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Introduction

Over the past twenty years globalization has put a constant demand on U.S. colleges and universities to internationalize their campuses in order to prepare students for active participation in a global world and marketplace. Data from the American Council of Education (ACE) reveal that most institutions, however, only claim a focus on internationalization or tend to take piecemeal approaches. “Poorly integrated into the core academic activities, international education has largely been a marginal aspect of undergraduate education and often simply equated with study abroad.”1 If the steadily increasing numbers of students being sent abroad over the past ten years are any indication, study abroad indeed seems to have become the singular choice in preparing our young for global citizenry and for demonstrating campus internationalization.2 By nature, study abroad clearly plays a large part, often a major role, in this effort. It has been said that international exchange “is one of the most powerful tools available for internationalizing the curriculum in American colleges and universities.”3 It is also easy


2 Yvonne Turner and Sue Robson, Internationalizing the University (New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2008), 55.

to measure its success or failure simply by the number of students who are sent abroad each year. The U.S. government’s favorable incorporation of the proposed legislation, The Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act (S.473), into the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011 (H.R.2410),\(^1\) fuels such focused initiatives.

Insular approaches such as increasing the number of students that go abroad or a focus on a language requirement here or an internationally related general education requirement there have each, individually, been historically accepted as a suitable display of internationalization. If a school simply required students to take two semesters of a foreign language during their college career or if campus internationalization was stated in a mission statement, administrators believed they were successful at campus internationalization. In recent years, though, it has been recognized that the internationalization phenomenon in higher education is far more complex and a lot harder to achieve. Those institutions that are considered successful in campus internationalization have taken the concept of “comprehensive internationalization” to heart and are not just concerned with rhetoric, but rather with a variety of indicators. Internationalization is in their mission statements as well as systemically encompassed in institution’s pedagogy, curriculum and learning goals,

---

\(^1\) The Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act would increase study abroad participation levels and make going abroad a cornerstone of higher education. The Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act (S.473) was approved by the U.S. House of Representatives in July 2009 as part of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011 (H.R. 2410) by a vote of 235-187. The bill has yet to go to the Senate.
campus life, available funding, institutional policies and practices, as well as in faculty and staff’s level of international competency.

Individual schools cannot be entirely held accountable for their level of internationalization efforts—lackluster, inspiring, misguided, or otherwise. The responsibility apparently rests on the shoulders of the U.S. government and the higher education field as a whole. First, the nation has historically neglected higher education internationalization as a top priority to the extent that it has been reflected in federal programming. In the past fifty years government support has been few, far between, and modestly funded. To date there has been little movement on high-level policy efforts since President Clinton’s 1999 memorandum on international education policy.²

Second, the U.S. higher educational system has not maintained one commonly accepted definition of internationalization, nor have there been industry-wide overarching indicators that measure a school’s success or failure at campus internationalization.³ Only until recently have three main theoretical frameworks been acknowledged as resources to gauge campus internationalization, details of which will be discussed later.⁴ While such theoretical developments can be applauded, there is no denying that a single entity ceases to be accepted in providing the systematic approach


³ Turner and Robson, Internationalizing the University, 11–12.

in measuring internationalization on college campuses resulting in comparative results. Without one, institutions are seemingly picking and choosing what indicators to focus on at will, no matter how intangible and intermittent the venture. This method prompts the questions: Can one indicator predict a campus’ entire internationalization efforts? Should one indicator of internationalization carry more weight over others or do all indicators exude equal pressure in making a campus more internationalized? Validating insular or piecemeal approaches to internationalization, such as study abroad, is key in determining their individual worth to the entire process of higher education internationalization.

**Literature Review**

A review of recent literature on the subject of higher education internationalization suggests several prevalent factors that account for the lack of schools fully integrating internationalization on to their campuses. They include, but are not limited to: (1) higher education internationalization simply has not been a priority for the U.S. government; (2) the term higher education internationalization has not been clearly and precisely defined; and (3) a common theoretical or conceptual framework that is universally utilized for higher education internationalization research ceases to exist. Very few research studies have attempted to measure comprehensive higher education internationalization.

---

5 Turner and Robson, *Internationalizing the University*, 12.
Not a U.S. National Priority

National rather than international interests have historically nudged their way to the forefront of federal agendas with concerns focused instead on nation building, national economic development, and civic society. The literature, as well as a policy review, shows that government policies on higher education and/or international education have been few and far between and only modestly funded throughout the century.

Most literature points to the subsequent years after World War II as pivotal in cementing the financing and establishment of structured acts, activities, projects, programs, and organizations under the collective umbrella of international education. Some authors argue, however, that the efforts at this time were marginal. Regardless, the significant yet limited government activity that prospered since includes: The Fulbright Program of 1946; the Department of Education’s Sputnik-inspired National Defense Education Act of 1958 later incorporated into the Higher Education Act of 1965;

---


7 Smith, “A Brief History,” 2; D. Walker, “The organization and administration of study abroad centers in two institutions,” *International Education Journal* 29, no. 1 (1999): 6–7. Several authors mention the first major shift having occurred before World War II with the creation of the Institute of International Education (IIE) in 1919 and the International Committee on Intellectual Co-operation in 1921, created under the auspices of the League of Nations (and the predecessor UNESCO). The phenomenon that occurred after WWII is largely contributed to not only the establishment of UNESCO and the Fulbright Act, but more importantly to the political and cultural rationales behind them.

The Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange (Fulbright-Hays) Act of 1961; and President Carter’s 1979’s Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. It is well known in the literature that the concept of globalization and that of maintaining competitiveness in the international market was realized by both the U.S. government and post-secondary schools as the new century was ushered in. In 2000, the first ever Executive Memorandum on international education was signed by President Clinton. First initiated in 1999 by NAFSA: The Association of International Educators and the Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange the Senate unanimously passed a resolution calling for an international education policy in 2001. Simultaneously, literature written on the subject exploded, reinforcing the magnitude of the topic at hand and higher education institutions took notice.

A decade into the twenty-first century, only minor progress has been made for a comprehensive international education policy in the United States, but there is hope with the new administration in the White House. Little traction was gained with the 2001 international education policy efforts despite resolution work by House members

---

9 de Wit, *Internationalization of higher education*, 17. The concept of higher education internationalization became a strategic process at a handful of U.S. institutions of higher learning as early as the 1980s, but not to the extent that the new millennium saw.

(Con. Res. 100) in July 2001, March 2005, and October 2006.\textsuperscript{11} Today, Con Res. 100, now with seven co-sponsors, sits in both the Subcommittee on Select Education and the Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness. President Obama’s coming to office in 2009 provides some hope on this front, though. During campaigning, then Senator Obama was asked if he would establish an international education policy for the United States if elected President and he affirmed that the short answer was yes. He stated that international education would have to be a priority and would be a fundamental policy goal that would have to be woven through all of the nation’s policies.\textsuperscript{12}

Long are the days of solely focusing on internationalization in order to expand nation-state influence or to promote peace. Authors agree that the rationale has most certainly shifted from political to economic.\textsuperscript{13} While some progress has been made in the past twenty years, the United States still does not have a comprehensive policy for marshalling the vital resource of international education for national purposes. Without one, experts in the field believe that the U.S. will not be able to maintain economic competitiveness in the years to come.


\textsuperscript{13} Turner and Robson, \textit{Internationalizing the University}, 3–4; Peter Ninnes and Meeri Hellsten, \textit{Internationalizing Higher Education: Critical Explorations of Pedagogy and Policy} (Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre, 2005).
Problematic and Overlapping Definitions

The concept of *globalization*, complex and contested in its own right, has most definitely widened the various interpretations of the term *internationalization* as it is applied to various educational processes and the higher education sector. In reviewing the literature it is essential to point out that a multiplicity of definitions and terms has been used for the concepts *international education* and *higher education internationalization*. In the past few decades alone, as the variety of contexts utilized has evolved, there have been just as many elucidatory attempts at a distinction.\(^{14}\) Sifting through the diversity of terms that have been used is fundamental in understanding the problem at hand. Due to the massive scale of literature on the subject, this specific study will only attempt to review recent literature regarding the aforementioned terms. The term *internationalism* will be excluded as to narrow the focus.

