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Abstract

Since globalization has become more visible on American campuses, US post-secondary institutions have begun to prepare new graduates for twenty-first century careers through internationalization initiatives (ACE, 2012; Hunter, 2004). As a result, administrators and staff members at post-secondary institutions implement internationalization policies. The process is designed to equip future graduates with the skills and knowledge necessary to be competitive in the current global economy (ACE, 2012; CIGE, 2012; Hunter, 2004). The purpose of this descriptive case study examined how a global center (hereafter referred to as Global Cultural Center, or GCC) staff and campus administrators at one large northeastern US post-secondary institution makes sense of and implements an internationalization initiative across a campus community. The research questions that guided this case study were: (a) How do GCC staff and administrators at one post-secondary institution understand their campus’s internationalization initiative to prepare faculty and students to embrace different cultures?; (b) What organizational decision-making processes and dialogue have GCC staff and campus administrators engaged in to operationalize the internationalization initiative?; and (c) How have GCC staff and administrators sought to achieve the institution's internationalization initiative throughout the campus community? Three findings emerged from this case study; (a) students and faculty are not yet fully prepared to embrace diverse cultures (b) faculty will need additional support and guidance in order to fully operationalize internationalization (c) limited resources have impeded full implementation across a campus community. Additional research regarding leadership, organizational culture, and the perceptions and experiences of an expanded set of members from the campus community should be undertaken to further understand internationalization.
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CHAPTER 1:
THE PROBLEM AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

Introduction

Globalization has altered the goals found in post-secondary environments. Former US President William J. Clinton declared in a speech on April 19, 2000 that in order “…to maintain its role as a world leader, the United States needs to ensure that its citizens develop a broad understanding of the world, proficiency in other languages, and knowledge of other cultures” (Hunter, 2004, p. 9-10). This reality was reiterated when President Barack H. Obama, referring to our current global economy, asserted during a speech on education that, “…a child born in Dallas is competing with children in Delhi” (Zhao, 2010, p. 423). To avoid falling behind in the global competition for jobs (Duncan 2010; Elliott, 2013), US education leaders must prepare students to become adept with international skills in effort to be competitive in the 21st century global economy.

Historically, the US began to consider its own global competitiveness with the 1983 “Nation at Risk” report that urged education reformers to face the demise of its economic security should changes not be instituted (Elliott, 2013; Mondale & Patton, 2001) at the post-secondary level. The manner of reform was placed in the hands of local communities; shifting away from federal oversight (Mondale & Patton, 2001). This allowed for state and local education leaders to interpret decisions about transformations in both secondary and post-
secondary education (Elliott, 2013; Mondale & Patton, 2001). Despite government and business leaders call for reform, educational environments have seemingly remained stagnant in their response to globalization; it is evident that limited attention was given to the task of implementing these changes (Stromquist, 2002). Today, America still falls behind other countries in the world, particularly those in Scandinavia and Asia. These countries have implemented globalization-related education reforms more successfully and consistently than the US (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Friedman, 2007). Implementing an internationalization initiative at a post-secondary institution will provide students with the necessary skills and knowledge to be competitive in 21st century work environments (Hser, 2005; Knight, 2004; Volet, 2003).

In short, the “Nation at Risk” report appears to still have merit. This point is underscored by President Obama’s call for educational overhauls comparable to those undertaken by other countries (Elliott, 2013), and by his commitment to expand international programs at the Higher Education level (McMurtrie, 2010). Further, President Obama challenged education leaders to prepare graduates to “…out-innovate, out-educate and outbuild the rest of the world…” (Zhao, 2011). In addition to political leaders calling for change, large business corporations have also weighed in on the preparedness of their employees for the global economy. In 2002, the Committee for Economic Development (CED) conducted a survey of large US corporations. This survey exposed that close to 30% of participating companies blamed inadequate international skills for the reason their business had limited exposure around the globe (Zhao, 2011). Moreover, 80% of the business leader participants in this CED survey noted that their company would be more prominent if their employees possessed greater intercultural competence (Zhao, 2011).
To ensure post-secondary students are prepared to enter the current global economy, it is essential that they acquire international or intercultural skills (hereafter these terms will be used interchangeably), which (Crawford & Kirby, 2008; Hunter, 2004; Knight, 2004) suggest could be promoted by the implementation of an internationalization initiative at post-secondary institutions. Intercultural skills are necessary for graduates to interact with individuals from different cultural backgrounds and geographic locations around the world (Cornell & Stoddard, 1999), so students should become competent in this field. The term *internationalization* refers to the “…intercultural, and/or global dimension into the curriculum and teaching learning process” (Knight, 2004, p. 6). Internationalization and globalization are not synonymous but are related (Knight, 2004). For this study, the researcher uses the term *globalization* to refer to the context in which internationalizing at a post-secondary campus takes place (Knight, 2004).

Evidence continually reveals that post-secondary graduates are in need of intercultural skills to be successful in the new global economy (Hunter, 2004; Mak & Kennedy, 2012; Sparks & Waits, 2011; Zhao, 2010). In order for US post-secondary students to acquire the ability to enter the global economy, implementing an internationalization initiative that fosters intercultural skills can be considered as one route toward achieving this goal (Crawford & Kirby, 2008; Hunter, 2004). The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) has reached out to university administrators to address this challenge head-on in order to ensure their graduates are to be competitive (NASULGC, 2004). The NASULGC challenged post-secondary presidents with the task of internationalizing their institutions to ensure that students remain competitive in the world today (NASULGC, 2004). Further, recommendations were made for college administrators to work in collaboration with other members of the campus community to promote changes in policy. Operationalizing their
mission, or preparing faculty and staff to implement an internationalization initiative on a post-secondary campus, is one preliminary step that could be taken (NASULGC, 2004).

Additionally, in 2006 the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers (NAFSA): Association of International Educators asserted that the new era sparked by globalization has altered the way post-secondary graduates should be prepared for future jobs (NAFSA, 2006). In 2005, a NAFSA study measured the perceptions of a sample of American adults on their views of US students’ current global readiness, foreign languages, and studying abroad as a way to provide students with intercultural skills that could prepare graduates for international job competitiveness. Out of the survey sample of 1,051 US adults, 90% of respondents stated that new skills and a knowledge base of international issues were necessary for success in their next future job. Moreover, 86% of the survey respondents noted that young people should be exposed to students from other places in the world, increasing opportunities for students to gain intercultural skills by interacting with foreign students more frequently. Additionally, 94% of the participants responded that it was essential for graduates today to be knowledgeable of global regions and cultures other than their own (NAFSA, 2006).

The American Council on Education (ACE) administered a survey both prior to and following September 11, 2001, which targeted nearly 2,500 student and faculty participants within 1,501 institutions (of which 752 participated). The results showed little difference in perception and opinion of foreign language training and its importance in job seeking. Respondents both prior to and after September 11 did not note any large-scale change. However, Green (2003) noted there was a gap between students’ interest levels in global issues and their actual participation rates, which presents questions and challenges for institutional
leaders who are currently implementing, or who plan to carry out an international initiative on their campus.

US post-secondary education systems are not preparing future graduates with the skills and knowledge needed to be competitive in the 21st century (CED, 2006) and as of 2006, only 1% of undergraduates had studied abroad and less than 10% had enrolled in foreign language courses that could provide them with the ability to become competent in a linguistic skill critical to national security (CED, 2006). Although the preparation of college students for the global economy is a point of discussion in politics and in the research literature, post-secondary graduates continue to be underprepared for the challenges they will face in the future (ACE, 2012; CED, 2006; CIGE, 2012; Duncan, 2010; Hunter, 2004).

Specifically, “…ultimately, the responsibility falls on higher education to do more than offer a series of internationally focused courses or send students abroad to have them become globally competent” (Hunter, 2004, p. 11). Universities that engage in the internationalization process should prepare faculty and students to embrace a “…diversity of cultures that exists within countries, communities, and institutions” (Knight, 2004, p. 11). To date, internationalization has been operationalized on post-secondary campuses by merging international and domestic research agendas, by recruiting international students, by hosting foreign scholars, by implementing global curricula, and by offering students study-abroad programs (Coryell, Durodoye, Wright, Pate & Nguyen, 2012). Internationalization initiatives in post-secondary environments provide opportunities through “…curriculum, co-curricular activities, and work abroad programs, such as volunteering, internships, and co-op programs…[which are] more effective than study abroad, which provides less direct contact with the community at large and is expensive to pursue” (Brigham, 2011, p. 33). US post-secondary
institutions have also built global centers, some with assistance from internationally-based partner institutions or programs, to serve as a central location on their campus for developing and sustaining an internationalization initiative (Bogotch & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2010). Global centers may also focus on conducting programs that support international research (Biddle, 2010) and assist in understanding the internationalization process.

Both internationalization and diversity on a post-secondary campus promote positive student outcomes such as critical thinking, “…enhanc[ing] inter-group understanding…”, “…adaptability…[and] tolerance and acceptance…[leading to] a strong decrease in ethnocentrism…” (Wong, 2006, p. 2-3). Traditionally, diversity and internationalization have been “disconnected” on post-secondary campuses (Wong, 2006, p. 3). Campuses have split their approach to diversity and internationalization, despite the similarity in their goal to “…reach across barriers that divide…” (Wong, 2006, p. 3). Specifically, diversity has been conceptualized as “…understanding and valuing difference…plac[ing] a strong emphasis on exploring individual differences in supportive environments in an effort to transform individual thinking and functioning from mere tolerance to embracing and finding value in differences…” (Davis, 2013, p. 2). Moreover, Davis stated that on post-secondary campuses in particular, internationalization has been viewed as an “asset,” while diversity initiatives have resulted from a “deficit” point of view (p. 2). However, Davis (2013) pointed out the belief that intercultural skills and their critical role in connecting varying cultural groups across borders have created the “…overlap between diversity and internationalization” (p. 2).

Statement of the Problem

The globe has become more interconnected than ever before due to technological advancements (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Duncan, 2010; Friedman, 2007; Jue,
Marr, & Kassotakis, 2010; Stromquist, 2002) and many nations around the world have transformed their education systems at various levels in order to prepare students to thrive in the environment of increased global connectedness heralded by the 21st century (Clotfelter, 2010; Friedman, 2007; Rhodes & Torres, 2006; Stromquist, 2002; Wildavsky, 2010). Post-secondary students in the US must be taught how to work collaboratively with individuals from different backgrounds in order to be prepared to enter the global workforce in effort to remain competitive in the 21st century (CIGE, 2012; Crawford & Kirby, 2008; Duncan, 2010; Friedman, 2007; Hunter, 2004; Sparks & Waits, 2011). Although internationalization efforts have risen across post-secondary campuses (Knight, 2001), there is still a significant disparity between the progress made in areas such as global curricula and programs that will develop students’ intercultural skills and their actual readiness for global work environments (ACE, 2012; CIGE, 2012; Duncan, 2010; Friedman, 2007; Green, 2003; Hunter, 2004; Zhao, 2011).

Globalization has changed the economic landscape and in response, US employers have invested millions of dollars to train their existing employees to be “globally competitive” and Hunter (2004, p. 6), suggests that post-secondary institutions in the US should be teaching students not only content knowledge in their field of study, but intercultural skills as well, in order to prepare them to enter the current transnational economy (Breuning, 2007; CIGE, 2012; Clotfelter, 2010; Friedman, 2007; Guruz, 2011; Rhodes & Torres, 2006; Stromquist, 2002). Despite the call from both researchers and employers to have US universities prepare graduates for a global economy (Hunter, 2004; Sparks & Waite, 2011; Zhao, 2010; 2011), the Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) found that only 51% of universities have noted their commitment to internationalization in their mission statement, and that similarly only 52% of universities have made internationalizing the curriculum one of their top priorities.
(CIGE, 2012). Coryell, et al. (2012) and Morris (2009) both noted that maintaining communication across a campus in order to sustain internationalization is critical to the process, and in order to make it successful, Knight (2001) pointed out that a monitoring system is pivotal.

**Research Questions**

This research study sought to examine how one northeastern post-secondary institution has understood and operationalized their campus-wide initiative to internationalize their programs of study. The following questions guided the study:

1. How do GCC staff and administrators at one post-secondary institution understand their campus’s internationalization initiative to prepare faculty and students to embrace different cultures?

2. What organizational decision-making processes and dialogue have GCC staff and campus administrators engaged in to operationalize their internationalization initiative?

3. How have GCC staff and administrators sought to achieve the institution's internationalization initiative throughout the campus community?

**Purpose of the Study**

Although post-secondary institutions have begun to internationalize, progress is neither widespread nor consistent (Green, 2003; Hser, 2005; Knight, 2001; 2004) and few studies currently exist to illustrate best practices for implementing and sustaining an internationalization initiative on post-secondary campuses (Li-Hua & Wilson, Aouad & Li, 2011; Taylor, 2004).

Such research is essential if institutions are to successfully develop and implement internationalization initiatives on their campus and avoid some of the pitfalls and challenges faced by those institutions that have already blazed this trail. Therefore, the purpose of this
descriptive case study was to examine the decision-making processes of GCC staff and administrators at one northeastern post-secondary institution, namely that the purpose was to gain this understanding in the service of providing a model for other campuses that wish to engage in an internationalization initiative of their own. Specifically, this study examined how GCC staff and campus administrators understand and operationalize an initiative to internationalize programs and curricula across the larger campus community in the service of enabling future graduates of the institution to be competitive in the current global economy (Crawford & Kirby, 2008; Duncan, 2010; Hunter, 2004; Sparks & Waits, 2011).

**Overview of Methodology**

According to Maxwell (2005), case studies allow the researcher to access information from individuals and organizations that could not be gained through other methods. Specifically, this single-site case study is descriptive because it explained a “…phenomenon and the real-life context…” as it occurs on a post-secondary campus (Baxter & Jack, 2008). Yin (2009) suggested that this methodology is largely effective in the exploratory phases of research; which is applicable in this case, given that limited models currently exist on the ways post-secondary institutions understand and operationalize internationalization initiatives. Employing multiple data collection strategies allowed for a broad perspective to be gained regarding how an internationalization initiative is not only understood and operationalized by GCC staff and campus administrators as it is implemented across the larger campus community, but also how it can illustrate best practices and challenges discovered through this type of process. Data from the following sources were collected to assist in answering the research questions and addressing the propositions: documents, an interview, a focus group, observations, and field notes. Once data was collected, they were analyzed, coded and categorized according to the common themes
that emerged. Triangulating multiple data sources helped ensure that threats to validity were minimized (Maxwell, 2005).

Research for this descriptive case study was conducted during the 2013-2014 academic year at a large university located in the northeast region of the United States. In order to attain the core values outlined in its current strategic plan, which includes internationalizing on various levels no later than 2015, Albani University depends on the work of GCC staff and campus administrators to implement this initiative successfully.

**Potential Significance of the Study**

This descriptive case study explored the internationalization process at Albani University during the 2013-2014 academic school year, specifically the decision-making processes of GCC staff and campus administrators. The implementation of an internationalization initiative may be effective when a university is unified through its leaders and staff to engage the larger campus community in promoting and acquiring intercultural skills. Specifically, Coryell et al., (2012) found in their research on post-secondary institutions in the US and in the United Kingdom that in order for internationalization to be effective, the university community as a whole will need to “…develop and acquire intercommunication skills, knowledge of international practices in one’s discipline, and transcultural sensitivity” (p. 90-91). Morris (2009) found that successful internationalization at post-secondary institutions is accomplished by “…regular and consistent faculty dialogue on the subject of internationalization leading to a shared understanding of the internationalization goals…” (p. 145). Furthermore, Knight (2001) noted that for internationalization efforts to be credible, valuable, and ultimately sustained, monitoring of organizational and program processes should be a top priority. This descriptive case study was designed to fill a gap in the research literature regarding the process of implementing an
internationalization initiative on a US post-secondary campus, specifically by examining how GCC staff and campus administrators have made sense of and executed this process.

Ensuring that US students are fully prepared to enter a global workforce has been touted by many researchers as an important objective (ACE, 2012; Anderson-Levitt, 2003; CIGE, 2012; Clotfelter, 2010; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Duncan, 2010; Friedman, 2007; Guruz, 2011; Hunter, 2004; Merryfield, 1992; Sparks & Waits, 2011; Stromquist, 2007), but only a handful of case studies have examined how post-secondary environments understand and operationalize an internationalization initiative. Specifically, few research studies exist that illustrate how universities implement an internationalization initiative across the larger campus community (Li-Hua & Wilson, Aouad & Li, 2010; Taylor, 2004). Certainly, as more post-secondary institutions make the commitment to internationalize, evidence-based models are needed to provide concrete examples for the best way to accomplish this objective. Universities are still discovering how to internationalize such that they adequately prepare their graduates to become part of the 21st century workforce (Duncan, 2010; Hunter, 2004; Morris, 2009).

From a theoretical point of view, this study was intended to promote a detailed understanding for how individuals involved in the internationalization initiative make sense of the process. Since internationalizing is considered complex (Ellingboe, 1998; Jordan, 2008) the outcome of this study answers the call for further clarification from both researchers and institutions. Additionally, this study provided insight into how GCC staff and administrators at Albani University have made sense of an internationalization initiative.

