students’ expressed belief that they must do so in order to make Thailand competitive.

U.S. higher education has a lengthy history of engaging in international activities that have led to accusations of its complicity in war and imperialism (Giroux, 2007). Often, the imperialism identified in these cases can be framed as both economically and
developmentally rational, even as it is more physically violent than the pedagogical and epistemic imperialism described in the case of Thai students studying in Australia. For example, the disciplines of geography and anthropology have both engaged in internal debates about the role of their fields and its professionals in the U.S. government’s post-September 11 commitment to mapping "human terrain” in the service of military operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the ongoing, dispersive War on Terror (Wainwright, 2013). It is possible in these instances for professors, as university employees, to make an economically rational choice to receive federal funding for human terrain research, and for these individuals and the university to feel as if they are engaged in developmental processes of nation-building and the spread of liberal social and economic values. However, this does not negate the fact that some would call these scholarly acts conducted in the service of U.S. imperialism.

**Neoliberal University Subjects**

Biopolitical management of a population is productive, in that it does not primarily repress individuals who do not adhere to a single idealized vision of subjecthood. Rather, they affect the constitution and ordering of individuals as subjects through varying normative mechanisms, creating an “optimization of systems of difference, in which the field is left open to fluctuating processes, in which minority individuals and practices are tolerated, in which action is brought to bear on the rules of the game rather than the players,” (Foucault, 1978-1979/2008, pp. 259-260). Thus, biopower distributes “the living in the domain of value and utility…it effects distributions around the norm” (Foucault, 1990, p. 144). According to Chow (as cited in Puar, 2007),
Foucault’s work on biopower implicitly acknowledges the ascendancy of whiteness in the modern Western world, but in a way that also incorporates racial and ethnic difference in its ordering efforts. The internationalization planning documents operate to affect these systems of difference amongst the university population, so that all individuals are subject to ordering and assigned varying values.

The discourses of the internationalization planning documents construct a domestic student who participates in internationalization activities as the most valuable subject, and although none of the documents specify the race or ethnicity of a prototypical domestic student, it is possible to deduce this from their very absence. According to Roshanravan (2012) university study abroad initiatives, and one may arguably extend this to other international initiatives as well, “cente[r] a normative Euro-American ‘local’ as the seat of modernity against which the culturally different and geographically distant realm of the ‘global’ becomes legible” (Roshanravan, 2012, p. 1). Indeed, efforts to emphasize the importance of cultural diversity often implicitly construct Whiteness as “an invisible, homogenous standard” against which the outside/Other is measured by its difference (Ashcraft & Allen, 2003, p. 15). Throughout the corpus it was a common theme that the recruitment of more international students would enhance the diversity of the university community, which signals the presumption that the normative domestic U.S. university student is White, and upholds the popular idea that diversity in higher education “can help White students become more racially tolerant, liven up class dialogue, and prepare White students for getting a job in a multicultural, global economy” (Yosso, Parker, Solorzano, & Lynn, 2004, p. 8).
The answer to the question of why universities must recruit from abroad in order to find and foster a diverse population may lie at least in part in class. For if the internationally-inclined neoliberal domestic student is ideally White, they are also ideally upper or middle class, able to afford not only entry into the university but also to pursue study abroad and other costly international opportunities. Thus, although certain international students may not be White, they may be recruited because of their material resources and ability to pay the full cost of attendance. Although not discussing college students in particular, Koshy (2001) suggested that expanded opportunities for highly-educated Asian immigrants to enter the U.S. is a result of perceived needs of the global economy, and may be used “as evidence that the racial problems of the 1960s have been resolved” (p. 190). In higher education in particular, the increased efforts on recruitment of wealthy international students may increasingly serve as the primary source of racial or ethnic diversity, and replace efforts to recruit and retain minority domestic students. According to Koshy (2001) “Whiteness dissembles race privilege as fitness-within-capitalism and recruits highly skilled middle-class and recruits wealthy new immigrants to endorse this narrative of American color-blind equality” (pp. 193-194). This also suggests that some immigrants or domestic students are not biopolitically constructed as “value-added Americans” (p. 194).

Class therefore complications notions of normative Whiteness in the context of what Robinson and Harris have identified as a “transnationalist capitalist class” (as cited in Koshy, 2001, p. 192). Universities may recruit non-White students from this class, because they simultaneously serve “to showcase U.S. multiculturalism and equal
opportunity,” while following the properly neoliberal goals of “success in a system that purports to reward the capitalist virtues of hard work, striving, and self-sufficiency” (pp. 192-193). Given the internationalization documents’ biopolitical production of difference as more or less valuable in neoliberal subjects, recruitment of international students must be further contextualized and qualified. Following Chow, Puar (2007) argued that in addition to material and cultural capital, the “tolerable ethnic” within liberal diversity discourses is also usually straight and male. She suggested that “the homosexual other is white, the racial other is straight” (p. 32), as embodying more than one minority subject position might disqualify their tolerability. How, then, do the internationalization planning documents construct positionality of international students who may be from a geopolitically suspect country of origin, little material means, and/or any sexual orientation other than heterosexual?

In fact, these subjects tend to be left out of the internationalization planning documents’ neoliberal subjectification altogether. Because life always exceeds techniques of power (Foucault, 1990) beyond the available subject positions, spaces of illegibility demonstrate the effects of neoliberal biopolitical normalization, as well as its limits, and therefore the possibilities that exceed its administration. The degree of alterity that is permitted in the context of university internationalization efforts is not without bounds. Normalization of neoliberal subjeckhood and the accompanying governmentalities police certain boundaries in order to determine appropriate degrees of difference. The international student whose class position allows them to pay to study in the U.S. may be welcomed on campus. Although international students may be considered and treated as
less valuable university subjects than the White, wealthy student, they are nonetheless recognized by the university as legitimate members of the community.