Globalization & Internationalization

Discourse shows that the terms *globalization* and *internationalization* are sometimes used interchangeably, have been confused with one another, or are considered radically different, yet related processes.\(^{15}\) This study will consider the

---

\(^{14}\) de Wit (2002) points to Sven Groenings 1987’s *Economic Competitiveness and International Knowledge* staff paper as first indicating the problematic definition of internationalization.

definition of the terms as the latter—*globalization* is the catalyst, while

*internationalization* is a response.

Neither globalization nor internationalization is a new concept in higher education. Most publications on the subject generally trace today’s focus of internationalization back to the original European roots of the university. The “academic pilgrimage” can be traced back to the medieval period and further carried through the nineteenth century. There are authors who criticize this notion. Peter Scott’s *The Globalization of Higher Education* (1998) and Guy Neave’s *The European Dimension in Higher Education: An Historical Analysis* (1997) call the idea of international elements stemming from the middle ages as “inaccurate” and “internationalist rhetoric.”

The knowledge economy of today, however, is unprecedentedly central to twenty-first century development and its reach is now worldwide, which many authors agree upon. Altbach and Knight (2007), for example, more recently define globalization “as the economic, political, and societal forces” pushing higher education today “toward greater international involvement. Global capital has, for the first time,

---

16 de Wit, *Internationalization of higher education*, 4–5.
17 Ibid., 5.
18 Ibid., 4–5.
19 Ibid., 142–143.
heavily invested in knowledge industries worldwide, including higher education and advanced training.”

The general range of international/ization related terms, activities, and subject disciplines connected to higher education is extensive. They include, but are not limited to: international affairs, international studies, intercultural studies, global education/studies, multicultural education, cross-cultural education/studies, transnational education, peace education, and internationalism. Another group of subdivision terms accepted in the literature, and more closely related to this study, include study abroad, academic mobility, international exchange, and international cooperation. Each term has a different emphasis, reflects a different approach, and is used by different authors in different ways.

**International Education & Higher Education Internationalization**

In terms of a specific definition, recent literature shows that two terms—international education and higher education internationalization or internationalization of higher education—are currently used interchangeably, at least in U.S. discourse. The literature review in this section will focus on definitions from well-known authors in the field, as well as from industry organizations.

---


22 de Wit, *Internationalization of higher education*, 106.

23 de Wit, *Internationalization of higher education*, 111–116. The term international education is used by more American authors and internationalization of higher education is used by more non-American authors.
Historically, it is important to note that international education was not always synonymous with higher education internationalization but rather associated with comparative education. In fact, many authors carelessly used comparative education and international education as much without distinction as presently is the case with the two terms in discussion. The debate on the relationship between international education and comparative education explicitly manifested itself (again) in the 1990s, likely prompted by Erwin H. Epstein’s editorial appearing in the *Comparative Education Review* in 1992. Although the intricacies of this debate are not central to this study, there was an explosion of literature that was produced in the last decade of the twentieth century that attempted to rework through the question of the boundaries of the two fields. Many meaningful contributions emerged, but the debate still continues. More recently, authors such as Rust (2002) believe that as long as articles on international education meet certain academic criteria regarding conceptual framing, methods, and originality then they have a proper place in comparative education journals.

With respect to the terms higher education internationalization and/or internationalization of higher education, it is interesting to note that de Wit (2002), too, wants to stay connected to the field of comparative education. He argues that using the

---

24 de Wit, *Internationalization of higher education*, 104–108, 110. In the mid- to late twentieth century, as the field of comparative education strived for rigorous methodology, several authors such as Harold J. Noah and Max A. Eckstein, William W. Brickman, George Z. F. Bereday, C. Arnold Anderson, Erwin H. Epstein, and Irving Epstein were instrumental in challenging and clarifying comparative theory.

term internationalization of education is more accurate and more appropriate, especially in the area of educational research. Using one and the same term for different levels of education is characteristic of the subdivisions used under the umbrella of comparative and international education.

The research should be positioned within comparative higher education research, an area that might, in analogy with comparative and international education, better be called comparative and international higher education, thereby giving recognition to the growing importance of internationalization in higher education.26

The concept of higher education internationalization/internationalization of higher education has evolved over the past several decades. It has gone from being defined in terms of a set of activities in the 1980s to an institutional process approach in the mid-1990s. Prominent scholar, Jane J. Knight, has been instrumental in the dialogue, and her definitions continue to be some of the most frequently cited and accepted definitions to date. Her work is central to this review.

Knight (1994) first defined internationalization as “the process of integrating an international dimension into the research, teaching and services functions of higher education.”27 Only three years later a slightly redefined definition emerged. Essentially, she changed “international” to “international/intercultural” and “higher education” to “institution,” as well as reordered the placement of “research” and “teaching.”28

---

26 de Wit, *Internationalization of higher education*, 208.


28 Ibid.
same year, van der Wende (1997) proposed a broader definition, suggesting that internationalization is “any systematic effort aimed at making higher education responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy and labour markets.”

Scholars such as Romuald E. J. Rudzki, Peter Scott, Stephen Arum and Jack Van de Water, Clark Kerr, Fred Halliday, Dilys Schoorman, and Joseph A. Mestenhauser all had lucid attempts at defining higher education internationalization in the latter part of last century. Another author, Söderqvist (2002), introduced a new definition that was similar to Knight’s in that it also focused on the change process at the institutional level. Higher education internationalization is a change process from a national higher education institution to an international higher education institution leading to the inclusion of an international dimension in all aspects of its holistic management in order to enhance the quality of teaching and learning and to achieve the desired competencies.

Taking van der Wende’s criticism into consideration regarding the limited scope in which she applied her past definitions—solely to the institution—Knight conceded the

---


30 de Wit, Internationalization of higher education, 111–112. Hans de Wit, a leader in the field, recognized scholars such as Rudzki (1998), Scott (1998), Arum and Van de Water (1992), Kerr (1994), Halliday (1999), Schoorman (1999), and Mestenhauser (2000) as contributing to the efforts to define internationalization in higher education.

importance and influence the national/sector level had on higher education internationalization through funding, policy, and programs. Yet she still maintained that it was at the institutional level that real process of internationalization took place. “Internationalization at the national, sector, and institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions of delivery of post-secondary education.”

The twenty-first century brought not only more important dialogue from scholars in the field but industry organizations also began recognizing the need for a clearer definition of internationalization in relationship to education. The American Council on Education (ACE), NAFSA: Association of International Educators, and the Institute for International Exchange (IIE) have all had long-standing relationships with professionals in the field of higher education. They are each actively involved at the collegiate level and internationalization efforts vary from organization to organization.

The American Council on Education (ACE) has had a long standing commitment to internationalization, but it was not until 2000 with funding from the Ford Foundation that progress came more quickly. While a date of the definition could not be located, in describing internationalization ACE respectfully acknowledges the long history the term has had in the U.S. The definition begins by stating internationalization is an ongoing process that includes many different approaches and strategies rather than a stagnant


set of activities. Knight’s definition of ten years ago is cited and concludes with their ideal—comprehensive internationalization.