Data gained through this study has provided a deeper understanding for the practitioners at Albani University as internationalization initiatives involve many stakeholders who must share essential goals across an institution (Green, 2003; Knight, 1997; Morris, 2009). The document
analysis, observations, as well as administrator and staff experience captured from individual and focus group interviews were especially useful as Albani University continues to embark further into its internationalization initiative to reach its goals in 2015. Harnessing a clearer understanding of the perspectives and experiences of practitioners within the GCC and the larger campus community at Albani University may be applied to future work as they continue to progress toward achieving the common goals documented in its current academic strategic plan.

In 2011 Albani University embarked on a journey that involved engaging in several initiatives, and one was to internationalize its institution. In 2015, its current strategic plan will expire. Out of the five core values outlined in the institution’s plan, embracing intercultural relations is one major component. More specifically, embracing intercultural relations seeks to foster a campus culture that respects all diversities and demonstrates an appreciation for them. The GCC provides the larger campus community with opportunities to transform their academic and cultural learning experiences in preparation for the transnational environment, its administrators and staff are pivotal to the execution and attainment of Albani University’s core values related to internationalization outlined in the Strategic Plan 2011-2015.

Figure 1.1 provides the conceptual framework that guided this descriptive case study. It served to illustrate the context for the study, which shows that the GCC and post-secondary institution maintain a constant connection. It also demonstrates the interconnections that exist between the GCC and Albani University, along with research propositions that were explored throughout this study. The conceptual framework also presents research questions as directly connected to the propositions. They were further examined in this descriptive case study through the data collection process.

Figure 1.1
Conceptual Framework: Case Study Propositions & Research Questions

Conceptual Framework

Weick’s (1995) Sensemaking Theory was employed to understand how GCC staff and campus administrators at one large northeastern post-secondary institution have understood and operationalized an internationalization initiative across the larger campus community. Before defining Sensemaking Theory, it is important to note that organizational change initiatives are embedded in this framework and are viewed as both continuous and social because they are contingent on others’ actions (Weick, 1995). Weick’s (1979; 1993; 1995) Sensemaking Theory
illustrates how organizations evolve, and encompasses three phases that include enactment, selection, and retention.

More specifically, Weick’s (1995) theory is guided by the following properties: 1) identity construction 2) retrospection 3) enactment of a sensible environment 4) social sensemaking 5) ongoing 6) extracted cues and 7) plausibility over accuracy. These properties provide a framework as to how individuals process actions and beliefs within an organization to make sense of their changing environment (Weick, 1995). The Sensemaking Theory was well suited for this case study because its framework assists in understanding an organizational change that often leads to equivocality (Choo, 2002; Weick, 1979; 1993; 1995); a post-secondary environment undergoing an internationalization initiative makes efforts to comprehend the decision making processes of its pertinent stakeholders.

In the Sensemaking Theory, environmental changes result in the gathering and creating of information that could be used for future action by individuals within the organization. Organizational sensemaking is led by individual beliefs and actions, which are then interpreted by sequences of enacting, selecting, and retaining certain events in an environment for future use (Choo, 2002). Figure 1.2 illustrates that enactment precedes sensemaking in a changing environment that may consist of equivocality due to the many interpretations that can exist regarding the ways an initiative could be implemented. Choo’s (2002) representation in Figure 1.2 also illustrates the relationship between beliefs and actions found in Weick’s (1995) Sensemaking Theory.

Figure 1.2

The Sensemaking Process: Action and Belief Dynamics Breakdown
Next, enactment may be followed by both selection and retention of information that is processed, interpreted, modified, and eventually applied to a situation through the interpretations developed from individuals’ belief systems (see Figure 1.3). Choo (2002) illustrated that this planning process is reflective and conducted with the future in mind, therefore can be viewed as topsy-turvy. Choo (2002) utilized this phrase because once information by the organization is used it is either stored or extinguished depending on its usability in the future. When information is retained it is seen as useable and may make decisions more orderly. Finally, as actions are enacted, they may have already come under control, thus sensible (Weick, 1979).

The Sensemaking Theory helps to explain organizational decision-making as it may lead to equivocality, which makes it appropriate to apply to a post-secondary institution that is currently implementing an internationalization initiative. An organization can work to make sense of equivocality in order for its members to make appropriate decisions for current or future environmental changes. Understanding how GCC staff and campus administrators perceive the overall internationalization initiative may directly impact how they understand and operationalize organizational changes they implement across the campus community over time.
Figure 1.3 illustrates the relationship that exists among enactment, the organizing of information, and sensemaking in more detail. Sensemaking is part of a cycle that individuals within an organization engage in effort to gather information, process it, and decide on whether to use or get rid of it for the purpose of future decision making opportunities. Examining this process closely may provide insight into best practices for how other institutions may address this change. When decisions are made, leaders may retain critical information by documenting the actions and procedures used at their organization. Retention is displayed when members in an organization choose particular information to use in the future. However, Weick (1979; 1993; 1995) suggested that an overload of retention in the organization may prevent flexibility in system processes that could inhibit future changes. Together, these will help illustrate how GCC staff and campus administrators have understood and implemented the internationalization process may reveal cues as to better decisions in the future (Choo, 2002).

*Figure 1.3. The Sensemaking Process*

(Weick, Sutcliffe & Obstfeld, 2005)
For the purpose of this case study, the Sensemaking Theory uncovered how GCC staff and campus administrators may assemble and select new events as their organization evolves and engages in the internationalization process. This theoretical framework may assist GCC staff and campus administrators in understanding the networks that may be developed at a post-secondary institution when they implement an internationalization initiative across the larger campus community (McGraw-Hill, 2007). Ancona (2012) noted that sensemaking involves learning from “…those closest to the front line…” and assisted the researcher in identifying how GCC staff and administrators understand an initiative as they enact changes (p. 9).

This theoretical framework assisted the researcher in making sense of the beliefs and actions of GCC staff and campus administrators as they may affect their attempts to identify a collective vision in order to eliminate equivocality discovered when they implement an internationalization initiative (Choo, 2002). Finally, leveraging this theoretical framework may uncover how GCC staff and campus administrators assemble and select new events as their organization evolves and engages in the internationalization process now and in the future.

The two constructs that framed this case study are the internationalization initiative as an organizational change and the decision-making processes of GCC staff and campus administrators. There were also three propositions (see Appendix A; see Figure 1.4) that were explored to frame this case study. Yin (2003) and Stake (1995) agreed propositions assist in the development of a conceptual framework that guides the research process (see Figure 1.1). Propositions fulfill multiple roles. Initially, propositions can connect to data logically and ensure the researcher has bounded the scope of the study (Baxter & Jack, 2008). Propositions can be linked to literature, personal or professional experience, theoretical evidence, or data (Baxter &
The propositions that were designed for this descriptive case study are connected directly to literature related to internationalization initiatives.

Proposition I sought to understand how internationalization is a process that involves preparing faculty and students to embrace diverse cultures (Coryell, et al., 2012; Knight, 2004). Proposition II examined how internationalizing a post-secondary campus is accomplished through “…regular and consistent faculty dialogue…” (Morris, 2009, p. 145), and how communication and ownership demonstrated by administrators and faculty is pertinent for success (Coryell, et al., 2012). Proposition III examined the internationalization process and how it is implemented across the larger campus community. More specifically, Proposition III sought to find out how internationalization can be achieved when a campus community acquires knowledge of international practices (Coryell, et al., 2012) and reaches a common understanding of its ultimate goals (Morris, 2009) as GCC staff and administrators ensure monitoring remains a top priority from their perspective (Knight, 2001).

Figure 1.4.

The Research Propositions: Focusing the Case Study
Assumptions

The following assumptions were made for this study by the researcher:

1. Each participant held a subjective view.

2. Data gained through interview and focus group were rooted in practical experiences.

3. Literature supplied by GCC staff and campus administrator was accurate and up-to-date.

4. GCC staff and campus administrator responses reported accurate and timely progress toward the internationalization initiative.

5. The administrator leads the GCC staff, other departments, and initiatives at the post-secondary institution.

6. The larger campus community at the post-secondary institution included potential affiliate organizations that may support the internationalization initiative, as well as other university departments and their administrators, faculty, and/or students.

Limitations of the Study

This study had several limitations as noted below:
1. A single university and global center was examined.

2. The 2011-2015 Strategic Plan requirements may have affected the level of data results.
   a. Generalizability could have been affected, and data may not have represented larger campus community perspectives.
   b. Critical participants may have been unwilling or unable to participate.

3. Participants were limited to GCC staff, university administrators, and other members of the larger campus community who were available to partake in interviews for this descriptive case study.

4. GCC staff and campus administrator data may have been affected.
   a. The low administrator participation rate narrowed the study by providing limited insight into the research questions.
   b. Personal experience and bias of the interviewees may have affected the data or may not have represented a wider range of campus community perceptions.
   c. Potential biases held by the researcher may have affected the study.

**Delimitations of the Study**

The researcher bound this descriptive case study in order to focus on the work of a single institution that was currently implementing an internationalization initiative on their campus. Baxter and Jack (2008) noted that once the decision to conduct a case study is made it is essential for the researcher to decide what the study will and will not be. In order to avoid an unfocused study placing scopes on time, place, activity, context, and definition(s) should be completed (Baxter & Jack, 2008). A careful investigation of a large northeastern university that is involved in the process of understanding and operationalizing the initiative to internationalize was intended to provide an in-depth understanding of this process and to address the three research
propositions and questions (see Appendix A; see Figure 1.1) that ground this case study. The researcher gathered data through an extensive document review, as well as through observations of two staff meetings and administrators’ actions as they understand and operationalize an internationalization initiative. Document analysis was conducted as well as individual and focus group interviews. Field notes were also taken throughout the data collection process.

Summary

Chapter 1 has introduced the research problem, the research questions, the conceptual framework and the significance of the study. The assumptions and limitations of this case study were also outlined. Chapter 2 will provide a literature review of the content areas as well as pertinent definitions of key terms in the area of globalization and internationalization in post-secondary education. A discussion of the literature to date on intercultural skills from the post-secondary and employer perspectives will also be presented. Lastly, an overview of approaches to internationalization in national and international post-secondary environments will be presented.
CHAPTER 2:
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Introduction

This chapter will present a review of the literature and research available on the topic of internationalization in post-secondary environments. First, definitions of the terms internationalization and globalization will be presented, along with an overview on how the transnational environment has changed post-secondary institutions. A description of the purpose and approaches to internationalization will follow that includes how current, post-secondary scholars and employers address intercultural skills. Finally, the role of post-secondary faculty and administrators involved in internationalization initiatives is presented alongside descriptions of some practices used in the US and overseas. The questions presented below will guide this review of the pertinent literature:

1. How do researchers define globalization and internationalization?
   a. What impact has the transnational environment had on post-secondary institutions?
2. What are the purposes and approaches for implementing internationalization at post-secondary institutions?
3. How are intercultural skills and competencies addressed in the research to date?
4. How do post-secondary faculty and employers discuss intercultural skills?
a. How do post-secondary faculty prepare to teach intercultural skills?

5. What are some practices used at post-secondary institutions to internationalize in the US and overseas?

6. How have post-secondary faculty and administrators played a role in the internationalization process, and what have they experienced?

To address these questions, Chapter 2 will be split into three sections. The first section, *Globalization and Internationalization*, will address questions one and two and include an initial overview of definitions for the terms globalization and internationalization. Additionally, section one will identify how the transnational environment impacts post-secondary institutions. A discussion of the approaches used to successfully internationalize post-secondary institutions will conclude this section.

The second section, entitled *Intercultural Skills*, will cover questions three and four. This section will first address how intercultural skills and competencies are identified in the research to date. An examination of how faculty members and employers have discussed intercultural skills will also be presented.

Chapter 2 will conclude with a discussion concerning *Internationalization Practices*, answering questions five and six. Background information will explain how administrators and faculty continue to play a role in the internationalization process, and include their experience with its implementation. Finally, a discussion of some practices used to carry out internationalization in the US and overseas will be provided.

**Globalization and Internationalization**

To examine the literature concerning internationalization and the development of intercultural skills, one must search under the general theme of globalization. Although
globalization is often introduced along with the concept of internationalization, there are differences between the two terms and the relationship is often confused (Knight, 2004). For the purpose of this study, globalization will be utilized to understand how internationalization takes place in a post-secondary environment. Knight’s (2004) definition for internationalization, “…intercultural, and/or global dimension into the curriculum and teaching learning process,” will be adopted in order to ground this descriptive case study (p. 6).

Definitions

Although globalization and internationalization are often referred to interchangeably in the literature, there are important distinctions between the two terms (Knight, 2004; Kreber, 2009). These differences are initially determined by the fact that globalization is mainly an economic process (Yang, 2002). Altbach and Knight (2007) stated globalization is the “…context of economic and academic trends that are part of the reality of the 21st century…” (p. 290), while Knight (2004) noted the flow among people, their values and innovations in both technology and economies across and between nations. Kreber (2009) also contributed to the discussion of identifying differences between the definitions for internationalization and globalization by describing the latter as an “…increased interdependence and convergence and an ethos of competition, while internationalization tends to be associated principally with an ethos of mutuality and practices” (p. 2). Knight (2004) argued, “…internationalization is changing the world of higher education, and globalization is changing the world of internationalization” (p. 5). This illustrates that each term is interconnected and impacts post-secondary environments simultaneously. Differences exist as to how researchers view these two terms and Knight (2004) calls for a “…conceptual model that provides some clarity on meaning
Internationalization is a term that is roughly twenty years old, and has involved global-related activities in post-secondary environments; both in the US and abroad (Knight, 2004). First, internationalization at post-secondary institutions can be referred to as the “…policies and practices undertaken by academic systems and institutions—and even individuals—to cope with the global academic environment” (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 290). Knight (2004) further identified internationalization as, “…the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimensions into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (p. 11). The internationalization process continues to be influenced by globalization, altering the “…flow of knowledge, people, values and ideas” (Yang, 2002, p. 82). From an institutional viewpoint, it is critical to note that although internationalization and globalization are similar, each has different outcomes. For instance, globalization reflects the “…growing international labor market for scholars and scientists, the growth of communications firms…and the use of information technology (IT)...”; “…Globalization may be unalterable, but internationalization involves many choices” (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 291). When institutions respond to globalization, internationalization is viewed as a way to instill 21st century graduates with intercultural skills that prepare them to act positively toward other cultures (Green, 2012; Hytten & Bettez, 2008).

Olson, Green and Hill (2006) described internationalization as a process that affects curricular development, teaching and learning programs, non-academic related activities, and collaborations with local cultural organizations. For example, curricula may be infused with international themes, or students may take on a new language or cultural study (Olson, Green &
Global learning activities that facilitate intercultural skill development may also involve outside assistance such as inviting an expert to speak with students, in effort to provide international perspectives that may give students the opportunity to gain intercultural skills (Olson, Green & Hill, 2006). Another example of how students may gain international skills include attending intercultural campus events, liaison work with local cultural organizations, providing support for global programs or cross-cultural training, and servicing individuals partaking in sabbaticals overseas (Knight, 2004). Knight (2004) also defined internationalization initiatives to include “…activities such as study abroad, curriculum and academic programs, institutional linkages and networks, development projects, and branch campuses” (p. 20). Often, internationalizing incorporates numerous global activities on a campus that involve the use of technical collaboration or mutual projects that extend overseas (Knight, 2004).

The drive to implement an internationalization initiative is usually fueled by a common vision (Ellingboe, 1998). Harari (1992) pointed out a whole campus will come together and be committed to internationalizing if guided by individuals that lead the change. According to Ellingboe (1998), implementing an internationalization initiative is a complex process and is achieved when the entire post-secondary organization has integrated a global point of view. The internationalization process is “…an ongoing future-oriented, multi-dimensional interdisciplinary, leadership-driven vision that involves many stakeholders working to change the internal dynamics of an institution to respond and adapt appropriately to an increasingly diverse, globally-focused, ever-changing external environment” (Ellingboe, 1998, p. 199). Discussing the meaning of internationalization as it relates to their individual work will be an important step for post-secondary staff to take when they implement the process (Biggs, 1997).
Impact. World events trigger identification and response to globalization; and many institutions react to globalization by making economically driven decisions (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Kreber, 2009; Zeleza, 2012). One of the most poignant crises that triggered increased recognition and awareness of globalization were the events of September 11, 2001 (Hunter, 2004; Kreber, 2009; Leask, 2011). Historic events such as this lead faculty to raise questions about how students can attain global competence and the specific international skills they will need in an unpredictable interconnected world (Hunter, 2004; Zhao, 2010).

Goodwin (2010) argued preparing graduates for a 21st century world is defined by the increased mobility of people, which is on an “…unprecedented global scale…” (p. 20). The outcomes of this rapid movement of people is pertinent because the globalized world is complex and prone to increased conflict resulting in transnational employment, the displacement and migration of mass populations, larger income gaps, competition over resources, and technological advancements (Goodwin, 2010). Even amidst great conflict between nations, becoming a 21st century graduate that possesses “…strong communication skills, knowledge of cultural differences, and the ability to function as a…’cultural ambassador’…has direct implications for education” (Flinders, 2009, p. 4). An internationalization initiative is one way post-secondary institutions react to the pressure of globalization (Jordan, 2008; Qiang, 2003).