The qualified embrace of particular international students by U.S. universities may be a means of avoiding the threat of alterities perceived to be too dangerous, ungovernable, or otherwise undesirable for a university population. As Puar (2007), Chow (as cited in Puar, 2007), and Koshy (2001) suggest, difference is not just an afterthought but a primary element in the construction of normalized neoliberal subjects, from the ideal to the abject, across race, nationality, gender, sexuality, and citizenship. In this way, neoliberal governmentality orders a population via the construction of subjects that are deemed more or less desirable, and those who are categorically excluded. If the economic rationality of neoliberal governmentality continues to suffocate other modes of being and thinking as subjects within a university, it may be that the current barriers to higher education access for students, both domestic and international, from devalued backgrounds will continue to expand over time.

Further, any institutional commitment to internationalization that is made on the basis of diversity must also take into consideration the ways in which this commitment might affect or intersect the institution’s commitment to diversity amongst students from the U.S. Norohna (1992) and Fowler (2006) both suggested that combining these commitments could ensure that universities are addressing intercultural relationships in responsible ways. Yet while there is considerable potential for means to integrate commitments to both domestic and international student diversity, there is also a possibility that the presence of international students may be deemed preferable to that of
domestic students of color, particularly if the latter do not occupy desirable class positions. Any effort to resist or even merely understand the effects of neoliberal governmentality in higher education on the experiences of differently-valued subjects both within and outside of the university must therefore take into account the place of capital and the changing roles of state and nation in relation to the targeted recruitment of students from the “transnationalist capitalist class.”

**Deterritorialized Capital and the Changing Roles of the State and Nation**

Despite Foucault’s (1978-1979/2008) contention that “the state is nothing else but the mobile effect of a regime of multiple governmentalities” (p. 77), much of his discussion of governmentality, and that of other scholars of governmentality, focused on governmentalization of the State (e.g. Brown, 2003). In many cases governmentality establishes the physical and conceptual limits of its own political authority over subjects of a particular nation (Rose & Miller, 1992). Perhaps it is the case that neoliberal governmentality creates a “new topography of the social” (Lemke, 2001, p. 203) for the very reason that its “[m]arket rationality knows no culture or country, and administrators are, as the economists say, fungible” (Brown, 2003, para. 27). Given the dominant role of market or economic rationality in neoliberal governmentality, it may be that the emphasis of university internationalization is on managing “the ensemble of mechanisms and tactics through which a conducive social environment for capital accumulation emerges, renews, or even improves” (Mendovi, 2007, p. 57).

I do not suggest that for a university, the primary object of concern with regard to capital is its "accumulation" for the university itself, or for accumulation’s sake, with the
exception of for-profit institutions. However, particularly given the decline in state and national funding, public universities operate under conditions and consideration of the increasingly deteritorialized nature of capital, even as they are also obliged to serve state and national governments, i.e. specific territories. As capital has become increasingly untethered from previously more considerable spatio-temporal constraints, the response by many governments has been to revise their former functions and emphasize creation of a “good business climate” (Harvey, 2006, p. 106). Growing emphasis on efficiency, the use of corporate governing models (through new managerialism), and the push for faculty to create profit-producing intellectual property can be understood as an effort to create this climate at universities. Further, given that “capital can only reproduce itself by ultimately transgressing the boundaries of neighborhood, home, and region,” the state or national government may conduct itself “as protector of those boundaries” (Ferguson as cited in Reddy, 2011, p. 163). Public universities are therefore microcosms of tensions between territorial state and national interests and the circulation of capital between porous geographical boundaries. Internationalization may be the example par excellence of these tensions, and the sometimes-contradictory efforts on the part of public universities to resolve them.

Such tensions were in fact evident throughout the corpus of Big Ten internationalization planning documents, even as universities not only aligned themselves with the state and nation, but also sometimes positioned themselves as a metonym for them. Despite the steady decline in direct state financial support of public universities (Kiley, January 2012), including the Big Ten, there was a pronounced emphasis in the
corpus on internationalization as a means of serving the state, in particular its economic needs. The dynamics of international student recruitment illustrate the tensions involved in the universities’ dual position as both a part of and reliant on the state. I have argued that, as per the documents in the Big Ten corpus, targeted recruitment of certain international students can be largely understood according to an economic rationality, motivated by the ability for these students to bring in more resources to the university (either directly through their out-of-state tuition, or indirectly through external sponsorships or raising the profile of the university). Yet, given the fact that university expansion can only happen gradually, and even then has limits on enrollment, a tension emerges: if international students take up more available spots, there are less spots open for students who come from in-state.

Although the intensification of international student recruitment may create revenues for the university that make up for some of the gap left by state defunding, many state citizens may see little benefit from these efforts, either economic or otherwise. This in turn may contribute to resentment on behalf of domestic students, which, if gone unaddressed by the university, may exacerbate violent or unpleasant conditions experienced by international students in U.S. universities, in particular the xenophobic racism described by Lee and Rice (2007). Thus, international student recruitment exemplifies the university’s ambivalent position with regard to its responsibilities to serve a specific territory (the state and at times the nation), and its need to secure sources of funding in an era of mobile capital and decreased public financial support.
Similarly, if the justification for cultivating “global competency” in in-state students is to make them more competitive in an age of “outsourcing and migration of labor,” as is suggested in discourse sample 2 from the University of Wisconsin-Madison (2008), it is not clear what benefit this would have to the state’s citizens without college education, who would remain vulnerable to job cuts due to outsourcing and other shifts in capital investment. Although the university might frame study abroad as an important investment for the state in its students qua human capital, given the rapid mobility of capital in a globalized age as well as the fairly continuous relative immobility of labor, it is unclear who beyond students themselves, their future employers, and perhaps the university if it receives alumni donations from students, will benefit from this investment.