For some, internationalization means adding a few programs or courses, increasing the number of students going abroad, or recruiting additional international students. Such changes generally entail doing more of the same thing, or doing the same things in a slightly different way. But another view of internationalization, one that sees it as pervading the institution and affecting a broad spectrum of people, policies, and programs, leads to deeper and potentially more challenging change. Comprehensive internationalization is the ACE shorthand for this broad, deep, and integrative international practice that enables campuses to become fully internationalized.\footnote{American Council on Education (ACE). “Comprehensive Internationalization,” Program and Services, Center for International Initiatives, http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ProgramsServices/\texttt{cii/Comp\_Intz.htm} (accessed February 2009).}

NAFSA: Association of International Educators only recently defined internationalization. Its working definition is


It is also the number two goal in their 2008–2010 strategic plans and specifically addresses making internationalization an essential component of U.S. higher education.

The Institute for International Education (IIE), one of the oldest international education organizations, does not provide a working definition for internationalization despite the fact that it gives out an award for best practices in internationalization. One
of the four Andrew Heiskell Award categories is titled “Internationalizing the Campus,” but this category is only defined briefly as “advancing curriculum development and creatively integrating international students into university life.”

The online article “Twenty Ways to Strengthen International Education on the Campus,” an adaptation from a prior piece which appeared in the IIE membership newsletter several years ago, provides little more insight. The listing is full of self-described ideas and suggestions. In part, it includes

- Encourage your president’s office to include internationalization and global education in your institution’s mission statement. Why not develop an international mission statement for your office, as well?
- Recruit foreign students to your campus. Use currently enrolled students, faculty and staff and overseas alumni to help with this effort.
- Establish a partnership with an overseas institution.
- Look at your institution’s/office’s brochures, catalogs and website. Is a global message being conveyed?
- Offer to make presentations to individual academic divisions about international students programs.
- Hold international festivals, such as film/slide shows, folk singers, dancers, theater, food fair, displays. Celebrate international holidays.
- Promote internships overseas. This could be a joint project with, or led by, your campus career office.

Dialogue on the subject has been plentiful but are the definitions of international education and higher education internationalization any closer to specificity? The field in the U.S. seems to have only agreed on the interchangeability of the two terms.


Several prominent authors of higher education internationalization discourse, Hans de Wit and Jane J. Knight, have stated that a precise definition may never be agreed upon, or needed for that matter.\(^{38}\)

...as the international dimension of higher education gains more attention and recognition, people tend to use it in the way that best suits their purpose. While one can understand this happening, it is not helpful for internationalization to become a catchall phrase for everything and anything international. A more focused definition is necessary if it is to be understood and treated with the importance that it deserves. Even if there is not agreement on a precise definition, internationalization needs to have parameters if it is to be assessed and to advance higher education. This is why the use of a working definition in combination with a conceptual framework for internationalization of higher education is relevant.\(^{39}\)

Although it is true (and appropriate) that there will likely never be a true universal definition, it is important to have a common understanding of the term so that when we discuss and analyze the phenomenon we understand one another and also refer to the same phenomenon when advocating for increased attention and support from policy makers and academic leaders.\(^{40}\)

**Theoretical Frameworks and Research**

Despite a dramatic increase in the literature concerned with higher education internationalization the review reveals that research centered on a theoretical framework has only occurred recently. Turner and Robson (2008) asked it best: “If

---


\(^{40}\) Jane J. Knight, “Internationalization Remodeled,” 8.
internationalization exists as such different phenomenon in different contexts, how is it possible to understand an individual institution’s orientation to it, let alone manage organizational progress towards a desired style or level of engagement?“\textsuperscript{41}

In response to such questions, several scholars have developed organizational models for the internationalization of higher education with varying approaches. They include but are not limited to Guy Neave (1992), John Davies (1992), Romuald E. J. Rudzki (1995, 1998), Jane J. Knight and Hans de Wit (1995), Marijk C. van der Wende (1996), and Hans van Dijk and Kees Meijer (1997).\textsuperscript{42} The Modern Language Association (MLA) and the Institute of International Education (IIE) have also provided valuable research over the years related to some aspects of internationalization—language study, study abroad, and international students.\textsuperscript{43} Only as of late, have three main research efforts been acknowledged more than any others as providing a theoretical

\textsuperscript{41} Turner and Robson, \textit{Internationalizing the University}, 40.


**American Council on Education (ACE)**

The American Council on Education (ACE) has had a long commitment to conducting empirical research studies for the purpose of advancing internationalization at U.S. higher education institutions of learning. Their first study, by Charles Andersen, was published in 1988 and was based on a survey of institutional policies and practices at 541 institutions. The survey, titled *International studies for undergraduates, 1987: Operations and opinions*, 44 covered foreign language requirements and course offerings, study abroad opportunities and participation numbers, area studies and other internationally focused concentrations, the role of library holdings in international studies, and presidential attitudes toward international studies. Another study quickly followed that incorporated data from the previous study, among other national studies,

---

campus visits, and transcript analyses. Richard Lambert’s *International Studies and the Undergraduate* was published by ACE in 1989.\(^{45}\)

It was not until 2000 that research work continued. Written by Fred M. Hayward, *Internationalization of U.S. Higher Education: Preliminary Status Report 2000*\(^{46}\) was an update of the work done more than a decade earlier by Lambert. Similar areas that repeated themselves included foreign language requirements and enrollments, study abroad participation, international education requirements, and curricula. New areas measured were students’ awareness of global issues, the presence of international students and faculty, institutional support for internationalization, funding, employment demands, and attitudinal and experiential data. The *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses: Final Report 2003*\(^{47}\) was the result of three surveys conducted in 2001 to a national sample of 752 U.S. colleges and universities of various institutional types. The first and second surveys focused on undergraduates’ and faculty members’ international experiences and attitudes about internationalization, respectively, and the third on institutional internationalization. The report focused on the usual areas of internationalization, which they now termed as indicators. These indicators included stated institutional commitment, financial commitment, foreign language requirements


and offerings, international course requirements and offerings, academic programs abroad, and internationally oriented extracurricular activities.

In 2005, a series of publications was published that built upon the 2001 surveys and established an internationalization index for each of the Carnegie classification of institutions—community colleges, comprehensive universities, liberal arts colleges, and research universities. The 2001 data were re-examined along six key dimensions—articulated commitment, academic offerings, organization infrastructure, external funding, institutional investment in faculty, and international students and student programs.

The most recent report, Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses: 2008 Edition, is based on a five-year update and comparison done in 2006 that utilizes the 2001 index as a baseline. Most but not all of the same questions were asked. ACE surveyed 2,746 of the Basic Carnegie Classification institutions and received a response rate of 39%. The indicators of internationalization were centered on four main areas: institutional support (stated institutional commitment, organizational structure and staffing, and external funding); academic requirements, programs, and extracurricular activities (foreign language requirements and offerings, international/global course requirements, education abroad, use of technology for internationalization, joint degrees, and campus activities); faculty policies and opportunities (funding for faculty

---


49 Ibid.
opportunities and criteria for promotion, tenure, and hiring); and international students (enrollments, recruiting targets and strategies, financial support for international students, and programs and support services). Comparisons were made against the 2001 data when possible.

Jane J. Knight and Hans de Wit’s Strategies

Jane J. Knight and Hans de Wit’s *Strategies for Internationalization of Higher Education: Historical and Conceptual Perspectives* (1995) suggests using the term *strategies* to describe those efforts undertaken by a higher education institution to integrate an international dimension into its research, teaching, and service functions as well as into its management policies and systems. These strategies fall into two broad categories: program strategies and organizational strategies. Program strategies refer to those academic activities and services that are initiated in order to establish an international dimension at an institution.\(^{50}\) Knight (1999) further clarified the program strategies into six areas—academic programs, research and scholarly collaboration, technical assistance, export of knowledge (inward), export of knowledge (outward), and extracurricular activities.\(^{51}\) Knight and de Wit believe that internationalization needs to be entrenched into the culture, policy, planning, and organizational process of the institution. Without a more permanent organizational commitment the efforts could fail.