Education has become increasingly affected by the onset of globalization (Crose, 2011; Friedman, 2007; Stromquist, 2002), and a significant challenge for 21st century education has led to questions over pedagogy and curricular development (Crose, 2011; Lule, 2009). Stromquist (2002) noted that educators are faced with a new calling today brought on by globalization. Globalization must encourage educators to become less protagonistic, and instead take on a more interactive role in preparing students to possess the international perspective necessary to
succeed in an interconnected world (Stromquist, 2002). Educators must begin to motivate others to re-examine globalization as impacting economics and focus more on ‘internationalism’ which entails encouraging “…global peace and well-being through the development of international structures…” for the purpose of “…ensuring a better world for all…” (Stromquist, 2002, p. 188).

A new era of the post-secondary environment has come to fruition, which has ultimately changed the face of 21st century learning. Ivan (2011) noted “…the educational philosophy of the higher education world today is moving the emphasis from teaching to learning…” (p. 55-56). Today the ‘third millennium university,’ will be focused on a unique and innovative education that will be globally competitive (Ivan, 2011). Furthermore, Ivan (2011) posited that a new era has paved the way for the phrase ‘Open University,’ which is considered a fresh perspective on post-secondary institutions and that “…The University which is built today for the future is a strong institution, defined by quality, performance, responsibility and autonomy…” (p. 57). Universities that implement internationalization agendas will be open to diversifying and embracing multiculturalism across their campuses (Ivan, 2011), providing an organizational structure that can support intercultural learning.

**Purpose.** There are many reasons for implementing internationalization initiatives at post-secondary institutions. Knight (2004) noted it is critical and its “…rationales vary enormously and can handle human resource development, strategic alliances, commercial trade, nation building, and social/cultural development” (p. 19). In Europe, an impetus for change at post-secondary institutions is due to globalization at the higher education level, population migration patterns, or emerging national economic centers (e.g., China) (Jordan, 2008). The Erasmus program, which went into effect in 1987, has also influenced internationalization across Europe and altered how students view their own identities and nationalities (Zeleza, 2012). The
Bologna Accord has given students and universities in the European Union (EU) flexibility to gain greater academic mobility (Clotfelter, 2010; Wildavsky, 2010). In 1999, the Bologna Accord began providing more compatibility among participating Higher Education institutions (Zeleza, 2012), and has allowed international students to transfer courses more easily across national borders (Knobel, 2011). Today, the Bologna Accord includes 47 participating institutions (Chung, 2011) and “…harmonizes entire academic systems to ensure compatible degree structures, transferable credits, and equal academic qualifications…” across the EU (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 293). Events such as these have led post-secondary environments in the United Kingdom to embed global themes across their campus and into classrooms (Jordan, 2008). Many factors impact how a post-secondary institution is internationalized (Jordan, 2008). Although the process is increasingly important, it still remains confusing and multifarious (Jordan, 2008). Although post-secondary institutions have varying experiences with internationalization, some have had great barriers to achieving it beginning with how this process is discussed and developed (Leask, 2011). Leask (2011) noted:

Internationalisation defies orderly, organized and rational analysis. Its meaning is not fixed, in place or time. On the contrary, different groups construct it differently at the same time in the same place, at the same time in different places, and at different times in different places. (p. 1)

Internationalization has been implemented differently in post-secondary environments across the US and in the world. Knight (2004) noted there are many reasons institutions decide to implement an internationalization initiative, including a desire for new technologies for communication and development, labor and economic changes, and the search for knowledge acquisition. In a study conducted by Knight (1997) on the Canadian post-secondary system, a pertinent purpose for an internationalization initiative was for students to not only attain knowledge of other parts of the globe, but to become competent in intercultural relations. Other
significant reasons for internationalizing that stood out in this study, aside from political and economic motives, were rooted in the motivation to provide students with opportunities to gain a cross-cultural understanding in an interconnected world (Knight, 1997).

**Approaches and Components.** Qiang (2003) provided substantial information on the various characteristics found in post-secondary environments that implement internationalization initiatives. The approaches to internationalization that are evident and currently standard practice at some universities include: activity, competency, ethos, and process (Qiang, 2003). The activity approach involves changes to curricula, providing technical related work, recruiting students from overseas, and facilitating global exchanges between faculty and students (Qiang, 2003). Competency “…emphasizes the development of skills, knowledge, attitudes and values in students, faculty and staff” (Qiang, 2003, p. 250) and ethos specifically relates to the culture created by an organization, such as a post-secondary institution, to sustain an internationalization initiative. For example, Qiang (2003) noted that ethos “…emphasizes creating a culture or climate that values and supports international/intercultural perspectives and initiatives” (p. 251). The final approach, process, pertains to the way activities and an organization embeds intercultural skills into the environment, particularly teaching, research and servicing the institution with international resources (Qiang, 2003). There is a call for more research in tracking the specific intercultural competencies necessary for students to be successful citizens in the world today (Qiang, 2003).

There are several components to internationalization that are currently being implemented at post-secondary institutions and have led to success with carrying out the process. The specific components include the following:

- Establishing specific goals
• Developing a strategic plan linked to other campus initiatives
• Requiring accountability of individuals tasked with facilitating the process
• Streamlining pertinent communication across the campus
• Establishing learning outcomes (e.g., intercultural skills)
• Celebrating successes (Morris, 2009)

An internationalization initiative can also be achieved through international student exchanges or global centers (Biddle, 2010; Bogotch & Maslin-Ostrowski, 2010). Studies have demonstrated that many institutions have internationalized by sending students overseas to learn (Green, 2012; Knight, 2001; Qiang, 2003). The Institute of International Education (IIE) report found substantial increases in US students studying abroad (IIE, 2011). There were 270,604 US students that studied abroad in 2009-2010, which represented a 3.9% increase from the year prior (IIE, 2011). More recently, IIE identified there was a 1.3% increase in study abroad since the 2009-2010 report (IIE, 2012). Fourteen of the top 25 destinations chosen by students to study abroad have continued to be outside of Europe (IIE, 2011; IIE 2012). These findings suggest that US post-secondary institutions may have listened when the Council on International Education Exchange encouraged them to support students when they study abroad in places where English is not the primary language spoken (Hunter, 2004).

The evolution of US post-secondary education has undoubtedly supported the “…integration or infusion of an international/intercultural dimension into teaching, research and service through a combination of a wide range of activities, policies and procedures…” (Qiang, 2003, p. 251). International learning environments in the US have become more common, which is due to the foreign student presence in US post-secondary classrooms (Coryell, et al., 2012; Harrison, 2011). The number of international students currently studying in the US is at an all
time high of 764,495, which is a 5.7% increase from 2010-2011 (IIE, 2012). Qiang (2003) noted the importance of looking at both organizational and academic elements to internationalization initiatives. If both elements do not receive equal attention, then the initiative may not be successful (Qiang, 2003).

Morris (2009) noted changes within the post-secondary environment that are related to internationalization. Specifically, the new challenge for faculty is that they “…not only remain current in their disciplines globally but [that they] must also be aware of developments in key related disciplines since the nature of knowledge and the problems facing humanity are cross-disciplinary and global” (Morris, 2009, p. 143). Since universities are largely diverse organizations, new challenges for faculty related to pedagogical approaches in classrooms with international students have become evident (Harrison, 2012). Some ways faculty have altered their instruction to facilitate an international focus is by integrating role plays into lesson plans that reference global themes, or by organizing international and intercultural events on their campus (Olson, Green & Hill, 2006). Faculty may also need to alter their teaching practices to accommodate visiting international students or scholars who have studied abroad (Olson, Green & Hill, 2006).

Internationalization of curricula may promote students’ intercultural skills and the attainment of a deeper understanding of cultural identity (Crose, 2011). An internationalization initiative provides students with tremendous knowledge regarding the world around them. Intercultural skills help ensure today’s graduates are “…better prepared to contribute positively to local, regional, national, and international progress because they develop skills deemed necessary for the modern workforce and global conditions, such as second-language acquisition, cultural awareness, international contacts, and adaptation skills” (Kreber, 2009, p. 8).
To summarize, scholars to date have discussed globalization and internationalization but it is important to understand that each concept has a separate definition. However, both impact post-secondary institutions. It is clear that internationalizing post-secondary institutions may include such aspects as curricular reform, program or activity development, and the promotion of students’ intercultural skills. Intercultural skills and competencies will be reviewed in the next section, followed by a discussion of how post-secondary faculty and employers discuss and prepare to teach these competencies.

**Intercultural Skills**

Educational environments in the US and overseas have been impacted by the transnational economy, yet the outcomes of internationalization efforts vary across different institutions (Hser, 2005). Internationalization enhances intercultural learning within a given subject matter by encouraging students to consider multiple perspectives and social conditions (Hytten & Bettez, 2008). Consequently, internationalization may promote stronger critical thinking skills (Hytten & Bettez, 2008). Preparing students for a globalized workforce is no longer an option as McTighe-Musil (2006) noted, with today’s global “…rapid change[s], institutions must be driven less by internal customs and more by external awareness” (Sparks & Waits, 2011, p. 5). Graduates need 21st century skills, tools, and knowledge, all of which are tremendously different from what was demanded of graduates in the 19th and 20th centuries (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Friedman, 2007; Hunter, 2004). Furthermore, US businesses argue that they are not finding adequately skilled workers needed in today’s global competitive environment (Hunter, 2004; Sparks and Waits, 2011). The United States is currently ranked significantly below other countries in the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development for post-secondary degree attainment (Sparks & Waits, 2011). Therefore, it is
imperative that post-secondary graduates are career ready (Sparks & Waits, 2011) and possess intercultural skills.

**Defining Intercultural Skills**

A single and commonly applied definition of intercultural skills is hard to pin down in the research literature (Behrnd & Porzelt, 2012; Holmes & O’Neill, 2012). This section of the literature review will discuss how intercultural skills and competencies are described in the literature, as well as how they are viewed from employer perspectives.

The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) classified “…global knowledge, ethical commitments to individual and social responsibility, and intercultural skills as major components of a twenty-first-century liberal education” (McTighe-Musil, 2006, p. 1). Olson, Green, and Hill (2006) stated the term "intercultural" specifically refers to the knowledge and skills needed to be able to understand cultural differences. Some of the skills and knowledge that 21st century students need to gain in order to be successful in today’s market were also outlined by one study conducted by the Minnesota State College and University System Workforce and discusses intercultural competencies (Sparks & Waits, 2011). The five skills identified in the table below were noted by employers as being important for employees to possess in the workplace (Sparks & Waits, 2011, p. 23). The percentages listed on the right side of the table represent the frequency with which employers discussed the job skill when the study was conducted across 352 private-sector companies in Minnesota (Sparks & Waits, 2011).
Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Job Skills</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory/Management</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Business and Finance</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International and Global Understanding</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Skills</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Skills</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rate of frequency found in participant responses.

(Qiang, 2003) noted, demands for graduates include “…not only academic and professional knowledge, but also multilingualism, and social and intercultural skills and attitudes” (p. 248). Intercultural skills also include proficiency in such languages as Chinese, Russian, Hindi, Japanese, and Arabic as these are essential to business, trade, and development (Sparks & Waits, 2011, p. 25). In addition to foreign languages, a stronger emphasis and incorporation of soft skills will be necessary for students to achieve the intercultural skills that will prepare them for the transnational economy. Soft skills include: critical thinking, analysis, problem solving, communication, teamwork, leadership, and the ability to work in diverse and changing environments (Sparks & Waits, 2011, p. 25). Through the incorporation of these new requirements, students should gain a sense of professionalism, become self-directed, demonstrate initiative, adapt easily, and communicate effectively both online and verbally in local and global contexts (Sparks & Waits, 2011).
Morris (2009) presented an extensive list of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that faculty and students should possess. The understanding of culture in a global context is important, along with demonstrating knowledge of “…global issues, processes, trends, [and] systems…” (Morris, 2009, p. 146). Additionally, skills that allow students and faculty to use culturally rooted information and viewpoints to think critically are essential to this learning process (Morris, 2009). Communicating with other cultures by utilizing foreign language and demonstrating an “…ongoing willingness to seek out international or intercultural opportunities…” as well as appreciating and tolerating “…cultural ambiguity…” are all related to intercultural skills (Morris, 2009, p. 6). The appreciation of attitudes and beliefs as well as the acceptance of differences are also a pertinent component of intercultural skills (Morris, 2009).

After The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) reached out to survey their constituents it is clear that education leaders agree graduates should be prepared for a global future (McTighe-Musil, 2006). However, McTighe-Musil (2006) pointed out that “…AAC&U’s investigation of college practices reveals a disturbing disconnect” between their realizations of “…intercultural knowledge and competence…[and how] essential learning outcomes for all fields of concentration and for all majors…” are identified (p. 1). Generating knowledge of global issues and fostering international skills are regarded as essential components to a post-secondary education today, and the goals outlined by McTighe-Musil (2006) may serve to guide post-secondary institutions as leaders and faculty develop intercultural skills on their campus. Students need to “…understand diverse cultures and the complexities of individual identities in a transnational environment…to communicate across diverse cultures…to prepare students to be citizens of the world who are actively engaged in promoting equity, justice, and the well-being of the world’s communities” (McTighe-Musil, 2006, p. 6). One goal
presented by McTighe-Musil (2006) stands out and it provides a clear perspective on what graduates should be able to demonstrate to be prepared for a transnational economy. This goal is outlined in more detail below as presented by McTighe-Musil (2006):

- Students are able to interpret aspects of other cultures and countries with greater sophistication and accuracy.
- Students are able to traverse cultural borders with greater skill and comfort.
- Students are able to describe their own culture with greater knowledge and awareness.
- Students are able to view a single issue from multiple perspectives, and they are more comfortable with complexity and ambiguity.
- Students are able to work effectively with others who are different from them.
- Students are more tolerant of and curious about others’ beliefs (p. 13).

**Intercultural Competence**

There is a close connection between intercultural skills and intercultural competence. Individuals must possess a specific level of skills, knowledge, and attitudes when they interact with individuals from other cultures (Holmes & O’Neill, 2012). Demonstrating intercultural competence “…encompasses processes of acknowledging reluctance and fear, foregrounding and questioning stereotypes, monitoring feelings and emotions, working through confusion, and grappling with complexity” (Holmes & O’Neill, 2012, p. 707). Prior to interacting in a globalized world, it is essential for an individual to first understand his or her own culture (Holmes & O’Neill, 2012). Holmes and O’Neill (2012) pointed out that intercultural competence is achieved when an individual is able to make decisions among behaviors and demonstrate that
they can understand “…what to do and how to act in specific circumstances, groups, times, and places” (p. 708).

Some researchers have found that there is a connection between intercultural competency and personality traits, such as “…appropriateness and effectiveness in intercultural communication…” (Holmes & O’Neill, 2012, p. 708) in order to be self-aware before an individual can interact with others in a transnational society (Deardorff, 2006; Harrison, 2012). Intercultural skills are shown through the “…ability to display appropriate communication behaviors in a given context…” such as classroom interactions (Holmes & O’Neill, 2012, p. 708). Harrison (2012) rooted his work in ethnocentrism and cultural intelligence, and revealed domestic students understand what is ‘right’ or ‘good’ when they interact with international students. Furthermore, the term ‘cultural intelligence’ was described as “…a person’s capability to adapt effectively to new cultural contexts” (Harrison, 2012, p. 228). Teekens (2003) provided insight into how intercultural competence can be promoted in curriculum that includes: foreign language skills, global themed courses, and focusing on attitude goals (e.g. respect for cultural differences, broad-mindedness, and understanding) which all enhance a student’s ability to effectively work with people from different cultural backgrounds. Cultural learning demands a new responsibility on the learner, which involves harnessing a new attitude and adopting reflective strategies to interpret one’s personal view on cultural differences (Teekens, 2003).

The model presented below illustrates the cycle and meanings of intercultural competence attainment according to Deardorff (2006):
Deardorff (2006) noted that intercultural competence is cyclical and involves an individual and their interactions with others. First, Figure 2.1 illustrates that the process toward achieving intercultural competence begins with one’s attitudes that may include their willingness to be open to learning about other people, their level of curiosity about other cultures, or the degree to which they respect and value people of different backgrounds. Next, an individual must gain the knowledge and skills to listen to and interpret individuals from other cultures. During this stage the individual would deepen their knowledge of different people and thereby become more culturally aware. Following this stage, an individual may increase empathy, adaptability, and flexibility when interacting with unfamiliar people. Finally, intercultural competence is attained.
when an individual illustrates he or she can communicate effectively and act appropriately in any intercultural situation.

**A Post-Secondary Perspective**

It is important to understand the role that post-secondary administrators, faculty members and staff play during an internationalization initiative. Lule (2009) found that some post-secondary campus faculty members still deny that globalization exists, regardless of its impact on the current context of the world. However, in some cases Lule (2009) pointed out that 9/11 stirred different reactions at post-secondary institutions; the events on this day “…galvanized faculty and students to more fully internationalize” their campus and integrate globalization themes into curricula. Curricular reform as a result of global change was also echoed in research conducted by Pears (2010) who revealed that in the engineering field for example, globalization is viewed as a key instructional consideration and as such emphasizes the development of student “global workforce skills explicitly through curriculum design” (p. 4). Globalization is often considered in the economics or business arenas, and it should be an equally important consideration in curriculum development if students are to be prepared to apply their knowledge and skills in the current transnational environment (Jordan, 2008). Furthermore, Jordan (2008) argued that with an “…internationalised curricula students can be encouraged to learn about each other’s cultures, traditions and societies, and to acquire intercultural competencies” (p. 101).