Although economic growth may be successfully framed through neoliberal governmentality as benefiting the public good, these twelve Big Ten internationalization planning documents suggest a tenuous connection between the state population as a whole and economically-driven internationalization efforts. Olssen and Peters (2005) suggested that neoliberalization of education may be part of an incremental move toward full privatization of education, so perhaps these universities have calculated that they are better off cutting ties to the state entirely, and the states may have calculated the same. Similarly, the universities may believe globalization of the higher education market to be beneficial, rather than an existential threat. Growing middle classes in places like China and India, locations specifically identified as target recruitment locations for international students by Michigan State University in sample 2 and by other planning documents in the corpus, are a potential pool of students who may be willing and able to pay full-
tuition while also contributing to the university’s diversity. The global education market described by many of the Big Ten universities may be a self-fulfilling prophecy: this global market exists and continues to grow at least in part because these universities make it so, by expanding recruitment activities abroad and enacting other internationalization efforts.

In the case of prestigious public universities like those in the Big Ten, privatization may not significantly disrupt ongoing operations, as these schools may be able to attract students willing and able to pay high tuition costs, and receive grants and external investments from other sources. Internationalization efforts, including international student enrollment, may therefore help these schools to maintain financial stability. Yet while these schools may successfully recruit students from the “transnational capitalist class” described by Robinson and Harris (as cited in Koshy, 2001, p. 192), the approaches taken by these institutions may not necessarily translate to other, less prestigious public institutions. These other schools may have smaller endowments, less wealthy alumni bases, and lower national rankings. These schools may not weather the continued decline of state funding, nor be able to make up for these losses through internationalization or other revenue-seeking efforts. It may therefore be that higher education becomes increasingly out of reach for many in-state students.

Resisting Neoliberal Discourse

According to Davies and Bansel (2007) neoliberal discourse “competes with other discourses and cannibalizes them in such a way that neoliberalism itself appears more desirable, or more innocent than it is” (p. 259). This study was an effort to understand
how planning documents serve as tools of university internationalization when internationalization is understood as a technology of neoliberal governmentality in higher education. Not only does economic rationality emerge as hegemonic, providing pointed, market-driven direction to faculty research and international student recruitment targets, but even the presence of potentially progressive developmental rationality may be put in the service of neoliberal governmentality and result in the commodification of international students, and the spread of neoliberal governmentality across the globe.

Through discourse analysis, the “innocence” of neoliberal discourse in university internationalization planning documents was refuted, and its role in the production and maintenance of neoliberal governmentality was established. Yet Boden and Epstein (2006) argued that it is necessary “not only to analyse and monitor [neoliberal] processes and social dynamics, but to rethink, even re-imagine, possibilities for different futures” (p. 224). How might future research answer the second half of this charge? I began this study by declaring my postionality as someone critical of the hegemony of neoliberal governmentality, both in higher education specifically, and more generally in the U.S. as well as globally. At the same time I made plain my intention not to prescribe particular alternatives to neoliberal governmentality, other than identifying what I might find in the documents. I took this stance for two reasons: the first is recognition that not everyone may view neoliberal governmentality as a problem. Indeed, it may be that there are those who read the results of this study and are pleased with the dominance of neoliberal discourses and economic rationality in this corpus that will help constitute university subjects and drive internationalization efforts. More important, however, is my
recognition that there is no single, totalizing means of resistance to any problematic, and thus, I do not wish to dictate this.

Nonetheless, I do believe in the need to engage critically with neoliberal governmentality and its effects on higher education, including the role played by university internationalization. This is not merely because of the effects of neoliberal governmentality in the limited space of higher education, but also because university subjects governed by neoliberal governmentality bring these mentalities with them after graduation. As Suspitsyna (2012) argued with regard to higher education, “no reform can occur with disregard to the nation’s neoliberal economic setting and its narrow definition of higher education” (p. 67). The same is true in reverse: no reform of the nation’s neoliberal economic setting can occur with disregard to the role of higher education in creating, reproducing, and possibly resisting, the hegemony of this entrepreneurial mentality.

In the case of internationalization specifically, when guided by neoliberal governmentality these efforts normalize not just on a national level but also on a global scale the idea that pursuit of higher education is firstly a question of economic gain. These gains are not necessarily evenly distributed, and in fact may come to some as a result of others’ losses. Thus, while I do not provide an outline for exactly what should be done to resist current internationalization efforts, I do provide what Foucault (1977-1978/2007) described as “conditional imperatives”: “if you want to struggle, here are some key points, here are some lines of force, here are some constrictions and blockages. In other words, I would like these imperatives, around unsettling the notion of public and
private spheres, and troubling the notion of “global citizenship” in internationalization discourse, “to be no more than tactical pointers” (p. 3).

**Unsettling the notion of public versus private spheres.**

Davies and Bansel (2007) argued that one of the means by which neoliberal governmentality has been installed is “through producing the illusion of each institution inventing the process itself, voluntarily taking neoliberal strategies up in the interests of competing in the local and global market as well as competing for increasingly scarce government funding” (p. 251). The irony is that although throughout the corpus internationalization is often framed as a means to better serve the state, in fact internationalization efforts (such as international student recruitment or international research grant projects) appear to be in part motivated by the need to make up for revenues lost from a steady and precipitous decline in state funding. Elision of this fact suggests the inevitability and desirability of neoliberalism, obfuscating government’s conscious withdrawal from previously public spheres like education, and thus, the active making of these into private areas.