---

\(^{50}\) Knight and de Wit, “Strategies for Internationalisation,” 20–22.

\(^{51}\) Hans de Wit, *Internationalization of higher education*, 122–125.
and this is where organizational strategies would come into play. These strategies are focused on integrating international dimensions into the infrastructure. Knight (1999) also regrouped the organizational strategies into four areas: governance, operations, support services, and human resource development.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators

NAFSA: Association of International Educators has been publishing an annual report titled *Internationalizing the Campus: Profiles of Success at Colleges and Universities* since 2003. This publication, researched and written by Christopher Connell, profiles colleges and universities and highlights their best practices in various aspects of internationalization. Each year the institutions are determined by a jury panel of five volunteers who apply the following areas of criteria as defined by NAFSA:

- administrative support and infrastructure (leadership support, financial support, established administrative frameworks);
- community service and outreach (commitment to increasing intercultural awareness in the local, state, regional, and global communities);
- curricular initiatives (internationalization is reflected in courses across disciplines and departments and graduation requirements);
- faculty commitment (faculty support as demonstrated by their participation in curriculum internationalization, through the use of technology, distance learning, participation in education abroad, or

---


53 Hans de Wit, *Internationalization of higher education*, 122–125.

innovative teaching techniques such as language immersion); institutional commitment (mission statements and planning documents contain a commitment to international education and the campus culture echoes this); research and faculty exchange (faculty participate in international interdisciplinary research and international exchange, and international faculty are integrated into the institution); student learning and participation (international education initiatives positively contribute to student learning and life through development of cross-cultural skills); support for education abroad (students are encouraged to study abroad, support is available throughout the process, alternative intercultural learning options are available, and students are assisted in integrating their experiences into their lives and the campus community); and support for international students and scholars (international students and scholars are welcomed on campus, their and their family’s social and cultural needs are met, and they significantly contribute to the intellectual and cultural fabric of the institution).  

At the same time, NAFSA recognizes that institutions are very different from each other and that the usefulness of certain criteria or pedagogical approaches to internationalization, even their own, may vary according to the situational needs of the individual campus, division, or department. Therefore, each profiled institution in *Internationalizing the Campus: Profiles of Success at Colleges and Universities* is categorized and searchable by the following: demographics (size and type of institution

---

or NAFSA region), strategies from Jane J. Knight and Hans de Wit (1995), as well as internationalization criteria from NAFSA and from ACE’s 2003 *Internationalizing the Campus: A User’s Guide*. NAFSA hopes to expand this resource to include non-U.S.-based criteria, as well as more dialogue on the various frameworks, approaches, and theories.

**Gaps in Literature**

The biggest gap in the literature is the lack of research studies across the three prominent areas I discussed. Although there has been an increase of research in international education over the last fifty years, a substantial amount of quality research prior to the late 1990s is lacking. This is considered to be a major factor in undermining the seriousness with which academics, most notably those in comparative education, view the field of international education.

My literature review did not find any significant studies that analyzed government policies and their effects on higher education or their effect on any aspects of internationalization at institutions of higher learning. The phenomenon of higher education internationalization only started coming into its own in the past decade, a time in which higher education was not a priority for President George W. Bush. This could account for this gap. It will be interesting to see what President Obama’s administration does at the national level and how scholars respond empirically in the coming years.

---

56 Ibid.
Secondly, other than analyzing and critiquing the variety of definitions that have been put forth, no quantitative or qualitative studies have looked more closely at the similarities and differences of what scholars have defined as higher education internationalization. For example, a content analysis of related journals would prove invaluable to the dialogue on the subject and would assist in scholars coming to a consensus on a commonly accepted definition.

Most importantly, there is a deficit of studies that look at comprehensive internationalization. Of the significant studies discussed, ACE’s work offers the only exhaustive analysis of comprehensive internationalization in the U.S. It, too, has just begun to establish comparative results as demonstrated by its 2008 edition of *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses*. One note about ACE’s study is that it is a self-reporting survey and that can lend itself to certain inaccuracies since there is not one person applying the same definition or criteria in the same way across the board.

NAFSA’s work, *Internationalizing the Campus: Profiles of Success at Colleges and Universities*, while consistent over the past six years, has many theoretical holes. The most obvious and most significant is the committee itself that determines the award winning schools. There is no consistency in the analysis year over year since the committee is made up of volunteers and the same people do not necessarily serve year over year. While NAFSA has defined indicators in which to review, biasness of the jury cannot be ruled out.
The strategies—program and organization—suggested by Knight and Hans de Wit offer a great theoretical framework, but a review of the literature did not reveal any comprehensive studies that utilized this model.

It is hoped that my study will address many of the gaps that exist by incorporating many of the key indicators of all three studies. Additionally, researching select aspects of higher education internationalization—have it be study abroad participation, foreign language proficiency, or the number of non-U.S. faculty on a campus—and connecting it to higher education internationalization have not been done in the past. The proposed study hopes to initiate such dialogue on the connectedness or lack thereof of the many facets of internationalization.

**Research Question**

The core issue at hand is to what degree, if any, a single indicator of higher education internationalization relates to a campus’ overall internationalization level. *Is there a correlation between the participation rates of undergraduate students sent abroad and how internationalized a campus truly is?* This question needs to be examined against not only a distinct definition of internationalization that outlines specific indicators, but also one that acknowledges both rhetoric and reality.

It is hoped that answering this question will strengthen the theoretical basis of campus internationalization studies and that these understandings will be increasingly applied to policy and implementation issues in higher education.
Procedure

Unit of Analysis

A major goal of this proposed study was to research a specific aspect of higher education internationalization—undergraduate study abroad participation—and select higher education institutions that were the backbone of this effort. The institutions were broken down into three institution types: doctoral/research, master’s, and baccalaureate. This study examines the level of international activity (as defined below) at institutions that have consistently held the number one and number twenty rankings of study abroad participation over the period of five academic years, 2002/2003–2006/2007, as reported by IIE’s Open Doors Project. The number one ranking was considered to have a high study abroad participation percentage or SAPP, while the number twenty ranking was considered to have a low SAPP. If consistency across the academic years was not found, institutions that had the higher or lower percentages were chosen for the high level and low level categories, respectively. Additionally, only institutions that met the methodological standards of this study were included. Six institutions in total were analyzed—a school with a high SAPP and a school with a low SAPP from each institution type. Study abroad participation percentage (SAPP) was defined as the percentage of undergraduate students at a given school that studied abroad during the academic year, including during the summer. The length of the program or experience was irrelevant (e.g. semester, year, summer, J-term, Maymester, winter or spring breaks). The Open Doors report defined study abroad as “only those
students who received academic credit from an accredited U.S. institution of higher education after they returned from their study abroad experience.” It made no difference whether that experience occurred through a third party provider, directly with a foreign institution, or on a faculty-led program.

**Methodology**

The conceptual framework that was utilized is based in part upon the research work of the American Council on Education (ACE); the unifying voice of all U.S. accredited colleges and universities. One indicator from each of the main four areas that ACE’s 2008 study used guided this limited study.

- **Institutional Support**—Evidence of stated institutional commitment to internationalization was determined by the frequency of relevant key word groupings in mission statements.
- **Academic Programs**—The number of area studies (i.e. Southeast Asian Studies, Italian Studies, etc.), foreign languages/literatures/linguistics, as well as international relations/affairs’ bachelor degrees conferred assisted in determining whether students have the opportunity to gain the specific knowledge about international and global issues.
- **International Students**—Enrollment levels as a percentage of the total student body allowed for a possible indication of peer perspective being shared in the classroom, dining hall, and dorm room.