Ivan (2011) asserted that the endeavor to achieve internationalized curricula has been popularized publically, in US rhetoric, accreditation guidelines, and through a focus on student learning. Crose (2011), Leask (2001), and Mak and Kennedy (2012) have also underscored the pertinent role that faculty members play in facilitating classroom environments that develop students’ intercultural skills. Intercultural competence is achieved by faculty through their
participation in training programs that will enhance their global awareness and abilities to deliver an international curriculum (Crose, 2011; Leask, 2001; Mak & Kennedy, 2012). Green (2003) pointed out that internationalized curricula is “…integrative, intercultural, and interdisciplinary…” and its delivery possibly “…may require faculty to develop or refine a different set of intellectual skills from those that were emphasized in their original graduate training and by their professional disciplinary associations” (p. 13). Internationalized curricula bridges gaps across a campus and requires a change in cognitive competence, meaning the way faculty present content (Leask, 2001). For example, learning in an open, flexible, enthusiastic, and inclusive environment is highly regarded (Crose, 2011). Deardorff (2006) and Sparks and Waits (2011) also noted that understanding and openness are intercultural skills that are needed in today’s work environments and can emerge from post-secondary classrooms when domestic and international students interact. Examining how globalization has influenced the transformation of curricula at post-secondary environments may assist in understanding how GCC staff and campus administrators understand and operationalize an internationalization initiative in this study.

A globally-centered education that emphasizes intercultural skills includes problem solving activities, life and work skills, citizenship, ethical and non-violent problem solving strategies, as well as the development of critical thinking skills (Miller, 2009). Basic, scientific, and economic literacies also assist in providing a foundation to develop globally equipped students (Miller, 2009). Similarly, Behrnd and Porzelt (2012) pointed out that intercultural skills have been found to increase when students study abroad as it improves their language skills and efficacy at performing activities in a global environment, thus helping to prepare them for transnational work after graduation. Intercultural competence is difficult to measure according
to Behrnd and Porzelt (2012), but is defined by strategic, social, individual, and professional skills. Figure 2.2 provides a clear framework of the types of intercultural competencies that may be integrated into curricula at the post-secondary level. More specifically, students may demonstrate the skills listed within the four aspects shown in Behrnd and Porzelt’s (2012) Process Model (see Figure 2.2) when they have successfully attained intercultural competence.

Figure 2.2

Process Model of Intercultural Competence

Intercultural competence is developed overtime and is demonstrated by a balance of skills in the four aspects found within an intercultural context (Behrnd and Porzelt, 2012; see Figure 2.2).

Universities in the US are not alone in their work aimed at teaching intercultural skills. Rising numbers of international students in the United Kingdom and the US have made college classrooms increasingly more diverse. There are approximately seven international students that enter post-secondary institutions in the United Kingdom for every single native student that leaves the country (Harrison, 2012). Harrison (2012) noted that a similar trend was found in the
US; 690,923 international students entered post-secondary institutions while 260,327 US students left to pursue a post-secondary education in another country (p. 224). Harrison (2012) argued that students who graduate from college in the US have yet to possess the requisite skills to meet the needs that employers are seeking from prospective employees. In many European universities, Witte (2010) found that the English language is mandatory for students, perhaps illustrating one strategy used in those institutions to promote internationalization. For example, in Europe many business programs at the undergraduate level require English language coursework to be coupled with study abroad programs and humanities courses (Witte, 2010).

Although post-secondary administrators and faculty integrate some form of global learning into campus programs, they still remain either unfocused or uncertain as to how well it will prepare students for 21st century work environments (Jordan, 2008; McTighe-Musil, 2006). Both post-secondary scholars and employers have weighed in on which intercultural skills are necessary for college graduates.

**Employer Perspective**

New skills and competencies are more important now than ever before due to changes in the pace of businesses, global competitiveness, how work is currently conducted, and organization structures today (AMA, 2010). The pace of change and global competitiveness are among the most significant reasons why business employers highly value prospective employees that possess skills and competencies that are necessary in a transnational economy (AMA, 2012; AMA, 2010). The Minnesota College and the University System Workforce found in a study of 352 private-sector companies that among the highest rated competencies pertinent to future jobs, was diversity skills; more than half, (57%) of respondents also indicated that future employees should understand global issues (Sparks & Waits, 2011, p. 23). Similarly, it was found in a study
conducted by the American Management Association (AMA) on 2,115 managers and executives from various companies that competencies such as “…critical thinking, communication skills, collaboration, and creativity (the four C’s)” are regarded as highly valued by executive management teams among business organizations (AMA, 2010, p. 2). The report also indicated that it is essential to fuse traditional education subjects such as reading, writing, and arithmetic with the four “C’s” (AMA, 2010). The survey revealed that three out of four (75%) executive respondents stated that the four “C’s,” would be largely important in the future job market, specifically in the next four years (AMA, 2010, p. 4).

In 2012, the AMA surveyed 768 managers and executives once again; “…executives say they need highly skilled employees to keep up with the fast pace of change in business in order to compete on a global level” (p. 1). The survey respondents noted that the pace of change within the business world and global competition were still the highest rated reasons that the four “C’s” are essential to their work (AMA, 2012). Currently, “More than half of executives admit their employees are “…’average’ at best in critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and communication skills” (AMA, 2012, p.1). Reading, writing and arithmetic are important mainly in entry-level jobs, whereas in today’s interconnected world it is clear that executives demand more international skills (e.g. communication across borders) from their low level employees if businesses are to compete globally (AMA, 2010; AMA, 2012).

Currently, US citizens possess a limited understanding of the dependency this country has on the global market (Hunter, 2004). Moreover Hunter (2004) posited administrators must ensure students are able to become literate in global affairs to the point that they have, “…a high degree of international understanding and intercultural competence” (p. 11). Today the new educational approach has to be “…meaningful, futuristic, and applicable…” (Hunter, 2004, p.
11). Delivering information will now need to involve measuring learning outcomes, or competencies that will empower student graduates for work in the 21st century labor market (Ivan, 2011).

Employers seek graduates that possess skills (e.g. “…interacting across cultures…”) that are critical to working alongside individuals from different countries and “…frequently appear in employers’ ‘wish lists’ for university graduates…and in management manuals” (Harrison, 2012, p. 7). Research documenting employers’ perspective on the paucity of international skills amongst graduates is plentiful, and often calls for more training of employees to prepare them to work competitively in the transnational economy (AMA, 2012; Harrison, 2012; Sparks & Waits, 2011; Yoshida, Yashiro & Suzuki, 2013). For instance, Hunter (2004) argued that US companies in particular have had to spend millions of dollars on training to ensure their employees possess essential skills to work across US borders. In order to attain intercultural competence, an employer might be required to take “…important steps in human resource development and training” (Teekens, 2003, p. 109).

Intercultural competencies are desired in business companies today (Yoshida, Yashiro & Suzuki, 2013). One example of how intercultural skills can be addressed comes from a study on Japanese businesses that emphasized these competencies can be developed through both university curricula and professional training (Yoshida, Yashiro & Suzuki, 2013). The 27 individual participants in this study believed that in order “…to be effective in intercultural situations one must be open-minded (have multiple perspectives), be able to enjoy differences, not have prejudices…” and be introspective (Yoshida, Yashiro & Suzuki, 2013, p. 83). Attitudes were regarded as an essential component to attaining intercultural skills in Deardorff’s (2006) Process Model as well (Harrison, 2012; Morris, 2009; Teekens, 2003). Consistent with other
researchers, Yoshida, Yashiro and Suzuki (2013) argued intercultural skills are dependent on an initial understanding of one’s own culture (Holmes & O’Neill, 2012; Lucas, 2010; McTighe-Musil, 2006). Additionally, employees may need to be able to identify “…differences between national cultures but also more importantly…differences that exist within nations” (Yoshida, Yashiro & Suzuki, 2013, p. 83). Employees should understand how to adjust and be flexible if they moved to another nation or experienced change in their own country (Yoshida, Yashiro & Suzuki, 2013). Flexibility was also reported by Behrnd & Porzelt (2012) and Crose (2011) to be an important trait for employees to possess when they work with individuals from other cultures. One significant finding revealed by Yoshida, Yashiro & Suzuki (2013) illustrate that intercultural skills are essential for all who work in a 21st century transnational economy.

In closing, this literature review section has served to illustrate the varying definitions of intercultural skills and how scholars and employers discuss these competencies in their professional environments. The final section of this literature review will describe how post-secondary administrators and faculty play a role in the internationalization process, and some practices used at post-secondary institutions in the US and overseas.

**Internationalization Practices**

Globalization has undoubtedly impacted educational environments as discussed in detail below (Friedman, 2007; Goodwin, 2010; Stromquist, 2002; Vongalis-Macrow, 2007; Qiang, 2003) and internationalization initiatives are a way for post-secondary institutions to react by implementing a process that fits their individual interests and needs (Kreber, 2009). Below a discussion of internationalization practices at post-secondary institutions will be presented.

**Background**
Globalization initially became a reckoning force in educational policy in the 1990’s (Vongalis-Macrow, 2007). As a result, globalization has “…bolted on to, rather than integrated into, analyses of educational structures, policies and processes…” leaving limited examples of how it is built into the infrastructure at post-secondary institutions (Dixon, 2006, p. 320). Many researchers have also attributed the recent rising focus on international issues in the post secondary environment to the events that took place on September 11, 2001 (Flinders, 2009; Goodwin, 2009; Green, 2003; Hser, 2005; Hytten & Bettez, 2008; Lule, 2009; Merryfield, 2003; Zhao, 2011). Following 9/11, global events challenged the traditional ways educators approached curricula (Merryfield, 2003). For example, conversations held by teacher educators now focus on strategies for helping students examine other parts of the world, and on having them engage in open discussions about what role the US should play in global affairs (Hser, 2005; Merryfield, 2003). The rise in global conflicts since 9/11 has continued to play a significant role in influencing internationalization as a means to address global issues in the classroom as well as across the campus (Knight, 2004).

Education reforms such as internationalization can be viewed as a reaction to globalization and as a reason to “…do things differently…” (Vongalis-Macrow, 2007, p. 426), forcing administrators and faculty to examine how students gain intercultural skills. Internationalization efforts may be related to the need for administrators “…to remain current, relevant and innovative in their research, teaching and service missions…” (Morris, 2009, p. 145). Internationalization has also contributed to post-secondary campuses becoming more diverse and mobile via new technologies than ever before (Knight, 2004). Since post-secondary classroom dynamics have changed due to increases in international students as well as faculty
members, the need to teach intercultural skills has become more prominent; yet preparing the post-secondary institutions for this change has not come easily (Harrison, 2012; Teekens, 2003).

The rising number of international students on US campuses continues to provide an impetus for administrators to consider ways to promote, manage, and successfully implement internationalization on their campus (Clotfelter, 2010; Guruz, 2011; Morris, 2009; Rhodes & Torres, 2006; Wildavsky, 2010). Harrison (2012) reiterated, “Today’s universities are among the most diverse organisations in the world, with dozens of nationalities…” (p. 224). As Jordan (2008) pointed out, “…one of the greatest potential benefits of the internationalisation of HE [higher education] is the possibility it affords for intercultural exchange” (p. 101). Before implementing internationalization, post-secondary institutions determine not only commercial advantages but also the benefits of increasing language programs, global curricula, and knowledge that could possibly enhance the marketability of student graduates (Qiang, 2003).

The Process

An internationalization initiative involves “…many stakeholders working to change the internal dynamics of an institution to respond and adapt appropriately to an increasingly diverse, globally focused, [and] ever-changing external environment” (Gopal, 2011, p. 373). There are many steps that need to occur in order for an internationalization initiative to be successfully implemented. Below is a list of steps that are necessary to take during the internationalization process according to Morris (2009):

- Define the purpose and language associated with the initiative (i.e., internationalization, globalization, intercultural, international education)
- Develop an internationalization plan that involves committed members from faculty, administration, and other partners (i.e., external)
• Make connections between the internationalization and university strategic goals
• Ensure stakeholders (administrators across the campus) are accountable for goals
• Design a structure that involves consistent and regular communication
• Point out champions of the process and celebrate successes
• Identify the specific learning outcomes and assessment procedures (p. 145-146)

Green (2003) noted leaders must “…consistently articulate the importance of internationalization, keep attention focused on the issue, secure and allocate resources for it, provide symbolic support, engage external groups, and develop on-campus leadership and support…” (p. 17). More specifically, enthusiastic leaders of an internationalization effort should “…identify and align resources, remove barriers, and help people think differently…” (Green, 2003, p. 18). Echoing Morris (2009), Green (2003) placed an emphasis on leaders who will ensure communication is consistent, and can relate the internationalization initiative to the institutional agenda.

Establishing a Network

Networks are developed through communication. Communication is vital to internationalization initiatives (Biggs, 1997; Morris, 2009). There are multiple ways an internationalization initiative is implemented in a post-secondary environment; one of many involves developing a strong network of supporters (Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999; Green, 2003; Morris, 2009). Government officials and business leaders have expressed that college graduates need to understand not only globalization as a force, but also intercultural skills (Bonfiglio, 1999). Furthermore, post-secondary institutions must extend their network to the board of regents, and to the local community with study abroad presentations that are conducted by students along with reports or brochures available to alumni and the larger academic community
Collectively, these opportunities drive internationalization initiatives by providing service-learning programs for students that may lead to long-term partnerships.

**Stakeholders.** Hser (2005) argued that the international education field should be a top priority and Knight (2011) stated that internationalization “…requires a major investment of human and financial resources from individual faculty members, departments, and international offices” (p. 14). Challenges exist, but if all stakeholders take holistic efforts in the process, successful outcomes will result (Cooper, 2007). An internationalization initiative requires support from not just faculty, but also institutional leaders (Green, 2003; Morris, 2009). Leaders identify “…points of synergy” to ensure various stakeholders build on commonalities across an institution (Green, 2003, p. 20). Leaders will also involve others with similar ideas to support their initiative and guide them in working on their agenda (Green, 2003).

**Outcomes.** Morris (2009) identified several outcomes of internationalization initiatives that include; transformations in teaching, research, curriculum, global learning, student life, and community outreach. Within a network, individuals can be identified as essential advocates for an internationalization initiative on a post-secondary campus (Green, 2003). Internationalization initiatives cannot be implemented “…without the collaboration of many campus players” such as cross-departmental work groups (Green, 2003, p. 23). Providing more resources “…increase[s] higher institutions’ capacity to expand their international activities, produce experts who understand other cultures, languages, and national systems…” and “[they] cannot accomplish these goals alone” (Hser, 2005, p. 46). In order to implement an internationalization initiative, staff and administrators across the larger campus community must work together to drive the initiative and equip students with intercultural skills. In order to ultimately achieve internationalization, promoting programs such as “…symposia (using faculty, community
members, and outside speakers), retreats, informal gatherings such as brown-bag lunches (for faculty, staff, and students)…institutional roundtables, and town meetings” will involve the campus community in the initiative (Green, 2003, p. 23) and further develop international skills.

**Barriers.** There are many barriers to internationalization and each must be not only identified, but also addressed if the initiative is to be successful. Most often, barriers to successful implementation are caused by funding, available resources (Green, 2003; Hser, 2005), or institutional structures that have limited support when an internationalization initiative is implemented (Bonfiglio, 1999). For example, Hser (2005) pointed out that faculty have reported being discouraged from traveling and teaching overseas. Some institutional leaders are wary of its impact; “…they question who will teach those courses while the faculty members are away…they argue that foreign travel is a luxury and it is unlikely to promote scholarly work…” (Hser, 2005, p. 40). Furthermore, some faculty members that have traveled experience hardship such as financial burden as well as limited positive recognition when they return to their institution (Hser, 2005). Rewarding faculty who seek international opportunities for teaching and scholarship is a critical component of a successful internationalization process (Hser, 2005; Morris, 2009).

**Common Ground.** Conflicting agendas are often the case on post-secondary campuses, but working cohesively toward the goal of internationalization can enhance communication and limit challenges (Green, 2003). Strong networks that encourage internationalization are essential and possible due to financial support such as federal funding provided through the Title VI grant that promotes international agendas (Green, 2003). However, Green (2003) argued that federal money intended for international initiatives has not reached enough institutions in the US.
Bonfiglio (1999) touted, developing any program such as curricula “…does not require funding as much as it requires faculty and administrative commitment to make learning relevant to the students who will enter a global society” (Bonfiglio, 1999, p. 14). Information communication technologies (ICT) are a catalyst to internationalize institutions, and introduce new educational opportunities that bridge gaps between students and the world (Jue, et al., 2010; Rhoades & Torres, 2006).