This has led some who have problematized neoliberalism in higher education to argue for the need to emphasize higher education as a public good and as a primary site for developing democratic civic engagement (Giroux, 2002; Nussbaum, 2010). Advocacy for such a move is framed as a means to protect the university and the citizenry in general from the encroachment of corporate logics. Yet, as Suspitsyna pointed out (2012), a model such as the one proposed by Giroux erringly presupposes a universal set of values held by a cohesive “public,” which disregards significant epistemological differences and
disparate positions of power and influence amongst heterogeneous participants. Additionally, emphasizing a return to or reimagination of the public sphere ignores the role of the mass media in disseminating neoliberal ideology. Finally, if, as Suspitsyna suggested, the social functions of higher education have already been successfully “re-signified as promotion of national competitiveness and the global market” (p. 67), then the kind of democratic engagement described by Giroux may be insufficient for fostering the conceptualization of viable alternatives.

To further extend this critique of the reclamation of a democratic public sphere as a central means for challenging neoliberal governmentality in higher education and university internationalization specifically, it is necessary to reconsider the viability of continued analysis through the prism of the strict binaries of public versus private spheres, and government versus civil society. Through neoliberal governmentality, the government reconfigures the accepted boundaries of the public and private spheres. In doing so, the government adjusts its role to that of organizing and optimizing its population’s participation in the growth of markets by ensuring free trade, repealing regulations, and privatizing previously public programs such as healthcare or welfare (Saunders, 2010). Conceptualizing the shifting role of government in this way nonetheless maintains the presumption that, however it may be re-drawn, some clear boundary between public and private spheres naturally exists, and that these spheres are experienced independently as such. To understand how failure to examine this presumption limits the possibilities for critical evaluation of neoliberal governmentality and its effects requires reconsideration of the roots of neoliberalism – liberalism itself.
Classical liberal political theory presumes the separation of public and private spheres. In this formulation, according to Harris (2006), “[t]he public sphere is the domain of politics and government; the domain of the private sphere is identified sometimes with ‘the market’ sometimes with ‘the family,’ sometimes more broadly with ‘civil society’” (p. 1563). Given government’s role as being clearly limited to the public sphere in this formulation, individuals are expected to govern themselves in the private sphere; failure to do so is seen as a moral shortcoming, and may result in government interference for the benefit of serving the good of the rest of the population. Neoliberalism heightens these notions of individual responsibility by extending the domain of the private to encompass areas formerly designated as belonging to the public sphere and thus, the government’s responsibility. Yet because this reshifting of boundaries is only made possible through the interventions of the government, even if the government presents its obligations to citizens as somehow lessened in neoliberal governmentality, and plays a less directly intervening role, its powerful organizational role is not reduced. The significance of the government’s organizational role is underscored by Foucault’s (1990) emphasis on the administrative nature of governmentality and biopower – and in particular, the role these play in the organization of capitalist production.

Nonetheless, critical evaluation of the outcomes that result from the retreat of the government’s direct involvement in many areas of what is (or was once) perceived as the public sphere (including public higher education), may stimulate discussion about the desirability of increasingly universalized application of economic rationality across all
areas of life. Such discussions should eschew analyses reliant on what Harris (2006) called “anti-political economy,” or “the figuring of market institutions as governed by natural laws of supply and demand, economic analysis as a value-free, and the sphere of the market itself as pre-political” (p. 1564). To put it another way, in order to understand, and potentially challenge, the hegemony of neoliberal governmentality in higher education, it is necessary to go beyond a framework centered on mapping the increased role of economic rationality in university decisions, or calling for a “return” to a romanticized notion of the public university of the past. Thus, part of the task is to recognize and historicize the fact that neither public nor private spheres are independent from either the state or economic relations, but are rather immanently inscribed by both.

At the same time, recognizing that the state is no longer the only source of governance, and questioning the boundaries of public and private spheres does not preclude attendance to the way that the state “remains the fulcrum of political legitimacy in late modern nations” (Brown, 2006, p. 83). In fact, according to Brown, any accounting and subsequent challenge to governmentality would necessarily “attend not only to the production, organization, and mobilization of subjects by a variety of powers but also to the problem of legitimizing these operations by the singularly accountable object in the field of political power” (p. 83). All of this suggests the need for the field of higher education to engage in more scholarship that critically examines the political economic milieu in which internationalization efforts occur, and how this aligns with greater trends within universities. More sophisticated conceptualization of the relationships between universities and broader transnational neoliberal economic and
political systems would better foster the reimagination of a different role for higher education.

**Beyond global citizenship.**

Vague but frequent calls were issued throughout the Big Ten internationalization planning documents for students to develop and embrace “global citizenship.” The idea that one can be more or less of a global citizen suggests one may be more or less implicated in the lives of others around the globe, and vice versa, despite many clarion calls to the contrary. Nonetheless, there is a notion in the documents that in order to be “marketable,” students should procure particular certifications of “global citizenship,” for example by studying abroad, or learning a new language. Those able and willing to procure these legitimized certifications may be “winners” in the present economy, and those who do not may lose, even though all parties are equally imbricated in a system of transnational political and economic relations.