---

• Faculty and Staff Diversity—Ethnicity of full-time and part-time faculty and staff was examined. This finding helped in determining where and from whom influence on students is coming.

The first indicator allowed for examination of the rhetoric, while the remaining three indicators focused on the degree to which internationalization efforts were already in effect on each campus.

The data were collected electronically from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) for academic year 2006/2007. IPEDS is a system of interrelated surveys conducted annually by the U.S. Department’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to all schools that participate in any of the federal student financial aid programs. While the amended Higher Education Act of 1965 requires that all colleges, universities, technical, and vocational institutions—some 6,700 of them—report their data, any institution neglecting to do so was not used in this study.

Collecting data from IPEDS for academic year 2006/2007 provided the most current, stable benchmark in which to make comparisons. This academic year is significant to measure as it is before the current economic crisis in the U.S began affecting the country.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{58}In a February 27, 2007 press release the Federal Home Mortgage Loan Corporation (Freddie Mac) announced it would no longer buy the most risky subprime mortgages and mortgage-related securities. This was the beginning of a domino effect of many more banks and mortgage lenders taking similar, if not graver, actions and the economy falling into what many term, the Great Recession.
A final analysis compared and contrasted the four internationalization indicators described above in relation to their respective SAPP. Any correlations were examined in-depth.

**Results and Discussion**

The averaged high (H) and low (L) SAPP from each of the three main institution types over the period of five academic years was determined with the help of IIE’s *Open Doors Project*. The six institutions include: doctoral/research institutions University of St. Thomas (Minnesota) and Tulane University (Louisiana); master’s level institutions Lynn University (Florida) and Rollins College (Florida); and finally Austin College (Texas) and Luther College (Iowa) representing the baccalaureate institutions.

The institutions that were analyzed for this study, their respective SAPP, and the differentials between the high and the low SAPPs are outlined in table 1. It was important to ensure that there was enough of an empirical difference between the high and low SAPPs before even beginning this study. If there was not a substantive differential then the entire study would be built on a weak unit of analysis. It is interesting to note that all institutions were private; four out of the six were located in the southern region of the United States (Florida, Louisiana, and Texas); 12-month unduplicated 2006/2007 undergraduate enrollment ranged from 1,354 students to
7,179 students with an average of 3,818 students; 2006/2007 academic year tuition averaged $27,104; and a third of the institutions had religious ties (Austin and Luther).  

Table 1. Table of selected higher education institutions used for study and their differentials, by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution type</th>
<th>SAPP</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Participation (%)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Academic year obtained</th>
<th>Differential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Research</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>University of St. Thomas</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>2003/2004</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>2002/2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Lynn University</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2002/2003</td>
<td>177.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Rollins College</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>2003/2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Austin College</td>
<td>123.1</td>
<td>2006/2007</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Luther College</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2002/2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: During academic year 2002/2003, Luther College had a tie with Concordia College-Moorhead in the number twenty ranking. Both schools had a participation rate of 68%. Luther College appeared again in the five academic years being analyzed (in 2006/2007) so it was ultimately selected as the unit of analysis for this institution type. Also note that during the course of this study, it was determined that Yeshiva University did not report necessary data to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Therefore, an accurate analysis could not be determined and doctoral/research institution, the University of St. Thomas, was awarded this privilege instead.

<sup>a</sup>Participation percentages over 100 percent can best be described by discussing briefly how the rates are calculated. In addition to the data reported to IIE directly by institutions on their study abroad population through their annual U.S. Study Abroad Survey, IIE also utilizes undergraduate completion data from the U.S. Department of Education’s Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). The participation rate is calculated by dividing the total number of undergraduates who studied abroad in a given year (as reported in the Study Abroad Survey) by the total number of undergraduate completions (from IPEDS). Due to various factors, such as students studying abroad more than once, students dropping out before graduation (non-completions) and differing cohort sizes from year to year, participation rates may exceed 100 percent.

**Institutional Support**

Mission statements are a public declaration of an organization’s purpose and commitment to certain issues and values that are of the utmost importance to a particular college or university. Often less descriptive than strategic plans, mission statements generally describe overarching goals of the organization and provide a sense of direction for the decision-making process. To determine stated institutional commitment to higher education internationalization the mission statements of each of

---

the six universities being examined underwent a content review for frequency of use.

Expanding upon ACE’s latest research on the topic at hand references to four key word groupings—international/internationalization, culture/cultural, diverse/diversity, and globe/global/world—were used. While ACE’s approach appropriately sought specificity by searching for the key words internationalization and global education, this researcher felt that was too limiting. Table 2 outlines the results.

Table 2. Frequency of key words in mission statements, by total and by SAPP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAPP</th>
<th>Institution type</th>
<th>Institution name</th>
<th>International/ -ization</th>
<th>Culture/ cultural</th>
<th>Diverse/ diversity</th>
<th>Globe/ global/world</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Rollins College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>Austin College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Doctoral/Research</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>Luther College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Lynn University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Doctoral/Research</td>
<td>University of St. Thomas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key word totals: 1 3 3 4 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAPP</th>
<th>Institution type</th>
<th>Institution name</th>
<th>International/ -ization</th>
<th>Culture/ cultural</th>
<th>Diverse/ diversity</th>
<th>Globe/ global/world</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>SAPP institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>SAPP institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Frequency of key words in mission statements, by total and by SAPP

Across all of the institutions, the four key word groupings were mentioned a total of 11 times. The most cited key word grouping used was that of globe/global/world with four occurrences. Both culture/cultural and diverse/diversity quickly followed and each appeared three times. International/internationalization only appeared once and that was in Tulane University’s (L) final sentence. “This mission is pursued in the context of the unique qualities of our location in New Orleans and our continual aspiration to be


Note: See Appendix A for actual mission statements and key words found.
a truly distinctive international university." The baccalaureate institution type led with five occurrences of the key word groupings. The master’s and doctoral/research institution types followed with four and two occurrences, respectively.

The low SAPP institutions outnumbered the high SAPP institutions seven to four in total key word groupings. The low SAPP schools—Tulane, Rollins, and Luther—also had more proportion across the key word groupings as each key word grouping was represented. Each occurred twice with the exception of international/internationalization. Austin College, representing the baccalaureate high SAPP schools, not only tied with Rollins (L) for the most key words, but it also represented three-quarters of the high SAPP institutions’ total. Lynn University (H) and the University of St. Thomas (H) had the two lowest frequency totals overall. The University of St. Thomas actually did not have any key word groupings in its mission statement.

It was felt that a further analysis of key word groupings as compared to the total length of the mission statement would provide an additional perspective. Austin College (H) had the longest mission statement (246 words), while the University of St. Thomas (H) had the shortest (30 words). With a difference like this, a longer statement could possibly account for a higher frequency rate of key words (see table 3).

From this perspective Rollins (L) ranked highest with 2.26%, then Tulane (L) with 1.77%, quickly followed by Lynn (H) with 1.75%. Rounding out the bottom half was Austin (H) (1.22%), Luther (L) (1.08%), and the University of St. Thomas (H) (0.00%).

---

60 Ibid.
Comparatively, low SAPP institutions had a higher concentration of key words in their mission statements (1.62%) than did high SAPP institutions (1.20%). The master’s

Table 3. Key words in mission statements, as a percentage of the total length of the statement and by SAPP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution type</th>
<th>SAPP</th>
<th>Institution name</th>
<th>Key word totals</th>
<th>Statement word count</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Rollins College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Research</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Lynn University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Austin College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Luther College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Research</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>University of St. Thomas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High SAPP institutions**
- 4 key words
- 333 statement words
- 1.20% of total

**Low SAPP institutions**
- 7 key words
- 432 statement words
- 1.62% of total

**Totals**
- 11 key words
- 765 statement words
- 1.44% of total


institution type (2.11%) took over the lead from the baccalaureate type (1.16%) when it came to key word groupings as a percentage of the total. Doctoral/research institutions Tulane University and the University of St. Thomas fell in the middle with 1.40%.