**Impact of Technological Advancements**

Anderson-Levitt (2003), Dede (2007), Hastie, Hung, and Chen (2010), Jue, et al. (2010), Stromquist (2002), West (2010) emphasized that technology infiltrates even the most remote areas of the world, and opens doors to international collaboration, be it students or faculty. An example of the immense impact of ICT comes from villagers in the Marovo Lagoon region in the Solomon Islands (Hastie, Hung & Chen, 2010). Villagers in the Solomon Islands gained access to the Internet via a satellite dish, which ultimately opened doors for them to improve their quality of life (Hastie, Hung & Chen, 2010). Advanced ICT developments depend solely on qualified individuals that can become the “…incubators of new services, particularly in the field of education” (Rhoades & Torres, 2006, p. 68). Competing globally is dependent on campus administrators who embrace ICT, so students with limited access to financial resources can gain intercultural skills since they are unable to travel overseas (Hastie, Hung & Chen, 2010; Rhoades & Torres, 2006; West, 2010).

**Education Technologies.** Education opportunities that teach intercultural skills through technology occur, despite border restrictions, and do not demand students or faculty to physically move from their geographic location (Clotfelter, 2010; Dede, 2007; Rhoades & Torres, 2006; Stromquist, 2002; Wildavsky, 2010). Utilizing non-traditional methods such as technology is
very important in developing students’ intercultural skills, particularly since budget constraints impede students from participating in study abroad experiences (West, 2010). Furthermore, “…transnationalization is made possible by new information and communication technologies and is based on the establishments of national and global networks…” (Rhoades & Torres, 2006, p. 79). Two specific education technologies that have been found to successfully promote intercultural learning include the Blended Synchronous Learning Model (BSLM) (Hastie, Hung & Chen, 2010) and videoconferencing (Barber, 2007). Hastie, Hung & Chen (2010) found BSLM allowed for teachers and students to participate with other schools outside the walls of their physical classroom, which cut travel time and costs down. Interactive and virtual technologies build up sociability between students who sit in classrooms across the globe, and enhance opportunities for educators to facilitate the development of intercultural skills (Hastie, Hung & Chen, 2010). Moreover, after Coastal Carolina University in the US and La Universidad San Francisco de Quito in Ecuador participated in videoconferencing, Barber (2007) argued that this technology “…may not just be a means of collaboration across borders, but a planetary necessity to prepare students for a global knowledge economy” (p. 116).

Administrators and faculty who implement strategic reforms can prepare students and faculty for 21st century learning challenges that require transnational empathy (Clotfelter, 2010; Darling-Hammond, 2010).

**Internationalization Practices in the US**

Internationalization initiatives have become commonplace in US universities. The outcomes of internationalization prepare graduates to both “…live and work in the global society of the twenty-first century,” however the process has not been addressed the same way across the US (Hser, 2005, p. 35). Technological advancement as well as political and economic changes
all impact the need for and frequency of new internationalization initiatives on post-secondary campuses (Svensson & Wihlborg, 2010).

Implementing internationalization may look different depending on the structure of the institution. For instance, a centralized university may house decision-making across multiple tiers of management, entrusting all departments it oversees to adhere to policies that are set forth. While a decentralized university design consists of various individual managerial systems found across the institution that align with the overarching university philosophy. A specific decision-making process may lead to varying outcomes in the progress toward internationalization depending on the organizational structure of the university. To further illustrate this point, Coryell, et al. (2012) presented examples (discussed below) of how internationalization practices may differ at two types of universities; strategies used at centralized and decentralized post-secondary institutions in the US are discussed below.

**Centralized.** At one centralized university in the US, the approach to internationalization is quite widespread, as it is embedded into the strategic plan (Coryell, et al., 2012). For instance, this university intends on “…making internationalization a tradition…” (Coryell, et al., 2012, p. 86). This university emphasizes the importance of internationalization through support from its administrators, and as a result they “…put in place a variety of requirements and opportunities to interact and connect with academics and academic leadership through a goal-setting method of moving the agenda forward…” (Coryell, et al., 2012, p. 86). International programming at this centralized university involves resources for faculty, student services, and outreach efforts that assist in coordinating programming (Coryell, et al., 2012) and support international skills. Faculty members may align their individual courses and the learning
outcomes with an internationalization agenda or one designed specifically for their institution or department that still reflects the institution’s overarching global goals (McTighe-Musil, 2006).

**Decentralized.** An example from a decentralized university reveals that an administrative position for international programs was intentionally not created due to concerns over competing for resources with other universities (Coryell, et al., 2012). Instead this particular university houses a separate council comprised of faculty, students, and researchers who discuss internationalization on campus and answer to the provost (Coryell, et al., 2010). Administrators and staff also develop programs to include courses, internships, and global exchanges (Coryell, et al., 2012). Coryell, et al. (2012) noted “Sweeping change was not forced on the faculty [at this institution]…[and] students voted to fund scholarships that supported study abroad. Programs and faculty could choose to ride the wave, or not…” (p. 85). A focus on study abroad provides faculty and students with more international experiences (Coryell, et al., 2012). Since community members are invited on trips and programs, the internationalization goal at this decentralized university is for it to “…become part of the culture of the institution…[which] …comes from within” (Coryell, et al., 2012, p. 85).

**Similarities.** US post-secondary institutions utilize strategies such as “…multilingual publications and recruitment literature…enhanced social networking for international students including links with home students and families…[and through] attraction of cultural events (e.g., concerts, exhibitions) with an international emphasis” to internationalize (Taylor, 2004, p. 156-157). Often internationalization efforts are also measured through foreign language courses and programs as an indicator of progress toward the goal of internationalization (Hser, 2005). Cornwell and Stoddard (1999) found internationalization is traditionally conducted using world language courses or study abroad programs. However, Hser (2005) reported that “…foreign
language enrollment in higher education institutions remain low and the nation’s deficiencies in foreign language expertise is alarming” (p. 44). Students, as Cornwell and Stoddard (1999) urged, must “…be educated to read back and forth between the local and global, between multiple forms of identity and difference” (p. 3).

**Leading Internationalization.** Internationalization practices are shaped by institutional goals (Hudzik & McCarthy, 2012). In order to achieve comprehensive internationalization on a campus, it is imperative that continuous efforts are taken to ensure an institution “…develop[s] an action-oriented approach that supports sustained, long-term internationalization…”; [and] continually…adjust[s]…to new challenges and opportunities within an evolving global landscape…” (Hudzik & McCarthy, 2012, p. 2). Developing a culture that supports comprehensive internationalization involves engaging the larger campus community outside of a single international office or center (Hudzik & McCarthy, 2012). More specifically, Hudzik and McCarthy (2012) suggested, “…engaging a wide array of active leaders…” is essential (p. 9). The internationalization leadership team may include invested individuals from an international office, individual faculty, campus support and service units, academic deans and chairs, as well as the President and Provost (Hudzik & McCarthy, 2012). Furthermore, leadership must incorporate a “bold vision” that drives internationalization across the campus beyond a single mission statement (Hudzik & McCarthy, 2012, p. 11). Strategic goals can lead to achieving comprehensive internationalization. For example, Hudzik and McCarthy (2012) noted the following strategic goals might assist with the implementation process:

- International, global, and comparative content will be infused throughout all institutional missions (e.g., teaching, research, and service).
• Access to international, global and comparative content and perspective will be provided to all students and in all majors.

• All faculty, students, and staff have the opportunity to acquire international, global, and comparative understanding and experience.

• International, comparative and global content and perspective will be integrated into the teaching, research, and scholarship of faculty as appropriate.

• The benefits of cross-cultural and comparative understanding will be extended through outreach to citizens, businesses, and public officials (p. 11).

**Considering a Self-Study Review.** The Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) provides some guidance for conducting a self-study and external review to assess progress with implementing internationalization. In the US, international education has experienced limited external reviews and self-studies (Brewer & Brockington, 2013). However, Brewer and Brockington (2013) provided insight into how Senior International Officers may engage in the process to enhance the value and awareness of international education at post-secondary institutions both in the US and overseas. One approach to the review process derives from the American Council on Education’s Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) and provides a valuable six step process for guidance:

• Articulated Institutional Commitment

• Administrative Structure and Staffing

• Curriculum, Co-curriculum, and Learning Outcomes

• Faculty Policies and Practices

• Student Mobility

• Collaboration and Partnerships (Brewer & Brockington, 2013, p. 7).
Each of the six steps noted should be reviewed during a self-study and are pertinent in understanding the nature of internationalization at an institution; each review will reveal areas of strength as well as limitations (Brewer & Brockington, 2013).

21st Century Learning. A joint publication from The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) and NAFSA: Association of International Educators have noted the importance of examining connections between internationalized curriculum and global learning (Hovland, 2014). Hovland (2014) noted, “...global learning is not necessarily the same as internationalization of the curriculum” (p. 4). Global learning places an emphasis on “...locational, cultural, and political fluidity characterizing real-world challenges and opportunities” (Hovland, 2014, p. 4). Hovland (2014) also provided insight into ways global learning can be demonstrated. An internationalization goal may be to increase study abroad participants, but students could demonstrate their achievement of global learning by linking their experiences overseas to learning expectations (Hovland, 2014). A campus goal could be to “…provide opportunities for participating students to demonstrate what they can do as a result of these [study abroad] experiences” (p. 10). The Global Learning Rubric is one tool that can provide evidence as to a student’s level of global competence; there are six domains that include: global self-awareness, perspective taking, cultural diversity, personal and social responsibility, understanding global systems, and applying knowledge to contemporary global contexts (Hovland, 2014, p. 10). Hovland (2014) pointed out that the Global Learning Rubric is especially helpful in assessing student work to gain a sense of their competency level.

The American Council on Education (ACE) has also provided insight into curricular trends at US post-secondary institutions. According to a 2012 report published by ACE, 64 percent of US institutions provide students with opportunities to enroll in internationally focused
learning programs (CIGE, 2012). More specifically, the most popular areas of international study include business, management, social and behavioral sciences, and economics; only five percent of institutions offer an international program in the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) field (CIGE, 2012). The development of learning outcomes or international goals were reported at 55 percent of the US institutions nationwide (CIGE, 2012). Among the post-secondary institutions with targeted global learning outcomes, CIGE (2012) pointed out one-fifth have also incorporated an assessment component to track learning. A need to assess learning outcomes is clear from the CIGE (2012) report, and may be best “...incorporate[d]...into plans and procedures for evaluating internationalization” (p. 13).

**Internationalization Practices Overseas**

The US needs to remain competitive to keep up with education centers overseas that have already answered the call for 21st century standards (Darling-Hammond 2010). Graduates entering the transnational economy may have opportunities to work overseas, and need to be able to transmit international knowledge and be flexible in this process as they travel the globe either physically or virtually (Wildavsky, 2010).

In Brazil, it is uncommon for faculty members to have international experience and as a result this country has not facilitated many opportunities for their post-secondary students to have global experiences in their classrooms (Knobel, 2011). By contrast, faculty in Australia have emphasized that there is a strong commitment to an international agenda (Volet, 2003) “…global competition…is forcing all Australian universities to think more strategically about how to position them in the new international educational environment” (Volet, 2003, p. 2). Volet (2003) also noted that most post-secondary institutions in Australia have included references to internationalization in their mission statements and institutional goals. The
internationalization experiences overseas presented below provide some insight into how institutions in the US may engage in this process.

**Program Development.** All disciplines have a role to play in internationalizing curricula at the post-secondary level (Pears, 2010). There are some disparities between the emphases that disciplines place on ensuring graduates are prepared for the global workforce from the curricular perspective (Pears, 2010). Both Hunter (2004) and Pears (2010) noted there is a need to reform learning objectives so they can prepare students for a transnational economy. Global learning objectives that introduce intercultural skills can vary from department to department, as well as from discipline to discipline. Programs that are internationalizing utilize an ‘infusion approach’ to incorporate intercultural communication and other global themed courses into their programs (Witte, 2010, p. 106). The general concepts of globalization that are emphasized in programs by incorporating international themes into curricula “…do more to promote full intercultural understanding…” (Jordan, 2008, p. 101).

Successful programs that are implementing internationalization come from the engineering, business, tourism, and hospitality disciplines. One example of how global learning objectives have been embedded into curricula comes from the engineering department at Uppsala University in Sweden (Pears, 2010). The engineering department made strides in internationalizing curricula through its Master of Science degree objectives; one goal is for students to be able to “…present and discuss their conclusions…with different groups, orally and in writing, in national and international contexts” at the conclusion of the course program (Pears, 2010, p. 5). European universities mandate that many students comprehend the English language, and couple business programs language coursework with study abroad opportunities and humanities courses (Witte, 2010). There is also an increase in business programs at French
post-secondary institutions that incorporate competencies related to intercultural skills to include study abroad and language learning (Witte, 2010). While in the United Kingdom, tourism and hospitality programs integrate global perspectives into curricula in order for students to connect to 21st century work environments (Jordan, 2008).

**Changing Paradigms.** Education in the 21st century must embrace a changing paradigm (Brisard et al., 2007; Gray, Emerson & McKay, 2005; Iqbal & Arif, 2011; Vongalis-Macrow, 2007). Brisard et al. (2007) argued, “Globalization redefines and reinforces the links between education and the economy thereby shaping education policy” (p. 210). Globalization impacts cultural issues and alters other university programs, such as teacher education (Iqbal & Arif, 2011). Iqbal and Arif (2011) argued globalization “…positively influence[s] education, since it may bring together different peoples, ideas and resources in a world-wide pool” (p. 100). Within a European context a singular understanding of how to embrace internationalization is not evident, and Brisard et al. (2007) argued, “This is because common prescriptions by international agencies in the field of education and global forces ‘are not uniformly implemented or unquestionably received’” (p. 210).

Pakistani universities are also addressing and reacting to questions brought on by globalization about reforming their post secondary institutions in the current global climate (Iqbal & Arif, 2011). In a survey conducted at five public universities in Pakistan, Iqbal and Arif (2011) found that 63% of educators believed globalization has led to paradigm shifts in how the curricula in teacher education programs can be designed to include new standards such as global themes (p. 104). Programs such as teacher education prepares graduates to “…have international experience, demonstrate foreign language competence, and…incorporate a global dimension into
their teaching” (Iqbal & Arif, 2011, p. 100). Questions continue to be raised about how students should be taught, along with the skills they need to attain for the transnational economy.

**Internationalizing Curricula**

**Impetus for Change.** Rhoades and Torres (2006) argued there has never been a more impressionable era than now to help shape the future generations. The time for action and reform rests within the higher education environment, as it continues to embrace the impact of globalization and prepare students for the transnational economy (Rhoades & Torres, 2006; Stromquist, 2002). Intercultural skills are important and involve students gaining “…an awareness of the major currents of global change and the issues arising from such changes, knowledge of global organizations and business activities, the capacity for effective communication across culture and linguistic boundaries, and a personal adaptability to diverse cultures” (Hunter, 2004, p. 10). The ability for students to analyze their own biases and cultural attributes while examining multiple viewpoints is highly valued; graduates should be able to work in an interdependent world in harmony as they maintain a level of productiveness in their professional responsibilities (Volet, 2003). Wildavsky (2010) touted that students today cannot be ignorant of global cultures and must be thoroughly prepared for what they will face in the 21st century. Moreover, 21st century graduates realize their jobs will be transnational and that they need to possess a global outlook (Wildavsky, 2010).

Green (2003) and Hser (2005) noted that American students are limited in their knowledge of the world, and call for better preparation of those students who will graduate in the 21st century. The US ranked next to last among nine countries on a National Geographic-Roper survey that asked 18-24 year olds about world events (Green, 2003, p. 11). A 1997 International Education task force helped create a model referred to as *Transnational Competence* and stated,
“...individuals and organizations need the ability to integrate technical and cultural skills in a variety of new settings...” but the process taken to internationalize curricula is still “...murky...in ways relevant to the twenty-first century” (Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999, p. 5).

**Developing Curricula.** Internationalizing curricula at a post-secondary institution promotes greater understanding of global issues and leads to students graduating with intercultural skills (Jordan, 2008). Kreber (2009) noted that curricular reform could be applied to various aspects of post-secondary education including, but not limited to, pedagogical approach, content, resources, and the physical or mobile location where the origin of instruction takes place. Internationalization practices that involve curricular development, as Kreber (2009) noted, can refer to any activity or opportunity where students, administrators and faculty can learn. The post-secondary environment takes on the important role of “...fostering intercultural understanding, [for] greater empathy and action towards those most in need...” (Kreber, 2009, p. 5). McTighe-Musil (2006) suggested it begins with “...overarching institutional goals for global learning, then divisions and individual departments can align their practices with those goals to create educational designs appropriate to their areas of expertise” (p. 7). Transforming academic centers to adopt new curricula is one of the challenges in preparing students to view the world in an interconnected way (Bonfiglio, 1999). This was echoed again when Teekens (2003) posited that although internationalizing curriculum on a post-secondary campus is discussed to a great extent, “...real tangible results is highly debated” (p. 109).

**Fostering Intercultural Learning.** McTighe-Musil (2006) emphasized that in order for an institution to foster intercultural skills it must utilize a structure to implement them. For example, an institution should take into account the overarching departmental, as well as course and campus life goals (McTighe-Musil, 2006). However, each of these entities should be
connected and work in collaboration to ensure synergy when an internationalization initiative is implemented (McTighe-Musil, 2006). Global learning such as: developing intercultural skills, understanding diverse cultures, preparing for local and worldly citizenship; the integration of collaboration networks are essential for developing intercultural skills (Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999). Teekens (2003) noted student’s need “real-life skills” that extend beyond the classroom in order to achieve a balance between local and global perspectives on world issues (p. 109).