Despite the Big Ten universities’ emphasis on “global citizenship,” the remainder of the global population likely rests entirely outside of the (admittedly porous) boundaries of the population presently envisaged by the state and the university through its administration of neoliberal governmentality. Although this area “beyond” is not conceived as part of the university population, and its people are non-subjects due little consideration except in the most abstract sense, the global “out there” is nonetheless crucial to the concept of internationalization and its related activities. After all, there can be no “global citizens” without the global. Every biopolitical population not only consists of individuals whom are subjectified with varying life chances, depending on their
perceived value to the population as a whole; it also has a constitutive outside, so that it is defined and made possible as much by its limits as by own population.

Categorical separation of local and global citizenship often relies on a reification of a binary between the United States and the rest of the world, in particular Asia, Africa and the rest of the Americas. Given that, despite (a highly circumscribed) embrace of multiculturalism, the normative US subject remains White, Roshanravan (2012) argued that people of color within the United States disrupt this “binary by virtue of their racialized inhabitation of a geopolitical space where they are always potential outsiders and never complete insiders to the US national imaginary” (p. 16). Although these students’ “daily encounters with racism and ethnocentrism make them painfully competent in issues of diversity and cross-cultural difference,” their experiences are not considered legitimate markers of global citizenship (p. 9). The effect, according to Roshanvaran, is to “erase the subordinated cultural differences inhabited by US people of color,” and suggest “‘global competence’ is the domain of white/Anglo knowers” (p. 9).

Combined with a generalized neoliberal notion of citizenship as self-entrepreneurialism, this points to a notion of “global citizenship” that is primarily a depoliticized and deracinated means to ensure that individual students, particularly White U.S. domestic students from middle and upper classes, will be marketable to potential employers. The relative vacuity of the “global citizenship” concept can be seen in the example of controversies around the use of foreign sweatshop labor in production of official university apparel (Silvey, 2002). It is unlikely that a university administration would encourage its students to identify too strongly with these fellow “global citizens,”
who decisively operate outside of the knowledge economy in which students are encouraged to imagine themselves.

Thus, in the documents global citizenship is not encouraged, for example, as a means to either explore the historical and ongoing political and economic international engagements of the U.S., or to cultivate ethical cross-cultural relationships. This is also evidenced in paragraph d of sample 2 from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, wherein the list of the interconnections between different areas of the world is presented as geographically, politically and economically neutral, and wealth and health disparities, global commodity chains, and (neo)colonial histories are absent. In this sample and throughout the documents, potentially critical engagements with the contradictions between state, national, and global citizenship obligations go unexplored while the explicitly entrepreneurial economic obligations of state and national citizenship are discursively overdetermined.

I would suggest that this kind of critical engagement with “the global” and the place of higher education in it is exactly what is demanded in response to a neoliberal governmentality that largely orders not just internationalization but the whole of university life. Apart from examining transnational political economic contexts, this would require engaging politics of alterity, both globally and locally, which Reddy (2011) described as “crucial to any project that strives not only for social justice but also for a participatory and radical democracy” (p. 148). However, the struggle for this kind of democratic engagement would differ from that which is demanded by those calling for reclamation of a democratic public sphere, although it would not necessarily contradict
such efforts either. Instead of reestablishing the boundaries between public and private, local and global, the focus of this critical engagement would be to wrestle with those boundaries, putting pressure on points of contradiction so as to open up new possibilities for relationality and responsibility beyond entrepreneurial economic notions of state and national citizenship, and apolitical notions of global citizenship.

Merely exploring sites of contradiction and the attendant politics, however, is unlikely to produce significantly concentrated sites of resistance to neoliberal governmentality that would seriously challenge its hegemony. This is evidenced by the saturation of neoliberal discourses and economic rationality within the Big Ten universities’ internationalization planning documents. Given this hegemony and its ties to the economic imperatives of the state and the nation, there are significant limits on the imagination and enactment of non-economic roles for higher education in the current moment. In response, Shahjahan (2012) has argued that although refusals “to buy into neoliberal personhood...could enable us to collectively mobilize for social change in higher education” (pp. 14-15, emphasis his), this alone will not create viable alternatives. The same could be said of the limitations on the imagination of university internationalization. Reimagining what is possible in higher education will therefore require actively and collectively “envisioning and working toward new subjectivities” (p. 21).

Any attempt to envision new subjectivities must recognize the ways in which a multiplicity of subjectivities currently exist, as well as the ways in which modes of being and thinking in the world exceed sanctioned subjectivities, so as to avoid reproducing the
abjections and negations of neoliberalism in any new vision (Reddy, 2011). One way of doing this is to explore alternative approaches to and meanings of “citizenship.” This could allow moving beyond an emphasis on local citizenship as self-entrepreneurialism, and global citizenship as apolitical exposure to other cultures, toward a more critical engagement with mutual obligations and varied areas of connectedness. Examples of this may be consideration of the ways that the university is implicated in global commodity chains, and/or in the U.S.’s imperial endeavors (both in the past and present).

While this kind of reflection could encompass recognition by students, staff, and faculty of their own positions of power and oppression, and the resultant obligations, Povinelli (2012) argued that a mere “reflexive gesture seems radically insufficient” for analysis of “enmeshment in worlds of power, including colonialism and imperialism” (p. 83). Further, any effort to affect resignification of the term “citizenship” would require significant solidarity to challenge the hegemony of its popular meanings. Engaging queer of color critique could provide the necessary “tension between on the one hand, politics understood as submitting to and engaging with a distinct political process and, on the other hand, politics understood as the material elaboration of cultural forms and subjects” (Reddy, 2011 p. 170). These tensions can reveal that institutional legibility “of a social formation does not exhaust existing social possibilities of that formation” (p. 170), and in turn make those possibilities more apparent by demonstrating not only the relative value assigned to certain subjects produced by, but also the limits of coherency within, the present neoliberal hegemony of higher education and internationalization. To lay bare these spaces of negation and incoherence thus disrupts the stability of existing
governmentalities, demanding the imagination of “our collective abjections and negations” (p. 181).