Having looked at both key word frequency and key words as a percentage of the total length of a mission statement provided an interesting perspective, one that has not been undertaken before. Low SAPP schools edged out their competition in this analysis. Although it is important to remember that mission statements can only express the intent of a school’s efforts towards internationalization and it is essential to view both the rhetoric and the reality.

**Academic Programs**

The number of area studies, foreign languages/literatures/linguistics, as well as
international relations/affairs’ bachelor degrees conferred in the 2006/2007 academic year will assist in determining whether students have the opportunity to gain the specific knowledge about international and global issues. It is recognized that other criteria may be more ideal to analyze for this indicator, but it is simply out of the scope of this research project and the data that IPEDS provide. The international content or perspective of individual courses and degrees, nor any relevant requirements for admissions, specific degrees, or graduation will be examined.

In total, of the three academic areas, conferred degrees in international relations/affairs (119) far surpassed area studies (79) and foreign languages/literatures/linguistics (40). See table 4. Degree distribution favored the low SAPP institutions of Tulane, Rollins, and Luther (199 degrees versus 39). They held 100% of the 79 area studies degrees, 83.19% of the 119 international relations/affairs degrees,

Table 4. Bachelor degrees conferred by program and by percentage of total degrees awarded, academic year 2006/2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution type</th>
<th>SAPP</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Area studies</th>
<th>Foreign languages, literatures, &amp; linguistics</th>
<th>International relations &amp; affairs</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of degrees awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Rollins College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Research</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Austin College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Research</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>University of St. Thomas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Lynn University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Luther College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SAPP institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SAPP institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>6.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>4.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Awards/degrees conferred by program are according to the 2000 CIP classification. Area studies included 30 variables and included such degrees as African Studies, East Asian Studies, etc. Foreign languages, literatures, and linguistics included 15 sub-areas encompassing a total of 75 variables. International relations and affairs fell under the social sciences category and included two variables.
and 52.50% of the 40 foreign languages/literatures/linguistics degrees. A large margin separated the two SAPPs—6.12% (L) versus 2.31% (H). Overall, these three academic degree areas accounted for just over 4.82% of total degrees conferred at all six institutions in the 2006/2007 academic year. Master’s institutions carried the institution type with 6.90% of their degrees being awarded in the specified academic areas. Rollins (L) and Lynn (H) were followed by doctoral/research (4.88%) then baccalaureate (2.36%) institutions.

Taking a closer look at the institutions themselves, there is a marked difference between this indicator’s top three and lower three schools. Each half also represents the institution types equally. All top three schools—Rollins College (L), Tulane University (L), and Austin College (H)—have a percentage of conferred degrees greater than six percent (average of 7.33%). On the other hand, the bottom half, made-up of the University of St. Thomas (H), Lynn University (H), and Luther College (L) are all well under two percent (average of 1.02%). Of note is that the “split” occurs between two institutions that have a similar number of degrees (17 and 20) yet are so vastly different in terms of the percentage of total degrees conferred (6.09% and 1.73%).

Rollins (L) had the greatest percentage of degrees awarded. Sixty-one of its 661 total conferred degrees, or 9.23%, were in two of the three academic areas being analyzed. No degrees were conferred in the area of foreign languages/literatures/linguistics. Tulane (L) had the second highest percentage of 6.68%. It was unique in that not only did it have the highest number of degrees in question (135), but it was also the
only school to have distribution across all three academic areas. By comparison, Austin College (H)’s third highest percentage (6.09%) was 0.59% lower, yet was attributed to only 17 conferred degrees. No area studies degrees were represented there.

With the exception of the University of St. Thomas (H), the lower schools Lynn University (H) and Luther College (L) had minimal representation across the three academic areas and where it did occur it was concentrated. Lynn’s (H) only two degrees were in the international relations/affairs area, while Luther’s (L) three degrees fell under foreign languages/literatures/linguistics. As eluded to earlier, the University of St. Thomas (H) had a similar number of degrees as Austin College (H) (20 compared to 17), but only represented 1.73% of total degrees conferred there.

Low SAPP institutions led the way with more conferred degrees in the specified academic disciplines of area studies, foreign languages/literatures/linguistics, and international relations/affairs. Earlier in this indicator’s discussion it was stated that the academic programs indicator and the chosen definition are nowhere close to being definitive. Nonetheless, the criterion used still provides valuable insight into an institution’s curricular approach to internationalization and the exposure students have to such issues.

International Students

An institution’s willingness to welcome international students to its campus indicates a commitment to allow for different peer perspectives to be shared in the classroom, dining hall, and dorm room. Undergraduate international student enrollment
total as a percentage of the 2006/2007 total undergraduate student body allows for a possible indication of such an embracement.

An analysis of the institutions at hand (see table 5) indicates that 3.63% of the total undergraduate student body in the 2006/2007 academic year were international students. Lynn University’s (H) international student population made up 11.47% of its total student body. This was 7.58% higher than the second highest percentage from Rollins College (L). In fact, every institution below Lynn each fell under 4.00%. Lynn’s (H) soaring percentage certainly contributed to the high SAPP institutions (4.87%) having a greater percentage, overall, of international students than the low SAPP schools (2.62%).

Table 5. Total undergraduate international student enrollment as percent of total undergraduate student body, academic year 2006/2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution type</th>
<th>SAPP</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>International student total</th>
<th>Undergraduate student total</th>
<th>Percent of student body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Lynn University</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2615</td>
<td>11.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Rollins College</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2904</td>
<td>3.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Luther College</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2585</td>
<td>2.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Research</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>University of St. Thomas</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>6272</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral/Research</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>7179</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Austin College</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SAPP institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>499</td>
<td>10241</td>
<td>4.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SAPP institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>332</td>
<td>12668</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>831</td>
<td>22909</td>
<td>3.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: "Undergraduate student total" is the grand total of men and women enrolled for credit during the 12-month reporting period. According to IPEDs, credit is the "recognition of attendance or performance in an instructional activity (course or program) that can be applied by a recipient toward the requirements for a degree, diploma, certificate, or other formal award."

Nonresident alien variable was used for "international student" as it is a person who is not a citizen or national of the United States and who is in this country on a visa or temporary basis and does not have the right to remain indefinitely. IPEDS indicates that nonresident aliens are included as its own variable, rather than in any of the other five racial/ethnic categories described. They go on to explain that: "Resident aliens and other eligible (for financial aid purposes) non-citizens who are not citizens or nationals of the United States and who have been admitted as legal immigrants for the purpose of obtaining permanent resident alien status (and who hold either an alien registration card (Form I-551 or I-151), a Temporary Resident Card (Form I-688), or an Arrival-Departure Record (Form I-94) with a notation that conveys legal immigrant status such as Section 207 Refugee, Section 208 Asylee, Conditional Entrant Parolee or Cuban-Haitian) are to be reported in the appropriate racial/ethnic categories along with United States citizens."
Not surprisingly, master’s degree institutions outranked the other institution types with 7.48% of the international student enrollment. Baccalaureate institutions Luther (L) and Austin (H) followed with 2.61% while the doctoral/research type rounded things out at 2.34%.

This indicator analysis showed that high SAPP schools surpassed the low SAPP schools in the percent of international student enrollment on campus. Lynn University (H) makes it clear that it has embraced the idea of providing their students an international perspective, peer-to-peer. It was a major contributor to the success of the high SAPP echelon as well as the master’s institution type.