Global programs developed by campus administrators and faculty offers opportunities for students to tap into cultural experiences (e.g. study abroad) that will teach intercultural skills. Internationalizing post-secondary environments includes the “…integration and infusion of an international dimension as a central part of a university’s programs…[which] may include reforming the curriculum in order to reflect an international scope, or it may encompass international research activities” (Gopal, 2011, p. 373). Volet (2003) posited that fostering intercultural competencies should include “…skills of inquiry and analysis rather than a set of facts about globalization” (p. 9). For instance, global themes may be integrated into the learning process through subjects that include “…trade, investment, politics, the environment, culture, research, health, etc.—facilitated by advances in information, communication and transportation technologies” (Morris, 2009, p. 145). The process of internationalizing the post-secondary environment involves applying cultural themes across all disciplines, but may lead to the removal of some knowledge that makes up the course curricula previously considered essential (Cooper, 2007). Emphasizing cultural themes from a broad sense provides students with an opportunity to analyze world citizens from various perspectives and encourage students to think critically about the world around them (Cooper, 2007).
In order for students to attain international skills, Stromquist (2002) highlighted that an emphasis needs to be placed on how universities “…create and offer learning environments that foster the students’ development of intercultural adaptability…” and will “…require a social protagonism most intellectuals have seldom had to engage in…” (p. 130). Cooper (2007) asserted that the university’s goal remains teaching students to think, rather than to attain knowledge that can be found in a textbook or online. Crose (2011) pointed out that pairing international and domestic students in a class is beneficial and may teach intercultural skills. Based on survey results, Crose’s (2011) study revealed that both international and domestic students that were paired with one another noted positive experiences and that cross-cultural understanding was the result. Crose (2011) and Harrison (2012) both discovered there are significant challenges with grouping international and domestic students together that may result in participants displaying discomfort with language barriers, fear, anxiety, and even reinforcing stereotypes. However, grouping international and domestic students are considered one way to attain intercultural skills and lead to positive outcomes (Crose, 2011; Harrison, 2012). Students may even foster friendships after engaging in group work if facilitated by an effective instructor with international experience (Harrison, 2012).

Preparing for Change

Relying on a traditional educational infrastructure in the US will not be sufficient in the 21st century (Crawford, & Kirby, 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2010). Anderson-Levitt (2003) lamented, “…Researchers who focus only on the local or who see only cross-national differences are missing the iceberg under the surface. Reformers who do not see the global model…are tinkering only with the surface” (p. 18). In relation to this sentiment, Cooper (2007) suggested in order for international skills to be attained, faculty need to facilitate students in fostering
“…attitudes and insights among them that will lead them to see the world from a multitude of perspectives” (p. 525). According to Volet (2003), designing international curricula will enable students, both at home and from overseas, to demonstrate intercultural skills in both professional and social contexts.

**Role of Faculty.** Education leaders in the 21st century must embrace a changing paradigm in how teachers are educated (Brisard, et al., 2007; Iqbal & Arif, 2011; Vongalis-Macrow, 2007). Preparing educators to teach in a globalized world is addressed in much of the scholarly work found on topics related to internationalizing curricula (Brisard, et al., 2007; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Flinders, 2009; Goodwin, 2009; Iqbal & Arif, 2011; Mangram & Watson, 2011; Merryfield, 1992). Goodwin (2009) identified a need to prepare educators differently in an interconnected age of education; “…globalization introduces new factors that demands consideration in any discussion about quality teachers, and promises to change fundamentally the very nature of teacher preparation” (p. 20). It is commonly noted that there is no time to waste in preparing educators and students for 21st century work environments, and this is due to the large number of educators that have yet to understand its impact on students (Colville-Hall & Adamowicz-Hariasz, 2010).

Many educators are not prepared to teach cross-culturally (Gopal, 2011; Kedia & Englis, 2011). Colville-Hall and Adamowicz-Hariasz (2010) asserted that in order for global issues to be “…meaningfully treated in the classroom, it is essential to prepare teachers who will have knowledge of global interconnectedness as well as intercultural competence and experience” (p. 49). Kedia and Englis (2011) pointed out that faculty did not possess enough background information from training on business topics in a global realm. Moreover, McTighe-Musil (2006) urged that institutional goals across a campus must “complement” each other; “Without
this coordination and alignment, students will continue to experience episodic and unconnected opportunities for global learning” (p. 9). The knowledge of specific pedagogical approaches to address culturally sensitive issues in classrooms, as well as communication strategies are lacking amongst faculty members (Gopal, 2011). Moreover, faculty members have not received an adequate level of training to instruct foreign students from overseas, nor do they possess substantial knowledge of intercultural skills (Gopal, 2011). Crose (2011) argued ensuring educators possess an open mind as they prepare their instructional environments to accommodate intercultural exchanges are important initial steps.

**Summary**

This chapter has served to present the literature and related research on how globalization has impacted post-secondary environments. The urgency to react to the global economy continues to be touted by many researchers (AMA, 2010; Friedman, 2007; Hunter, 2004; Sparks & Waite, 2011; Stromquist, 2002). However, not all universities have reacted similarly to the need for preparing students for a global work environment (Harrison, 2012; Hser, 2005; Green, 2003; Knight, 2004). Establishing an internationalization initiative is one way of equipping students with intercultural skills, which are necessary for work in the transnational economy (Holmes & O’Neill, 2012; McTighe-Musil, 2006). Intercultural skills are considered a significant characteristic of 21st century education and employment (Deardorff, 2006; Holmes & O’Neill, 2012; Hunter, 2004; Jordan, 2008; McTighe-Musil, 2006; Morris, 2009; Pears, 2010; Qiang, 2003). It is clear from the literature that the internationalization process is challenging and must involve multiple stakeholders (Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999; Gopal, 2011; Green, 2003; Morris, 2009). Recognizing and overcoming barriers will be essential for success (Bonfiglio,
1999; Hser, 2005), and will involve communicating a shared understanding of goals across the post-secondary context (Green, 2003; Morris, 2009).

Chapter 3 will discuss the methodology and design that was used in this study to examine how one northeastern post-secondary institution has understood and operationalized their campus-wide initiative to internationalize so that they ensure future graduates are prepared for the current transnational economy and are fully equipped to utilize intercultural skills.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter will discuss the methodology that was employed in this case study, and outline the overall design, site selection process, participant pool, procedural methods utilized to gather data, and analytical methods. The strengths found in using the descriptive case study methodology, as well as considerations made to protect the human subjects will be covered. This chapter will be organized into the following sections (a) research design, (b) site and participant selection process, (c) data collection, (d) data analysis, (e) strength of method, (f) researcher’s roles and biases, and (g) protection of human subjects.

This case study was designed to address the following research questions:

1. How do GCC staff and administrators at one post-secondary institution understand their campus’s internationalization initiative to prepare faculty and students to embrace different cultures?

2. What organizational decision-making processes and dialogue have GCC staff and campus administrators engaged in to operationalize their internationalization initiative?

3. How have GCC staff and administrators sought to achieve the institution's internationalization initiative throughout the campus community?
Research Design

A case study provides the researcher with an opportunity to obtain data about individuals or an organization that is challenging to gain through other means (Maxwell, 2005). Case studies are pertinent during the preliminary phases of research (Yin, 2009), which makes this an appropriate choice for this research study due to the limited models that currently exist regarding how US post-secondary institutions understand and operationalize internationalization initiatives. Case studies provide researchers with an opportunity to examine a “program, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals” (Creswell, 2009, p. 13). As Yin (2003, 2009) suggested, the case study methodology assists in uncovering both ‘how’ and ‘why’ inquiries. Qualitative studies are holistic in nature and are effective in “…reporting multiple perspectives, identifying the many factors involved in a situation, and generally sketching the larger picture that emerges” (Creswell, 2009, p. 176).

In order to provide a holistic understanding of how GCC staff and campus administrators understand their internationalization initiative and the decision-making processes and dialogue they have engaged in, a descriptive case study approach was chosen as the methodology for this research study (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991). More specifically, this single-site case study may be characterized as descriptive because it explains a phenomenon within the context in which the phenomenon exists (Baxter & Jack, 2008), in this case, as it occurs on a post-secondary campus. Descriptive case studies provide a “thick description” that includes data reports that are “very literal” (Brown, 2008, p. 3). A descriptive case allowed the researcher to present exactly what was discovered from the findings retrieved from the variety of sources gathered (Brown, 2008). Furthermore, this descriptive case study provided an overview of the “…complexities of the situation, and presents information from a wide variety of sources and
viewpoints in a variety of ways” (Brown, 2008, p. 3). Selecting a descriptive case study allowed the researcher to comprehend how GCC staff and administrators at a post-secondary institution have not only understood an internationalization initiative, but make decisions about the process as they implement it across the larger campus community (Feagin et al., 1991).

After selecting the descriptive case study design, it was pertinent for the researcher to identify what the study would be, and what it would not be (Baxter & Jack, 2008). The researcher defined specific parameters of time, place, activity, context, and definition(s) for the study to ensure the case study remained focused (Baxter & Jack, 2008). The researcher bound the case study in order to focus on the work of a single institution that is currently implementing an internationalization initiative on its campus during a specific time frame that would not exceed three months. Tellis (1997) noted that bounding research in regard to time maximizes what can be learned when it is complete. Yin (2003) posited that researchers are in control of ensuring analysis is of the highest quality; therefore, this descriptive case study focused on the most important aspects of the case and retrieved data from multiple sources (e.g. documents, interview, focus group, and observations) that addressed the research questions/propositions.

Because this case study was unstructured in its sequence and potential bias existed, the researcher also explored and discussed all topics related to the research questions and theoretical propositions utilized with advisors in an effort to organize the study (Brown, 2008; Tellis, 1997). The researcher also controlled bias during data analysis and minimized any threats through the use of coding (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Stake (2005, 2008) emphasized that the researcher acts as an interpreter in the case study, which is a critical role (Brown, 2008). Therefore, embracing a descriptive case study design for this investigation required that the researcher be
continuously reflective and represent the case itself with the data gained from the site and participants (Brown, 2008).

**Site and Participant Selection Process**

For this descriptive case study, the researcher located a large northeastern university that has a GCC currently working alongside the institution to internationalize its campus. GCC staff and campus administrators involved in implementing the internationalization initiative was the focus on this study. As noted by Bogotch and Maslin-Ostrowski (2010), a GCC at a post-secondary institution serves to provide a central location where an internationalization initiative can be developed and sustained throughout the larger campus community.

In 2012, the researcher spent time meeting with the Dean of the GCC on this university’s campus. Gaining initial access to the research site is essential to the case study. As Creswell (2009) posited, it is through the gatekeeper that the researcher will gain permission to conduct a study and collect data. The Dean of the GCC at Albani University agreed to participate in the study, contingent upon official approval from Northeastern University and the Institutional Review Board.

Specific criterion needed to be fulfilled in order for Albani University to be selected as the study site by the researcher. Specifically, the selected site had to be responsive and proactive to internationalization trends on campus and be taking steps to understand, operationalize, and implement an internationalization initiative. In this case, the GCC has committed to assisting the larger campus community in attaining the following international skills through various vehicles:

- Possess a knowledgeable and diverse worldview
- Comprehend the international aspects of their field of study
- Acquire cross-cultural sensitivity and adaptability
• Be able to possess global competencies that can be utilized throughout life
• Support international students and scholars in academic, social and personal needs
• Foster a learning environment by bridging out to the larger campus community so they understand and view themselves as world citizens (GCC Website, 2013)

The current Strategic Plan 2011-2015 at Albani University intends to guide the larger campus community in shaping their current and future work. The strategic plan is closely aligned to the institution’s mission and core values, and is designed so that students have life changing experiences. The strategic plan does focus on work that relates to internationalizing the larger campus community in today’s interconnected world. Albani University supports internationalization through its core value; Embracing Intercultural Relations:

• The Chief Diversity Officer will be charged with fostering a campus culture that respects all diversities and demonstrates an appreciation for them. The Chief Diversity Officer will also be the central point on campus to enhance existing intercultural programs and develop new diversity initiatives.

• We will eagerly recruit, advocate for, and retain faculty, staff, and students who will increase diversity on the campus community.

• We will absorb diversity into curricula that is delivered on campus by requiring intercultural proficiencies that will provide a more global worldview, and integrate international concepts into Western focused courses.

• We will commit to offering events and opportunities on campus that will build intercultural relations and encourage deeper understandings and appreciation for diverse perspectives (Strategic Plan, 2011-2015, 2011).
At Albani University, the GCC is comprised of six staff members that include one Dean who oversees five employees, in the following roles: one Assistant Dean of International Studies, one Study Abroad Advisor, one Administrative Coordinator, and two Peer Advisors. The researcher elected to focus on the five members of the GCC and campus administrators responsible for global initiatives at Albani University in this descriptive case study in order to understand their decision-making processes as they make sense of and operationalize an internationalization initiative. Creswell (2009) noted that the researcher must “…focus on learning the meaning that the participants hold about the problem or issue, not the meaning that the researchers bring to the research or writers express in the literature” (p. 175). Therefore, participants selected for this study were limited to the GCC staff mentioned above and Albani University administrators, who could bring great insight into how an internationalization initiative is understood, operationalized, and implemented across the larger campus community.

The researcher elected to recruit 1-2 campus administrators and 3-5 GCC staff members through an email letter. In order to be selected each participant needed to fit certain criterion. Participants had to be involved in the internationalization initiative at Albani University and be a department administrator, such as a chair, or a faculty or staff member. The researcher employed a snowball sampling technique to select the participant sample. This technique was applicable to the case because a snowball sample is used during a study when the need arises, or a participant is recommended due to the considerable knowledge they offer to the case (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). The researcher retrieved a list of potential participants from the GCC Dean. This list included GCC staff members, but also International Programs Committee members.

The International Programs Committee (IPC) is a functional unit on the Albani University campus that not only involves the GCC Dean and staff, but also members of the
larger campus community. Individuals that serve on the Committee are faculty, staff, administrators, and students from various departments on campus such as; Enrollment Services, Foreign Language Department, Finance Department, Global Studies Program, Political Science Department, Student Congress Representative, and Management Department. The Committee is tasked with discussing international programs and finding ways to meet the institutional goal of internationalization. The Committee involves individuals that fulfill multiple roles and the GCC acts as a functional sub-unit of this organization.

The GCC Dean suggested administrators, faculty, and staff who sit on the Committee could potentially offer insight into the case. Out of the participants recruited, 3 GCC staff members agreed to participate in the focus group. A follow up phone call was necessary to schedule the day and time of the focus group session after participants agreed to participate over email. A follow up phone call was also necessary to recruit the GCC Dean and determine interview logistics.

**Data Collection**

The researcher investigated GCC staff and campus administrators at Albani University located in the northeast region of the US. This post-secondary institution was selected because it is currently implementing an internationalization initiative on its campus. The data collected from this descriptive case study provided an in-depth view of the internationalization process, while addressing the research propositions and questions (see Figure 1.1; Appendix A). Tellis (1997) pointed out that both Yin (1994) and Stake (1995) suggested that the researcher develop a data collection system that will assist in efforts to discover patterns. Tellis (1997) stated, “…internal validity is enhanced when the patterns coincide.”
Data was gathered through a detailed document review, observations from two International Programs Committee staff meetings, as well as a focus group and an interview. The data collection process was bounded by both time and activities, resulting in an enhanced learning process that answered the research questions (Creswell, 2009; Tellis, 1997). During the 2013-2014 academic school year, data was collected for approximately two months to assist in answering the research questions and addressing the propositions (see Figure 1.1; Appendix A). The following data sources were collected and discussed in more detail in this section: documents, observations and field notes, an interview, and a focus group.

Documentation outlined below was retrieved during the data collection process. An overview of the data type and its purpose, data source, data details, and associated research questions/propositions below (see Table 3.1) was used to organize the data collection for this descriptive case study.
Table 3.1

Data Collection Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Type and Purpose</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Details</th>
<th>Related Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document Review and Observations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The researcher conducted a document review and took field notes during 2 staff meetings during the 2-3 month data collection period.</td>
<td>GCC staff and a campus administrator at Albani University provided documents relevant to the case study.</td>
<td>Documents Reviewed: GCC Dean’s 2008 Report Albani University Spring 2014 Statistics GCC 2013-2014 Statistics Report International Programs Committee Members</td>
<td>Informed: Proposition 1, 2, and 3; Research Questions 1, 2, and 3; Internationalization Interpretations; decision-making processes and dialogue; and program implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided in-depth meaning to internationalization as a process that involves preparing faculty and students to embrace diverse cultures (Coryell, et al., 2012; Knight, 2004) and is common across the institution (Morris, 2009).</td>
<td>Researcher took field notes from an observation of 2 staff meetings.</td>
<td>International Programs Committee Responsibilities and Guiding Principles External Evaluation Provider Letter Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs Letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified how staff and administrators seek to achieve the institution’s internationalization initiative and monitor the process as a top priority (Knight, 2001).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Focus Group**

Questions:

Provided in-depth meaning to internationalization as a process that involves preparing faculty and students to embrace diverse cultures (Coryell, et al., 2012; Knight, 2004) and is common across the institution (Morris, 2009).