Part of this exploration may be examination of exactly who a university, state, or nation, in a biopolitical imaginary, considers to be part of its population and therefore, its citizenry. In addition to consideration of the example of the sweatshop workers who produce university apparel abroad, this would provide, for example, a space for consideration of how outsourcing custodial services as a cost-saving measure excludes recognition of these service workers as members of the university population, and therefore also precludes their ability acquire benefits such as tuition remission. I suggest, following Reddy (2011), that given the fact that not all claims to citizenship are equally validated, it is necessary to “ask how the promulgation of a politics of citizenship…might further the ends of neoliberalism rather than thwart them” (p. 153). In other words, asking how certain constructions of citizenship (in any kind of population) enable production of subjects with varying values and life chances, and also exclude certain individuals from membership in the population at all. Engagement with internationalization and notions of global citizenship through queer of color critique may also be enriched through transnational and Women of Color feminist perspectives, which again may provide spaces for critique as well as collective reimagining and action. Transnational feminist practice, according to Mohanty (2002), “depends on building feminist solidarities across the divisions of place, identity, class, work, belief, and so on,” in order to “forge informed, self-reflexive solidarities” (p. 530).
It is possible for university internationalization to exist beyond those limited modalities of accumulation and self-valorization that are prescribed by neoliberal governmentality. However, in order to be enacted, such modalities must first be envisioned and negotiated, so as to situate their place in the context of the mutable obligations that might accompany what Mohanty (2002) described as “transborder democratic citizenship” (p. 528). In order to affect changes that could challenge the present increasingly-global hegemony of neoliberal subjecthood and its attendant expectations, this citizenship must necessarily engage various communities and individuals with a stake in the project. Processes of collective imagination, reflection, and action may be provided through engagement with political economic critique, as well as the application of queer of color critique, and Women of Color and transnational feminist critique and praxis, to university internationalization and U.S. higher education more generally. This could in turn open up the “different futures” evoked by Boden and Epstein (2006) and the “new subjectivities” called for by Shahjahan (2012) in ways that do not foreclose the possibility of a truly participatory and radical democracy, not just through participation in a university or territorial community but also as a member of a transborder democratic citizenry. To do so would be to “remain in the obligations that we find ourselves responding to and at the same time understand the arts of governance that disrupt and contain and redirect these immanent modes of obligation” (Povinelli, 2012, p. 83).

In spite of the hegemony of neoliberal governmentality, evidenced by the overcoding of discourses of economic rationalism and entrepreneurialism within the Big
Ten universities’ internationalization planning documents, universities nonetheless retain sites for the kind of collective critique and reimagination I propose. These discussions may take place in the classrooms or study abroad programs of professors who feel confident in the protection of their academic freedom, in service-learning courses that encourage students to reflect critically on their own positionality vis-à-vis a larger political economic issues, and in other spaces within the university deemed safe by participants for critique of the university itself. The importance of these conversations is not limited to their relation to university internationalization objectives, and neither may the content of these conversations align with the outcomes intended by the commissioners and authors of the planning documents like those reviewed in this study. Nonetheless, officially-sanctioned imperatives to university internationalization may provide openings in which these conversations are nonetheless encouraged, in form if not in content. The same may be said of higher education research that approaches internationalization with a critical eye, again for those staff and faculty who feel sufficiently secure in their position to conduct it. Following in the spirit of Foucault’s “conditional imperatives” (1977-1978/2007), I offer a “tactical pointer” that, for those who wish to resist the hegemony of neoliberal governmentality in higher education, one potential means for doing so is to engage critically with its technologies, like internationalization, and to resignify the tools that make its enactment possible, such as the Big Ten universities internationalization planning documents reviewed in this study.
Implications for Policy

The emphasis of this study has been on the identification of discourse and rationalities of existing internationalization planning documents, and suggestions for possible openings through which these might be subverted by university subjects in efforts to resist the hegemony of neoliberal governmentality. Although Foucault’s emphasis on the dispersive nature of power suggests the importance of localized resistance, I provide a brief set of possible policy implications based on the findings of this study.

Framing study abroad responsibly.

The most commonly identified theme in the corpus of this study was the importance of study abroad. However, the planning documents contained a dearth of descriptions about responsible study abroad practices. Although this open-endedness may be viewed as an opportunity by those administrators, faculty, and students, who wish to enact critical and social justice oriented emphases in their study abroad programs, the documents do not systematically mandate requirement of these emphases. What is emphasized, however, is the value of studying abroad as a means for (domestic) students to enhance their own human capital. In contrast, I suggest that any responsible study abroad program must contain elements of critical reflection, so that students can not only act respectfully toward their host communities during their time abroad, but also gain a greater depth of understanding of their own place in the world, as well as the place of the U.S. more generally. If this is to be substantial, it must include reflection that does not merely emphasize the intensification of global economic integration and what this might
mean for job prospects, but must also consider the effects of economic disparities between different parts of the world, as well as these disparities within different demographic groups in the same geographic location. Additionally, this would include reflection about the political economy of the university itself. One means of implementing this reflection would be for universities to indicate in their internationalization planning documents and subsequent policies the need for pre- and post-study abroad programming.