**Faculty and Staff Diversity**

Just as increasing the international student presence allows for greater perspectives that enrich the classroom, a greater diversity and ethnicity of faculty and staff, can have significant influence over the student body. Internationalization literature, as well as ACE’s experience working directly with higher education institutions show that faculty play the leading role in driving campus internationalization.\(^\text{61}\)

Overall, when comparing White non-Hispanic to non-White groups, the low SAPP institutions (28.38%) have 17.53% more diversity than high SAPP institutions (10.85%). See table 6 for the breakdown. The non-White population was comprised of Black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaska Native. Non-

White populations, from highest to lowest, include Tulane (L) at 32.65%, Lynn (H) at 24.64%, Rollins (L) at 17.52%, Austin (H) at 8.84%, the University of St. Thomas (H) at 5.19%, and Luther (L) at 3.16%. Half of the institutions had a White non-Hispanic population over 90%—Luther (L) (94.15%), the University of St. Thomas (H) (92.72%),

Table 6. Full-time and part-time faculty and staff diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low SAPP institutions</th>
<th></th>
<th>Low SAPP institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>Rollins College</td>
<td>Luther College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral/Research</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White non-Hispanic</td>
<td>3488</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident alien</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity unknown</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High SAPP institutions</th>
<th></th>
<th>High SAPP institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of St. Thomas</td>
<td>Lynn University</td>
<td>Austin College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral/Research</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White non-Hispanic</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident alien</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity unknown</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data from U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences’ National Center for Education Statistics, IPEDS Data Center, Full- and part-time staff by primary function/occupational activity (Degree-granting institutions with 15 or more full-time employees), Fall 2006 and Fall 2007, http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/ (accessed May 2010).

Note: In Fall 2006, institutions completed this question voluntarily therefore data was not available for all institutions. This included Luther College, Tulane University, and the University of St. Thomas so Fall 2007 data was used instead for these select institutions.

and Austin College (H) (90.24%). Approximately 29.50% separated the most diverse and the least diverse institutions.

Luther College hired 2.69% Nonresident Aliens at their institution during the 2006/2007 academic year. The remaining schools that had Nonresident Aliens on campus all fell below one percent: Austin College (H) (0.91%), Rollins College (L) (0.88),
and the University of St. Thomas (H) (0.84%). Tulane (L) and Lynn (H) did not have any.

Despite a low SAPP institution leading the Nonresident Alien population, high SAPP institutions hired slightly more overall (0.65% versus 0.36%). This indicated that more faculty and staff at the University of St. Thomas, Lynn University, and Austin College came from abroad.

A closer inspection of the non-White population breakdown—Black non-Hispanic, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaska Native—provides another perspective. Low SAPP institutions had a greater percent of the Black non-Hispanics (14.47% to 4.30%), the Hispanics (5.09% to 4.26%), and the Asian/Pacific Islanders (8.12% to 1.30%). It was only by .01% that they neglected to capture the American Indian/Alaska Native (0.33% to 0.34%) population. This was the smallest difference between the two SAPP levels. The largest percent difference was that of the Black non-Hispanic population (10.17%).

Looking at individual institutions, two major observations should be pointed out as they are significant to this indicator. Tulane (L) not only had the highest percent of non-Whites (32.65%), but it also held the lowest White non-Hispanic population (67.04%) reinforcing its status as the most diverse institution. Quite the opposite was found at Luther College (L). It had the lowest non-White population (3.16%) and the highest White non-Hispanic population (94.15%). Despite Luther having the highest proportion of Nonresident Aliens (2.69%), it was determined to be the least diverse school.
Institution types provide another perspective to this indicator. The doctoral/research institutions led the way in non-White diversity of their faculty and staff at 25.28%. Master’s institutions followed with 20.83% and baccalaureate institutions lagged behind with 5.10% ethnicity. White population percentages by institutional type supported these findings. The Nonresident Alien population was the strongest at baccalaureate (2.08%) institutions. Master’s (0.47%) and doctoral/research (0.22%) institutions proved to be much weaker.

This indicator proved that low SAPP schools are the forerunner in faculty and staff diversity, despite having the most (Tulane) and the least diverse schools (Luther) under their umbrella. Considered to be the leaders of campus internationalization, one must assume that Tulane’s diverse faculty and staff are infusing their student body with a unique and thought-provoking perspective.

Conclusions

This study hoped to analyze whether one indicator of internationalization, that of study abroad, had any predictive bearing on an institutions’ level of comprehensive internationalization. Moving away from piecemeal approaches and focusing on four indicators—institutional support, academic programs, international students, and faculty and staff diversity—as the means of comprehensive internationalization allowed for taking both the rhetoric and reality into consideration for a more accurate analysis.

The indicators in this study mainly favored low SAPP institutions. In other words, schools with lower study abroad participation have more comprehensive
internationalization occurring on their campuses. Low SAPP schools commanded institutional support (+3, +0.42%), academic programs (+3.81%), and faculty and staff diversity (+17.53%). High SAPP institutions were victorious in the international student enrollment indicator (+2.25%). A summary of each indicator’s findings can be found below. It should be noted that while institution types were analyzed across all four indicators, there was no pattern of consistency so they were intentionally not discussed.

Institutional Support—This indicator’s two-pronged approach proved that low SAPP schools provided more evidence of a stated institutional commitment to internationalization. Low SAPP institutions Tulane University, Rollins College, and Luther College outnumbered high SAPP institutions seven to four when frequency of key word groupings were explored. Rollins College (L) and Tulane University (L) were mainly responsible for low SAPP institutions also having a higher concentration of key words as a percent of the total length of the statement—1.62% (L) compared to 1.20% (H). They held the top two spots (2.26% and 1.77%), while Luther (L) held the second to last spot at 1.08%. High SAPP institution, the University of St. Thomas held the bottom spot since it did not mention any of the key words. Some critics would likely consider 0.42% a small margin, but it is a win nonetheless.

Academic Programs—Students at low SAPP schools (6.12%) have more of an opportunity to gain the specific knowledge about international and global issues, than their high SAPP (2.31%) counterparts. Low SAPP schools held 100% of the 79 area studies degrees, 83.19% of the 119 international relations/affairs degrees, and 52.50%
of the 40 foreign languages/literatures/linguistics degrees. It is interesting to note that these majors are much more conducive to going abroad, yet the low SAPP institutions had more of them.

Rollins (L) and Tulane (L) once again helped cement the win of this indicator. Rollins (L) had the greatest percent (9.23%) of degrees awarded, while Tulane (L) had the second highest (6.68%) and was the only institution to have distribution across all three academic areas being analyzed. Luther (L) had the smallest percent (0.53%).

International Students—Lynn University’s (H) considerable international student enrollment (11.47%) seemed indicative of diverse peer perspectives being shared across campus. Lynn (H) was clearly responsible for the high SAPP institutions’ win of this indicator (4.87% compared to 2.62%), as low SAPP schools Rollins College (3.89%) and Luther College (2.98%) rounded out the top three percentages. It should be stated that Lynn’s elevated percent seemed to be a sort of anomaly as the other institutions were all under 4.00%, with an average international student body of 2.71%.

Faculty and Staff Diversity—Low SAPP institutions (28.38%) have 17.53% more ethnicity, and possibly more of a diverse influence, than high SAPP institutions (10.85%). Non-white populations were largest at Tulane University (L) (32.65%), Lynn University (H) (24.64%), and Rollins College (L) (17.52%). Digging deeper into the non-White populations, low SAPP cemented their dominance in this indicator. They had a greater percent of Black non-Hispanics (14.47% to 4.30%), Hispanics (5.09% to 4.26%), and Asian/Pacific Islanders (8.12% to 1.30%). It was only by .01% that they neglected to
capture the American Indian/Alaska Native (0.33% to 0.34%) population. Once again Tulane and Rollins carried the low SAPP institution group while Luther was at the bottom (3.16%). Luther College (L) attempted to prove its worthiness by having the highest percent of Nonresident Aliens (2.69%), but a final analysis indicated that it was the least diverse institution across the board. It had the lowest non-White population (3.16%) and the largest White non-Hispanic population (94.15%). Tulane was considered to be the most diverse institution overall.