Identified how staff and administrators seek to achieve the institution’s internationalization initiative and monitor the process as a top priority (Knight, 2001).

Focus group conversation was limited to 1-1/2 hours and was semi-structured.

Open-ended questions were asked to participants in order to gain insight into the three research questions and propositions.

The researcher digitally recorded the focus group and took field notes (summary sheets).

Transcriptions were sent to participants for member checking and follow-up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Type and Purpose</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Details</th>
<th>Related Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 3 GCC staff members.
Criterion to participate:
GCC staff member, (including and was limited to other university department faculty or staff if necessary).
Participants had to have participated in internationalization at the institution that promotes and supports intercultural learning.

Informed:

Proposition 1, 2, and 3;
Research Questions 1, 2, and 3;
Internationalization Interpretations;
decision-making processes and dialogue;
and program implementation.
### Data Type and Purpose

**Interview**

**Questions:**

1) Attempted to understand the decision-making processes, dialogue and implementation with an internationalization initiative on a post-secondary campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Data Details</th>
<th>Related Research Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>N=1 GCC and Albani University administrator. Criterion to participate: GCC or Albani University administrator, (including and limited to other university department chairs and administrators). Participants had to have participated in internationalization that promotes and supports intercultural learning.</td>
<td>Interview with campus administrator was limited to 1 hour and was semi-structured. Open-ended questions were asked to the participant in order to gain insight into the three research questions and propositions. The researcher digitally recorded the interview and took field notes (summary sheets). Interview transcriptions were sent to the participant for member checking and follow-up.</td>
<td>Informed: Proposition 1, 2, 3; Research Questions 1, 2, and 3; Internationalization Interpretations; decision-making processes and dialogue; and program implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Document Review

In order to gain an understanding of the context of the GCC and Albani University as they implement internationalization on campus utilizing document review (Yin, 2009) in this descriptive case study during the first phase of the data collection process (see Figure 3.2) was essential. The campus administrator at Albani University supplied several documents that were examined to gain a deeper understanding of research questions one and three. More specifically, the researcher retrieved 9 comprehensive and critical documents that familiarized her with the internationalization initiative at Albani University. A total of 2 staff meeting observations of the International Programs Committee took place about one month apart. Observing two staff
meetings provided the researcher with the opportunity to examine discussions held between staff and administrators about international initiatives at the GCC and Albani University to address the second research question and Proposition II. Field notes were taken by the researcher during and immediately after the meeting to capture observations.

Examining documents during Phase 1 of data collection was essential to harness a clearer understanding of the site and activities related to internationalization initiatives. Reviewing documents provided greater insight into the overall structure used by the GCC and Albani University to understand and operationalize internationalization on its campus. Document review was selected as a data collection strategy to provide context to the case study, and also helped inform the focus group and interview (see Figure 3.2).

**Focus Group**

The next phase of data collection was comprised of the focus group and interview (see Figure 3.2). In order to participate, the GCC staff members needed to work at least part-time at the institution and be engaged in the internationalization initiative. Once the participant list was obtained from the GCC Dean, a letter was emailed to potential participants to recruit them. The focus group was made up of 3 GCC staff members. The staff members agreed to participate over email, and a follow-up phone call was necessary to determine focus group scheduling logistics.

Before conducting the focus group, a consent form was distributed and explained by the researcher and then signed by each participant. The focus group lasted 90 minutes in a location that was non-threatening, so participants were comfortable. Open-ended questions were asked during the focus group, which was semi-structured in nature. The researcher digitally recorded the focus group dialogue with a stand-alone device and took field notes, summary sheets, for the purpose of accuracy as well as coding and transcription using Rev.com.
The focus group informed all the propositions and research questions in this case study. It attempted to discover how GCC staff understand internationalization as a process that involves preparing faculty and students to embrace diverse cultures (Coryell, et al., 2012; Knight, 2004), and how they seek to achieve the initiative throughout the campus community. Semi-structured questions were used to probe participant responses in order to understand the decision-making processes, and the dialogue and implementation strategies employed by GCC staff and campus administrators.

**Interview**

In addition to the document review, observations, and the focus group, data collection included an interview with a campus administrator during Phase 2 (see Figure 3.2). The GCC Dean, who is responsible for global initiatives on the Albani University campus, agreed to participate in the interview. The interview was conducted face-to-face in a location that was comfortable and convenient for the administrator. The interview with the administrator was scheduled for up to 60 minutes. Before conducting the interview, a consent form was distributed and explained by the researcher and then signed by the interviewee. Similar to the focus group process, after data was recorded and transcribed using Rev.com, the responses were reviewed and analyzed. The interview was semi-structured in nature and served to inform all propositions and research questions presented. More specifically, the questions uncovered the decision-making processes, dialogue and implementation with an internationalization initiative at Albani University.

**Follow-Up & Member Checking**

The last data collection phase (see Figure 3.2) was intended to follow-up with participants and provide a member check. Once all documents were collected from the GCC and
Albani University and field notes were complete, they were organized, categorized and coded. Following the transcription of the focus group and interview, a copy was sent to all participants for member checking. Once the email was sent, they were asked to respond within 14 days with any additions or concerns with the interview or focus group data. One participant responded.

This final phase of the data collection served as an opportunity for interviewees to ensure the clarity and accuracy of their responses. A visual representation of the data collection and analysis processes is provided below for clarity (see Figure 3.2).

Table 3.2

Data Collection and Analysis

In order to address the data collected in this descriptive case study, general inductive analysis (GIA) was utilized (Thomas, 2006). This analytical process presented by Thomas (2006) supports the use of a “…detailed readings of raw data to derive concepts, [and] themes…” (p. 238). To gain insight into the research questions, a stepwise process developed by Miles and Huberman (1994) was utilized by the researcher, which included margin notes, written
codes with tracked frequency, draft summary sheets, and data comparison (Creswell, 2007). Furthermore, theoretical propositions initially used as a technique by the researcher to organize this case study was also employed to analyze all the collected data to arrive at conclusions and provide insight (Tellis, 1997) about the internationalization initiative at Albani University.

First, the researcher carefully reviewed the documents and made margin notes. Memos assisted in documenting the thought processes experienced by the researcher, and assisted in targeting recurring themes found in the data collection and observation phases of this study. Memos written in the field were coded, along with the documents collected during phase one.

Next, the researcher read interview and focus group data that was digitally transcribed and checked for clarity and accuracy (Phase 2). Summary sheets were completed and then coded following each session (Creswell, 2007). After all data were recorded and transcribed, responses from the focus group and interview sessions were also analyzed according to the constructs and theoretical framework presented in this case study (see Figure 1.1; Appendix A).

Throughout each phase, the data collected was analyzed, coded and categorized according to the common themes that emerged. An electronic data analysis program called MAXQDA OSX was utilized to code the qualitative data collected for this case study. Identifying and coding themes found in the data, along with their frequency revealed overarching patterns gained from the documents, observations, focus group, and interview. Along with analyzing and reflecting on the data, coding and categorizing provided a framework from which to develop conclusions (Saldana, 2013).

**Strength of Method**

In order to avoid potential concerns with trustworthiness that traditionally arise with qualitative case studies, several considerations were made by the researcher. First, by
triangulating multiple data sources threats to validity may have been minimized because the various data collected enhanced reliability and provided a larger perspective on the issue that was investigated (Maxwell, 2005). To make the case study trustworthy the researcher referenced criteria developed by Lincoln and Guba (1985), which are discussed below.

In regards to applicability, the participant selection technique used in this case study enhanced the findings and made it applicable to similar investigations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Consistency was also considered and other institutions may find the insights from this study helpful as they implement their own initiative on a campus (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

For truth value, the documents collected from the administrator were reviewed and then compared against the transcriptions from the focus group and interview sessions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This step served to find common themes and identify consistency among the data sources collected to ensure credibility.

To consider neutrality member checking was embedded into the data collection process (see Figure 3.2) in order to control for bias and ensure “…findings of an inquiry are determined by the subjects (respondents)…” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 290). Thomas (2006) posited, “Stakeholder checks enhance the credibility of the findings by allowing participants and other people… to comment on or assess the research findings, interpretations and conclusions” (p. 244). The use of member checking and multiple data sources provided a safeguard to any biases held by the researcher and validated findings.

Validity and Credibility

Qualitative methodologies call for the researcher to make interpretations of data such as that collected for this case study (Creswell, 2009). The credibility of resources, data, and conclusions presented by the researcher is based on preemptively contemplating and targeting
potential threats to the validity of the study. The researcher considered her role and its potential effect on the participants during observations, and the interview and focus group sessions. As a result, the researcher considered criteria found in Maxwell’s (2005) validity checklist. Validity threats cannot be eliminated through the method taken by the researcher, but instead will be achieved by how the evidence is examined (Maxwell, 2005).

The interview and focus group meetings were recorded digitally with a stand-alone device with consent from participants, transcribed verbatim with Rev.com, and then coded for theme identification. This ensured data was rich and revealed a clear perspective on the internationalization initiative at the GCC and Albani University (Maxwell, 2005). Other strategies such as reflective memoing, participant validation through various vehicles (i.e., face to face, verbal discussions, member checking) were employed. Comparative questions addressed to the focus group and interview participants as well as the use of numerous data sources safeguarded against threats to validity. Furthermore, misinterpreted meanings of responses were eliminated and allowed any potential biases to be exposed to the researcher (Maxwell, 2005).

Reliability

Reliability reflects the extent to which another researcher conducting a similar study would reach the same or similar conclusions from the data collection (Creswell, 2009). Documenting each step along the way supported reliable processes for data collection and analysis (Creswell, 2009). The researcher intended to present a data collection and analysis process that was well designed and clear, in the event another researcher would seek to design a similar study. Coding themes found in the data, such that both emic and etic perspectives were gained, allowed for reliability to be solidified (Boyatzis, 1998). Any threat to internal reliability was decreased by recording the interview and focus group, allowing exact records to be available
at a later time for analyzing and coding. Using memos and field notes during the observation and institution visits assisted in enhancing the reliability of the data collected.

**Researcher’s Role and Biases**

There are several personal and practical goals that link to why the researcher pursued this study. Maxwell (2005) asserted that the goals individuals seek to conduct scholarly research relate to their individual motives, desires, and purposes. First, the personal goals for conducting this study revert back to when the researcher began her career as an educator. A deep-rooted interest in culture and global issues has continued to motivate and to spur the researcher to understand what specific intercultural skills post-secondary graduates need for jobs in the 21st century, and how post-secondary institutions prepare them for the global environment.

The researcher recognizes biases exist; however, the researcher’s personal connection enhanced this descriptive case study. The researcher considered “critical subjectivity” which means that her experience was not eliminated, but kept in check (Maxwell, 2005, p. 38). Maxwell (2005) noted that even the most “…admirable scholars within the scholarly community…do not split their work from their lives. They seem to take both too seriously to allow such dissociation, and they want to use each for the enrichment of the other” (p. 38). The researcher was not overtaken by personal experiences, but instead understood it was critical during the “inquiry process” and was invaluable to the case study (Maxwell, 2005, p. 38). To further support this point Maxwell posited, “Separating your research from other aspects of your life cuts you off from a major source of insights, hypotheses, and validity checks” (p. 38).

To ensure bias was not reflected in the data analyses, the researcher employed a framework developed by Miles and Huberman (1994) that uses emic coding to highlight participant views in the focus group and individual interview. Data that appears unrelated was
identified and coded separately to uncover common themes found in the data collected. The activity of comparing participant responses and codes controlled potential biases held by the researcher and any potential misinterpretations across the data collected. Furthermore, the use of participant validation through both face-to-face conversations and the member-checking in Phase III served to eliminate potential misunderstandings (Maxwell, 2005). Discrepant data was identified, clarified, and verified when interview participant’s drew on their inferences after they examined the data results during member-checking (Maxwell, 2005).

**Protection of Human Subjects**

The researcher considered ethical concerns that were related to the participants, which is comparable to others studies undergoing a similar methodological design. Great care was taken with how participants and their data were treated during the study and after it was completed. The researcher gained informed consent after a thorough explanation of the study was provided to each participant. Participants understood that their participation was voluntary and that they may discontinue their involvement with the study at any time without consequence (NIH, 2008).

Beneficence plays an integral role in improving practice in the long run (NIH, 2008). This case study provided insight into how the internationalization process at Albani University may be improved in the future. No harm or risk was rendered from this study, and the benefits for participant and institutional growth are great (NIH, 2008), as insight will be gained into their internationalization initiative. More specifically, participants will learn how they understand internationalization and identify their decision-making processes that may shape future action. Gaining trust was essential and preserving institutional and participant anonymity was critical. Therefore, pseudonyms were used for the institution and all site participants. In addition, data collected for the study remained confidential and was reported in a manner that is unidentifiable.
The researcher does not hold alumni status at the institution, but had met with the Dean at the institution, which assisted her in gaining access through the gatekeeper. The researcher maintained all guidelines put forth by Northeastern University and College of Professional Studies and the Office of the Human Research Institutional Review Board.
CHAPTER 4:
RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS

Chapter four provides a report on the data found and analyzed from the processes set forth in the previous methodology chapter. Sensemaking plays a role in how organizations change (Weick, 1995); therefore, this case study was designed to examine decision-making processes of GCC staff members and a post-secondary administrator to understand how internationalization is implemented at Albani University. This descriptive case study provides a model for other campuses that seek to embark on the journey to implement internationalization.

Three research questions guided the study:

1. How do GCC staff and administrators at one post-secondary institution understand their campus’s internationalization initiative to prepare faculty and students to embrace different cultures?

2. What organizational decision-making processes and dialogue have GCC staff and campus administrators engaged in to operationalize their internationalization initiative?

3. How have GCC staff and administrators sought to achieve the institution's internationalization initiative throughout the campus community?

Data were collected at Albani University’s GCC, which is found in a central location on its campus. The GCC consists of one Dean that oversees five employees: Assistant Dean, Study
Abroad Advisor, Administrative Coordinator, and two Peer Advisors that alternate work days throughout the week. Additional data were collected across the larger campus community by observing two International Program Committee meetings that included GCC staff members and other individuals at Albani University who were involved with internationalization. This descriptive case study was grounded on three propositions that assisted in designating themes as they emerged from the data collected. Proposition I sought to examine how faculty and students were prepared on campus to embrace diverse cultures (Coryell et al., 2012; Knight, 2004). The themes that derived from Proposition I included (a) faculty development, and (b) student preparation. Proposition II stated that internationalizing is achieved by “…regular and consistent faculty dialogue…” (Morris, 2009, p. 145); Communication and ownership demonstrated by administrators and faculty is pertinent for success (Coryell et al., 2012). The themes that emerged from Proposition II were (a) ownership and commitment, (b) communication and dialogue, and (c) campus community engagement. Lastly, Proposition III stated that internationalization can be achieved when the campus community acquires knowledge of international practices (Coryell et al., 2012), reaches a shared understanding of internationalization (Morris, 2009), and places a high priority on monitoring program processes (Knight, 2001). The themes that were discovered and linked to Proposition III include (a) communication and dialogue, (b) shared goals, and (c) monitoring.

This chapter provides a discussion of the information that emerged from the data collection and analysis procedures described in Chapter 3. There are three different sections found in Chapter 4 to present the findings from each phase of the data collection process and these sections cover document review, observations, and the focus group and interview. Each section includes a review of the findings along with a discussion of the data analysis, as related
to the themes that emerged. First, the document review and observations were used in this descriptive case study in order to inform all propositions and research questions, as well as to understand the context of the GCC and Albani University’s internationalization initiative as it is implemented on the campus. Next, the focus group, which included three GCC staff members, was also conducted as a way to inform all propositions and research questions. Finally, the interview with the GCC administrator informed all propositions and research questions, but was specifically conducted to uncover the decision-making processes used to implement internationalization at Albani University. The documents collected were analyzed using Thomas’s (2006) general inductive analysis (GIA) processes, along with coding and tracking procedural methods that included identifying frequencies, summaries, and data comparisons (Miles & Huberman, 1994). For the focus group and interview, once raw data were digitally transcribed and checked for clarity and accuracy, summary sheets were completed and coded (Creswell, 2007), and then were compared to the theoretical framework presented in Chapter 1. To conclude this chapter, a discussion of the research question analysis and the cross-data collection summary findings is presented.

Introduction to the Document Review

The context of internationalization at Albani University was determined from an extensive investigation of nine documents that were supplied by the GCC Dean and Assistant Dean. Of the documents collected, all included evidence of active implementation strategies since the 2007-2008 academic year when the GCC was instituted. The documents included an in-depth report written in 2008 by the GCC Dean early in his career at Albani University. The GCC Dean’s 2008 Report consisted of 11 comprehensive recommendations that served to intensify internationalization across the larger campus community. The Albani University
Spring 2014 Statistics document included information about the international student population, study abroad, and international student enrollments. Another document, the GCC 2013-2014 Statistics Report was also reviewed and included a breakdown of current and past international student country origins, courses of study, sports involvement, class year, and demographic information. Detailed study abroad statistics for the 2012 academic year were also found in this document.