In her response to calls for more transnational approaches to women’s studies, Roshanravan (2012) suggested an alternative approach to “going global” than one that commonly “re-centers white/Anglo students as consumers and knowers of cultural diversity”: instead of studying abroad, “staying home” (p. 7). Staying home, as Roshanravan frames it, would be part of “an epistemic commitment to see the colonial/racial fractures that shape both one’s cultural, social, and political sensibilities and one’s (lack of) knowledge about differently located peoples and places” and in an effort to “make the United States known through the histories of genocide, enslavement, and hidden global circuits of exploitation that make possible its institutionalized power and wealth” (p. 18). Universities may consider including in their internationalization planning documents the possibility of offering, alongside traditional study abroad offerings, the opportunity for domestic students to “study abroad at home.” Such a program may be created through collaborations between faculty, staff, and university diversity and international offices and programs.
Collaboration between diversity and international offices.

In fact, there are many possible means for offices and programs with a focus on student diversity, and offices focused on international student services, to collaborate on U.S. campuses, even as the mission and structures of these offices and programs tend to differ between institutions. Given the emphasis in the corpus on the diversity that international students bring to a university, and the ambiguous boundaries between what qualifies as domestic and international diversity, universities must consider the ways that their policies and programs around both of these areas may intersect and reinforce, or perhaps contradict, each other. Although the racism experienced by international students may be of a different texture than the racism experienced by domestic students of color (Lee & Rice, 2007), normative Whiteness at universities impacts both domestic students of color, and international students from non-European backgrounds.

When universities emphasize the recruitment of non-European international students’, and encourage students to study abroad outside of Europe, the effect may be not only to reaffirm international students’ outsider position within the university, but it may also erase and devalue the experiences of domestic students of color and the reification of their position “at the ideological intersection of a falsely inclusive multicultural American and the foreign, backward, and always suspect real of the global” (Roshanvaran, 2012, p. 16). Recognizing that the discourses and rationales used to frame recruitment efforts and student services in one office may affect the students served by another office may contribute to greater sensitivity in the creation of programs and services that truly further the equity of the position of all students. However, this is not to
suggest the experiences of international students and domestic students of color are the same, nor is it to suggest that different offices that serve these students are redundant.

In one example, the University of Iowa (2009) created a task force to consider the ways that these concerns intersect, the final report of which suggested, “we view diversity and internationalization as different but deeply and profitably interconnected goals” (p. 1). In this spirit, by exploring collaborations, universities’ diversity and international student offices and programs may create opportunities to combine resources, avoid doubling their efforts, and better serve the needs of all students.

**Engage in institutional auto-critique.**

If universities are serious about their commitment to serve as global leaders and recognize their impact on communities abroad, then this necessarily requires that they engage in ongoing auto-critique. Enshrining this necessity in policy could ensure that this reflection takes place on a regular basis, and in the creation of any new policies and programs. Particularly given the emphasis in so many of the internationalization documents on centralized planning, it would seem appropriate to have voices from various constituencies as a part of these planning processes. At least one element of this centralized review should emphasize critical examination of the ethical implications of any partnerships, including consideration of power imbalances, and reference to what has been learned from prior, similar partnerships. For instance, such a review could require confronting and mitigating the potential for branch campuses to serve as neocolonial outposts of countries in the global North in countries of the global South.
Universities must critique domestic but internationally-focused programs as well, particularly in consideration of their funding sources. For example, universities must evaluate the ethics of research funded by the Department of Defense, particularly given academia’s history of supporting U.S. imperial projects. Although financial considerations must be part of any consideration, if universities are to be more than merely businesses, the ethics of their research engagement must receive critical scrutiny, beyond the requirements, for example, of the institutional review board process.

**Soliciting input from students in policy and program creation.**

Given the emphasis of the documents in this study on the importance of cultivating global citizenship amongst students, universities’ efforts to internationalize must include a greater presence for student voices. Rather than prescribing what students need based solely on economic calculation, I suggest that administrators engage with students to assess their interests and solicit their input on the creation of study abroad programs, as well as pre- and post-study abroad programs. Further, if, as Roshanvaran suggested, students of color often feel that their experiences are not valued in the context of university internationalization, it is essential for universities to consider these voices in their planning, not merely as an afterthought but as an essential part of the process. For example, how might the experience of studying abroad for a student traveling to the country of their heritage differ from the experience of a non-heritage student?

Similarly, given the emphasis in the corpus on international student recruitment, the presence of international students in the planning of policies and programs that will impact them directly (as well as impact future international students), should also be
indicated as a priority within internationalization planning documents. If universities are truly committed to serving international students’ interests instead of merely treating their enrollment as a customer transaction, then greater consideration needs to be given to the quality of their experience, and to addressing instances of racism against them. Ensuring the presence of their voices in internationalization planning may provide a means for universities to better meet their needs and improve their experience in substantial ways.

**Limitations**

It is not possible to predict how members of the university community enact internationalization efforts by considering the discourse of planning documents alone, nor to imagine all the ways that they may draw on marginalized discourses to go against the hegemony evident in the documents. Disregard for local realities in which discursively deployed rationalities play out is a common critique of discourse analysis generally, as well as of text-centered governmentality studies more specifically (McKee, 2009). However, my interest in these documents does not lie in predicting their exact outcomes or exhaustively cataloging all possible resistance, but rather in understanding how the documents discursively construct internationalization so that certain outcomes are made more or less likely through the development of particular mentalities amongst the subjects they hail. This is especially important given that these discourses travel not just across a single university, but also between universities.

Although most people in a university will not read the documents themselves, the discourse within them trickles down through other policies and procedures that affect students, faculty, and staff in their day-to-day university life. In her work on university
women’s commission reports, Allan (1996) cautioned that “just as the discourses of commission reports construct and constrain possibilities for thought, so too do the findings of this study” (p. 65). The findings of my study, in particular the identification of discourses that are marginalized and may be deployed in projects that run counter to dominant rationalities, are therefore not intended to provide an exhaustive inventory of the different possible rationalities that may be used to internationalize U.S. universities. However, the findings nonetheless demonstrate how critical awareness of that discourse can serve as a means for imagining and enacting ways to act and think differently, not only in the case of university internationalization but also in other domains of higher education.