It can be concluded that my research has determined that the participation rates of undergraduate students sent abroad cannot predict a campus’ entire internationalization efforts. There does not appear to be a correlation when validating singular indicators of higher education internationalization to overall comprehensive campus internationalization.

**Limitations**

This thesis had several limitations, some more significant to the study than others. Foremost, the biggest limitation with the study was the fact that the low SAPP was defined as those schools that fell near the number twenty ranking in IIE’s *Open Door’s Report* data. Lower rankings were not available to analyze and there may not have been enough of an extreme between the two SAPP levels for a good analysis. Care has been taken to differentiate the low SAPP as a lower level of participation, versus the more definite low, in order to more accurately set expectations.

---

62 It was not until the Open Doors Report 2007 that IIE expanded their rankings from one through twenty to one through forty. For consistency’s sake, the number twenty ranking was taken for the 2005/2006 and 2006/2007 academic years even though a lower ranking (number forty) was available.
It can be agreed that this study and the four main areas being analyzed—institutional support, academic programs, international students, and faculty and staff diversity—only represented one perspective of what is happening on campuses. ACE’s study delved much deeper into campus policies, requirements, financial resources, and institutional commitment than this study ever could. Campus ethos and the degree to which internationalization exists for students on a daily basis via extracurricular activities, as Knight and de Wit favor, were not measured either.

Along a similar vein, more data on the rhetoric would have provided for a more well-rounded analysis. However, obtaining data that were authentic was not possible due to the limited nature of this study.

Extensions

Research on comprehensive higher education internationalization remains in its infancy stage and continues to have trouble finding footing. This limited study is no exception. Ways in which this body of research could be further improved, built upon, and extended are specific and significant.

This thesis work could be improved by finding a solution to the biggest limitation that this study encountered: having a greater differential between the high and low SAPP institutions. In the selected academic years in question, rankings greater than the twentieth position were not available consistently. Not only has the study abroad participation ranking data been extended (since Open Doors’ 2007 Report), but IIE seems to be incorporating more extensive research into its reporting.
Places where another researcher could build upon what has been done in this thesis are many. The first is to do a comparative analysis of the same indicators, but utilizing other academic year parameters (i.e. 2000, 2005, 2010 or 2000, 2002, 2004, 2006, 2008, etc.) to determine the subjects or schools that would be used. Similarly, one could choose a different set of indicators but use the same institutions to compare their findings to this study. For example, replacing the rhetoric indicator of key words found in mission statements with an analysis of an institution’s strategic aims could prove more authentic, valid, and worthwhile. Another suggestion would be to replace the study abroad participation baseline indicator with another single indicator of higher education internationalization. Maybe a high level of international students on campus correlates to a more internationalized campus? All of these suggestions would provide another, yet related perspective that could support or contradict the findings of the study at hand. They key is in continuing the discussion on the validity of singular indicators and learning more about their relationship to comprehensive higher education internationalization.

It is hoped that having posed this research question and having attempted to answer it will strengthen the theoretical foundation of comprehensive higher education internationalization studies even if only in minute ways, positive or negative. This study should have expanded one’s perspective on piecemeal approaches and replaced it with the idea of comprehensiveness so that future research efforts, both major and minor, can be developed with the aim of being applied to policy and implementation issues in
higher education. Without such research the conversation on comprehensive internationalization cannot push itself to the forefront of higher education and political agendas in the U.S.
APPENDIX A:

KEY WORDS IN MISSION STATEMENTS
Austin College

Austin College is a private, residential, co-educational college dedicated to educating undergraduate students in the liberal arts and sciences while also offering select pre-professional programs and a graduate teacher education program. Founded by the Presbyterian Church in 1849, Austin College continues its relationship with the church and its commitment to a heritage that values personal growth, justice, community, and service. An Austin College education emphasizes academic excellence, intellectual and personal integrity, and participation in community life. Thus Austin College affirms the importance of:

- A community that through its size, diversity, and programs fosters lively intellectual and social interaction among persons of different origins, experiences, beliefs, accomplishments, and goals.
- A program that does not discriminate with regard to religion or creed, gender, sexual orientation, national or ethnic origin, physical disability, age, or economic status.
- A faculty that acknowledges teaching, sustained by active commitment to professional growth and development, as its primary responsibility.
- A student body of committed learners, actively involved in the programs of the college and in service to the greater community.
- A climate of civility and respect that encourages free inquiry and the open expression of ideas.
- A non-sectarian education that fosters the exploration and development of values through an awareness of the world’s religious, philosophical, and cultural traditions.

The mission of Austin College is to educate students in the liberal arts and sciences in order to prepare them for rewarding careers and for full, engaged, and meaningful lives.

Luther College

In the reforming spirit of Martin Luther, Luther College affirms the liberating power of faith and learning. As people of all backgrounds, we embrace diversity and challenge one another to learn in community, to discern our callings, and to serve with distinction for the common good.

As a college of the church, Luther is rooted in an understanding of grace and freedom that emboldens us in worship, study, and service to seek truth, examine our faith, and care for all God’s people.
As a liberal arts college, Luther is committed to a way of learning that moves us beyond immediate interests and present knowledge into a larger world—an education that disciplines minds and develops whole persons equipped to understand and confront a changing society.

As a residential college, Luther is a place of intersection. Founded where river, woodland, and prairie meet, we practice joyful stewardship of the resources that surround us, and we strive to be a community where students, faculty, and staff are enlivened and transformed by encounters with one another, by the exchange of ideas, and by the life of faith and learning.

**Lynn University**

The mission of Lynn University today is the same mission that has defined the institution through its first 46 years and that will continue to define it in the future.

Our mission is to provide the education, support, and environment that enable individual students to realize their full potential and to prepare for success in the world.

**Rollins College**

Rollins College educates students for global citizenship and responsible leadership, empowering graduates to pursue meaningful lives and productive careers. We are committed to the liberal arts ethos and guided by its values and ideals. Our guiding principles are excellence, innovation, and community.

Rollins is a comprehensive liberal arts college. Rollins is nationally recognized for its distinctive undergraduate Arts & Sciences program. The Crummer Graduate School of Business offers a nationally ranked MBA program. The Hamilton Holt School serves the community through exceptional undergraduate and graduate evening degree and outreach programs. We provide opportunities to explore diverse intellectual, spiritual, and aesthetic traditions. We are dedicated to scholarship, academic achievement, creative accomplishment, cultural enrichment, social responsibility, and environmental stewardship. We value excellence in teaching and rigorous, transformative education in a healthy, responsive, and inclusive environment.

**Tulane University**

Tulane’s purpose is to create, communicate and conserve knowledge in order to enrich the capacity of individuals, organizations and communities to think, to learn and to act and lead with integrity and wisdom.

Tulane pursues this mission by cultivating an environment that focuses on learning and the generation of new knowledge; by expecting and rewarding teaching and research of extraordinarily high quality and impact; and by fostering community-building initiatives as well as scientific, cultural and social understanding that integrate with and strengthen learning and research. This mission is pursued in the context of the unique qualities of our location in New Orleans and our continual aspiration to be a truly distinctive international university.
University of St. Thomas

Inspired by Catholic intellectual tradition, the University of St. Thomas educates students to be morally responsible leaders who think critically, act wisely, and work skillfully to advance the common good.
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