Another limitation of this study is the fact that it focuses entirely on officially-sanctioned, written texts, and does not seek to address how the discourses contained within these formal documents are translated into informal texts, such as departmental meeting minutes, or into the perspectives of individual university subjects, e.g. through analysis of spoken text obtained through interviews. As Childress (2009) found in her survey of internationalization planning documents, many individual schools or departments do indeed produce their own planning documents, apart from a university-wide plan. Nonetheless, as Gaffikin and Perry (2009) pointed out in their discourse analysis of universities’ strategic plans, analysis of official university planning documents allows for identification of those rationalities that are deemed important enough by top administrators to engage with and incorporate into public representations of key strategic commitments.
Furthermore, Callan (2000) pointed out that those who operate in a university environment where commitments to internationalization are implicit rather than explicit will likely experience and enact internationalization differently than those who do so under an explicit policy umbrella (p. 18). Therefore, it is likely that internationalization looks different at different institutions. For example, many arguments in the Big Ten planning documents frame internationalization as an economic imperative of the state, especially in the case of land-grant institutions. Therefore, it would not be appropriate to apply the findings of this study to all U.S. universities, and an analysis of similar documents at different institution types could be instructive. However, given the influence of the Big Ten not only in the U.S. but also abroad, these documents may provide insight into future directions of internationalization, and more generally into the ways neoliberal logics are spread in higher education.

Finally, the corpus encompasses documents that were created both before and after the economic recession of 2008. Many institutions of higher education experienced effects from this recession, and thus, it is possible that the documents addressed here reflect those differences in temporality. While the recession may have affected and continue to affect, universities’ long-term strategic plans (both with regard to internationalization and otherwise), this is not an object of analysis in the present study.

**Conclusion**

This study addressed a gap in literature critically evaluating the internationalization efforts of U.S. universities. The discourses, themes, and rationalities identified in the Big Ten internationalization planning documents analyzed in this study
suggest that these documents act as tools in the service of internationalization as a technology of neoliberal governmentality in higher education (and beyond). Although marginalized discourses and rationalities were identified, the hegemony of neoliberal discourses and economic rationalities suggest the difficulty of resisting neoliberal governmentality through discursive resignification alone.

In particular, the documents discursively produce a set of circumscribed potential subjectivities, which are granted varying degrees of value based largely on adherence not only to a commitment to maximize one’s value as human capital, but also based on other subject positions, including race, gender, sexuality, and citizenship status. Although processes of subjectification never exhaustively catalogue all possible positions, they nonetheless exclude these positions through their silence. Pointed political economic critique and critical engagement with the transnational position of higher education within state, national and global contexts may therefore be necessary steps toward creation and revaluation of subjectivities that would defy hegemonic logics of neoliberal subjecthood, and its governance of lives within the university and beyond.
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Appendix A: List of Internationalization Planning Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>DOCUMENT NAME</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>Indiana University International Strategic Plan</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>Recommendations of the Boldness by Design Internationalization Taskforce</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>Northwestern University Strategic Plan 2011</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>Proposed International Goals for The Ohio State University</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State University</td>
<td>University Office of International Programs Strategic Plan: 2009-2013</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Global Purdue: Globalization White Paper</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Strategic Plan</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>International Programs at the University of Iowa: A Strategic Plan 2006-2011</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>Global Engagement at the University of Michigan: University of Michigan Special-Emphasis Study on Internationalization</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>A Guiding Framework for the Office of International Program’s Approach to Internationalization of the Curriculum and Campus</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
<td>Report: Task Force on International Initiatives</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: List of Themes Identified in Response to The Three Research Questions, Which Occurred Twenty or More Times Throughout the Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes identified in response to each research question</th>
<th>frequency of occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) What reasons for university internationalization are presented in the documents?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university has responsibilities to help meet the state’s needs</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university must contribute to solving global challenges</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university must be a global leader in higher education</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university must respond to increasing global economic competition</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university faces greater competition from higher education institutions</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International students enrich the campus community</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university must respond to a changing world</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are competing for jobs in a global economy</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need to be interculturally competent</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International engagement produces funding opportunities</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International scholars enrich the campus community</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge production is of an increasingly global nature</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university has a history of internationalization</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The U.S government and U.S. businesses require global skills</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university is committed to diversity</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) What visions for university internationalization are presented in the documents?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize the number of students who study abroad</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster relationships with partners external to the university</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize the number of international students who enroll</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty will be highly engaged in internationalization efforts</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance language learning opportunities</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university will identify target regions for internationalization efforts</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalize the university curriculum</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create procedures for evaluation and assessment of internationalization efforts</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make students into global citizens</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the experience for international students and scholars</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university will better support research with an international focus</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make students into global leaders</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the brand and reputation of the university</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that strategic plans and mission statements are international</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivate students’ ability to apply, critique, and engage global issues</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the global competency of faculty and staff</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create more opportunities for international/internally-themed service-learning</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) How do the documents frame the means by which the university can achieve its internationalization objectives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create more centralized processes for administration of international efforts</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize technological tools in innovative and strategic ways</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate barriers to studying abroad</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer incentives and rewards for faculty participation in international efforts</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure external grants and contracts</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase alumni involvement</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicit private donations</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop business collaborations</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure funding from other additional, unspecified sources</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>