The International Programs Committee Members includes GCC staff members and its Dean, as well as other faculty, staff, an international student representative, and administrators from Albani University. The International Programs Committee Members document identified the staff and administrators, along with their department affiliations, who are involved in all internationalization efforts across the larger campus community. Another document, entitled *International Programs Committee Responsibilities and Guiding Principles*, included detailed information about Committee member roles and activities. Two official letters were also examined as part of the document review. One was written by an external evaluation provider, who discussed Albani University’s progress with respect to implementing internationalization after a site visit and review of a self-study report prepared by GCC staff members. The second was a letter written by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs at Albani University in response to the GCC Dean’s 2008 Report.

Finally, two very comprehensive documents were also reviewed; the GCC Self-Study Report and the external evaluation provider’s Peer Review Report. This document was released in March 2013 and outlined the GCC’s progress toward internationalizing Albani University. The Self-Study Report was conducted in order to prepare for a national quality improvement evaluation that would be conducted by an external organization. The final document was the
Peer Review Report. Prior to visiting the campus in Spring 2013, the evaluators reviewed the Self-Study Report. Following their visit they compiled the extensive Peer Review Report for GCC staff to review and utilize as they continue their progress toward implementing internationalization on their campus. Appendix B provides a more precise look at the details of each document, including their relationships to Propositions I and III, as well as codes and themes.

Emerging Themes

Following the thorough document review process, seven thematic elements relating to the propositions and research questions emerged. Each theme assisted in providing an understanding of the context of the internationalization process as it is implemented on the Albani University campus, specifically in terms of faculty development, student preparation, campus community engagement, ownership and commitment, communication and dialogue, shared goals, and monitoring.

Introduction to the Observation Results

The process of “…sensemaking is inherently collective; it is not nearly as effective to be the lone leader at the top doing…[it all] by yourself” (Ancona, 2012, p. 8). From the observations of two International Programs Committee meetings at Albani University, the researcher learned that many departments are represented, as well as the international student body. One member shared that individuals can be appointed to serve on the committee by a senior administrator or can volunteer for a three-year term. The committee re-emerged in 2007 with permission from the Provost when the GCC Dean was hired. Over time, the committee’s members have changed remarkably. One member shared that compared to when the committee was first re-established, many more members have an international connection now, whether
personal or academic. This committee member mentioned that newer members tend to be more
invested in internationalization and have now introduced “…younger...broader views” to the
committee’s dialogue. The researcher also learned that faculty members are now having more
conversations about developing international programs, which has further internationalized the
campus, providing more opportunities for intercultural experiences.

Introduction to the Focus Group and Interview Findings

In addition to the document review and observations, insight was gained into the three
research questions by conducting a focus group with three GCC staff members and an interview
with an Albani University administrator. Two staff members did not volunteer to participate in
the focus group. After the focus group and interview were completed, a recording from each
session was digitally transcribed and then the raw data were analyzed using MAXQDA OSX.
Each transcript was coded carefully and reviewed for themes that emerged from the data
collected. Excerpts from the focus group and interview sessions are presented and discussed
below as they relate to the guiding research questions, propositions, and theoretical framework
presented in Chapter 1.

Participant Backgrounds

Gordon. Gordon has served as the first GCC Dean since 2007 at Albani University. Prior to
Gordon being hired, the international office on campus only had a Director of Study Abroad who
reported to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Gordon oversees five GCC staff members in the
office who fulfill the following roles: Administrative Assistant, Assistant Dean, Study Abroad
Advisor, and Peer Advisor. He also serves as the Chair of the International Programs Committee on campus.
James. James serves as the Assistant Dean at the GCC and has worked in the GCC office for six years. He works with both inbound and outbound students on campus and is the Primary Designated School Official and Responsible Officer for F-1 and J1 visas. James also advises graduate students, and issues DS-2019s for J1 students and scholars on campus. This may be for the duration of one semester, or all four years depending on how long the student or scholar studies at Albani University.

James also maintains a role as Study Abroad Advisor and meets with students individually to guide them through the process of selecting a location and program of study. He specifically oversees students from the School of Arts and Sciences and the School of Professional Studies. He also collaborates with faculty members from these academic departments to identify overseas programs that are appropriately suited for their majors.

Kevin. Kevin has worked in the GCC office for two years and oversees Study Abroad. He advises students from the School of Business who study abroad for a semester or academic year, and he oversees faculty-led short-term programs. Kevin also manages summer and winter interim sessions, along with faculty-led study abroad programs from the School of Business. He is responsible for managing scholarship-related work pertaining to the GCC.

Mary. Mary serves as the Administrative Assistant in the GCC office and supports Gordon, James, and Kevin in their work. At 12 years, she has worked at Albani University the longest of the GCC staff. She is charged with collecting syllabi from study abroad program providers and distributing them to Chairpersons in various academic departments on campus. She meets with students before they study overseas to discuss their course selections, and determines how well the courses will fit into their degree audit. She also reviews payment
information and identifies what the institution will pay for, and outlines the individual financial responsibilities for each student.

Findings for Research Question 1

Document Review

Theme One: Faculty Development. The faculty development theme refers to the internationalization process that involves preparing faculty to embrace diverse cultures, as referred to in Proposition I (Coryell, et al., 2012; Knight, 2004) and the first research question; How do GCC staff and administrators at one post-secondary institution understand their campus’s internationalization initiative to prepare faculty and students to embrace different cultures? The data analysis revealed that what is still needed as a result of implementing internationalization at Albani University is; “…help[ing] faculty understand…that international students have different cultural backgrounds or understandings or frame of reference that they bring that’s different from the typical American view.” Furthermore, the data analysis exposed “…faculty [do not] have that kind of training…”; “…no one [at Albani University are] required to do any kind of diversity training…there is nothing done to…prepare people…” The first theme can also relate to preparation provided to faculty to lead a short-term program overseas; assistance or resources may be provided by GCC. Of the nine documents reviewed, two presented explicit ways in which faculty and staff at Albani University have assisted in preparing the campus community to embrace diverse cultures.

The first document reviewed was a description of each of the International Programs Committee members. The members were listed and the descriptions displayed, illustrating that the committee involved 11 different departments across the larger campus community, including one international student representative. The committee chair and ex-officio were both GCC
staff members, but held no voting rights. There were six staff and faculty members, along with five individuals who held administrative positions on campus, sitting on the committee. The committee’s responsibilities are described in the International Programs Committee Responsibilities and Guiding Principles document. Their activities include overseeing and advising the GCC on how international scholars and students are immersed into the campus culture, as well as reviewing and approving new initiatives, such as faculty-led programs overseas. Faculty-led programs are academic courses developed and implemented by faculty and staff on campus and abroad, and involves direct collaboration with the GCC Dean and staff. These responsibilities were also discussed in the GCC Self-Study Report document.

In the GCC Dean’s 2008 Report, 11 recommendations that aligned with Albani University’s 2011-2015 Strategic Plan were presented. Out of these recommendations, four connected to the faculty development theme. This report highlighted the internationalization improvements that have occurred at Albani University since 2004. In the first recommendation, the Dean noted the importance of increasing student involvement in study abroad programs in order to remain comparable to peer institutions, but the Dean also emphasized a need to develop study abroad programs that would be attractive to all disciplines across the larger campus community. It was revealed in this document that a stigma previously existed regarding the way both students and faculty viewed study abroad. Faculty and students were documented in the Self-Study Report as viewing study abroad as an opportunity that included few instances where participants would be challenged and receive a rigorous academic experience. This perspective on study abroad led to limited support in previous years, as it was not relevant to a student’s academic goals at Albani University. Recommendation two stated that faculty were encouraged to become more immersed in overseeing the selection of study abroad opportunities that are
available to students in order to ensure such programs are academically rigorous and appropriate. Within the Dean’s 2008 report, he suggested that growth in international program offerings could emerge from increasing study abroad opportunities on campus through short-term faculty-led programs.

A key finding in the Dean’s 2008 report was the statement that in October 2007 and April 2008, the GCC began providing a workshop for faculty interested in leading overseas programs. Since 2008, the GCC Dean reported that only a few faculty members expressed interest due to the large amount of work needed to develop and sustain a short-term program, which has led to limited proposals. A concern over how faculty members and departments across the campus will sustain these programs was expressed in this document. Recommendation 10 described the role of the center and identified its responsibility on campus in supporting the development of faculty by providing the following services:

- Workshops for faculty who plan, develop, and participate in short-term programs
- A location to hold meetings between faculty and study abroad providers
- Offer financial support to faculty who visit program sites and conduct evaluations on programs overseas

After the Dean’s 2008 report was released, the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs responded in a letter on September 24, 2009 that endorsed all of the Dean’s recommendations, although with some modifications. With regard to faculty development, recommendations one and two were endorsed with no exceptions. In sum, it was evident that campus community administrators support improvements in the quality of current international programs and support increasing the annual percentage of study abroad participants.
It was also learned through the GCC’s Self-Study Report that the recent academic culture is changing at Albani University. This was attributed to the Revised Core Curriculum that came into effect in the Fall of 2012 and will impact the class of 2016. The Revised Core Curriculum involves a new set of learning expectations that requires students to take a pre-approved number of courses from the following academic areas: Western civilization, philosophy, theology, fine arts, natural science, quantitative reasoning, social sciences. Students that are a part of the Class of 2016 will also need to demonstrate their proficiency in the following areas: civic-engagement, diversity, intensive writing, and oral communication.

The Revised Core Curriculum has impacted teaching and course selection strategies among students. For instance, students are selecting academic or study abroad programs that will fulfill requirements or academic goals under the Revised Core Curriculum. Students now may not select study abroad options based only on a specific location. It was also found that faculty members are now investing more as they become aware of different international programs and their alignments with the new academic requirements. In the Self-Study Report, commitment to working with departments across the larger campus community to establish discipline specific programs was clear. For example, the faculty has become more involved in the process of visiting study abroad program sites for review. However, the GCC staff reported that more financial resources are needed for ongoing reviews in order to ensure program quality and suitability for Albani students.

Additional calls for more faculty development in the area of advising students in capitalizing on international opportunities was clear in the Self-Study Report. One way to achieve this is through a teaching model that is to be implemented in May of 2014. The model includes one week of campus instruction and then two weeks spent abroad. For example, after
the Spring semester is complete at Albani University another session of classes are held for a few weeks in May. During this shortened semester, a faculty member may host a short-term special topics course that takes place in May on the Albani University campus and at an overseas location. A course offered at this time of year may allow students to fulfill the diversity or civic-engagement proficiencies required in the Revised Core Curriculum, and gain international skills through the experience.

Found within the Self-Study Report were six detailed resource documents available to faculty interested in developing a short-term program. For instance, there is a nine-page comprehensive faculty guide that includes a list of critical tasks that need to be fulfilled when preparing a faculty-led program. It provides a step-by-step protocol on how a faculty member would develop a budget, select students, make travel arrangements, design pre and post-departure activities, and guidelines for best practices with concern for health and safety. This document includes a selection and approval protocol. Detailed timelines for the proposal deadline, procedures for a review by the International Programs Committee, as well as information about a student orientation session are also provided.

A three-page proposal review form was also provided in the Self-Study Report. This review form includes questions about faculty experiences in the host country and the level of faculty language proficiency. It also solicits faculty members to share planned pre and post departure discussions or preparation that will take place in order to introduce students to a new culture.

Another document, the External Evaluation Provider Peer Review Report, demonstrated evidence of faculty development as well. The GCC was found by the evaluators to be highly functioning in their effort to implement internationalization. Administrative units have been
integrated into the internationalization process at Albani University. The GCC Dean and its staff members have successfully coordinated change across the university in the area of study abroad. The GCC’s use of the institutional infrastructure to reach across departments was also noted. The establishment of the International Programs Committee is one structural way that the GCC has reached varying academic departments across the larger campus community. The external evaluators highlighted that the GCC’s efforts to support faculty development have been tremendous, particularly over the short, six-year period during which the GCC has existed at Albani University.

There is also evidence of developing study abroad program lists with various departments on campus. The evaluators noted that efforts to involve faculty in site visits abroad, could lighten some of the workload for GCC staff members and internationalize faculty further at Albani University. It is clear that the Revised Core Curriculum Committee has also worked with the GCC to target study abroad programs that relate closely to the academic standards.

**Theme Two: Student Preparation.** The second theme, student preparation, connects to Proposition I and the first research question; preparing students to embrace diverse cultures (Coryell, et al., 2012; Knight, 2004). The data analysis revealed that Albani University is “…help[ing] acculturate the international students better into the US…and into the campus…” Furthermore, the diversity proficiency serves as one way “…to encourage [Albani University] students to take other courses that could have more of an international focus…” The focus group exposed that “…[the campus is] not at the level of diversity and acceptance…and cultural understanding that a lot of other campuses are…”; “…students identify with…whoever is like them…” The nine documents that were examined displayed some evidence of preparing students to embrace diverse cultures.
It is evident that the International Programs Committee is also responsible for reviewing and approving student petitions related to study abroad. The International Programs Committee Responsibilities and Guiding Principles document highlighted that one role of its members is to advise the GCC on the welfare of international students and scholars and their integration into the campus community. In addition, through maintaining these guiding principles and responsibilities, the university ensures that international study remains fully immersed in the curriculum across the campus. Furthermore, the role of the Committee members also includes the following:

- Advise on the GCC’s administrative policies and procedures
- Review and recommend an approved list of study abroad programs
- Review and approve faculty-led short-term programs
- Review and approve student petitions for study abroad programs

These principles also value and adhere to the mission of Albani University, which is to prepare their students for future work in a global society, and ensure the university commits to providing resources, such as study abroad, that will enhance culture immersion, language learning, and intercultural experiences. The Self-Study Report noted Albani University’s progress toward upholding this mission. For instance, the percentage of students studying abroad was at 13% in the 2007-2008 school year. The GCC closely monitored this mission. The GCC 2013-2014 Statistics Report and Spring 2014 Statistics documents highlight that they have achieved their goal; study abroad participation is now at 30%.

The Self-Study Report noted that the introduction of a Revised Core Curriculum in Fall 2012 would impact the Class of 2016. It can be understood from the examination of this document that faculty and students have not yet discovered how to apply it to new academic
standards, particularly in regards to incorporating study abroad. Students that enroll in either major or minor courses, and elective courses can demonstrate the Revised Core Curriculum proficiencies. The GCC identified areas of overlap and goals for increasing study abroad that would, in turn, develop students’ intercultural skills. First, the diversity proficiency could be achieved by participating in study abroad. Second, the civic-engagement proficiency could be achieved through a global service-learning project either on campus or abroad. The Self-Study Report revealed that students must be flexible and creative in understanding how to fulfill standards set forth in the Revised Core Curriculum.

Since 2007, the GCC identified in their Self-Study Report that resources are used to measure student preparation for embracing diverse cultures. A study abroad program evaluation is required for students. Their overseas transcripts are only released to them once the evaluation is completed. This process tracks support services on and off campus, academics, language learning, housing and meals, health and safety, finances, as well as student’s intercultural experiences over time. A question on this evaluation also requested that students identify any social adjustments they made in their host country, and included a section for them to provide suggestions as to how future study abroad students may get to know different people and cultures.

Another evaluation tool, the *Wesleyan Intercultural Competence Scale* (WICS), has also been used. Students take this assessment twice when they are abroad, once within the first few weeks of the program and then again once it is completed. It is used to track student’s intercultural experiences and learning. The types of questions that are asked on this assessment tool include common intercultural situations that students would encounter while they study abroad. They must read each of the 16 situations and determine how they have reacted during
their own personal experiences overseas. This assessment tool is not mandatory. The response rate to this survey has been low even with inducements, such as a chance to win an iPad. The Self-Study Report and observations of two International Programs Committee meetings by the researcher revealed that the GCC is committed to continuing to examine and approve study abroad site providers that incorporate intercultural learning.

Based on a review of the Self-Study and Peer Review Reports, Albani University has made great strides to make study abroad accessible to all students, despite their financial need or academic track. One way that equal access to study abroad has been made possible was by transitioning to a different tuition policy in 2011, which made institutional aide more portable. Enabling students to carry institutional merit and need-based monies for off-campus study beginning in 2011-2012 was critical to increasing study abroad participation across the campus community. Another recommendation found in the Dean’s 2008 Report relieved students of a full-year financial housing obligation if they studied abroad. The GCC Dean suggested that by collaborating with the Admissions Office, enrollment could be determined and an ideal amount of students in on-campus housing could be maintained. Other documents reviewed also emphasized the development of campus community networks that have assisted in making study abroad more accessible. For example, The Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs Letter revealed that senior administrators endorsed all of the recommendations presented by the GCC Dean that would increase study abroad participation at Albani University. With the implementation of these recommendations, more students are now able to study abroad.

**Observation Results**

**Students should be able to “…draw connections…[and] think globally.”** After observing two International Programs Committee meetings it became clear that Albani
University has worked toward operationalizing internationalization by preparing faculty and students to embrace diverse cultures (Coryell, et. al., 2012; Knight, 2004). The Albani University Spring 2014 Statistics document was shared with the committee members during the first observation. The document revealed that there were a total of 80 international students on campus from 37 different countries. The two largest groups of students were from Vietnam and Canada, and one international student represented each of the remaining countries listed. An increase in the presence of international students on campus may create more opportunities for domestic students to develop intercultural skills (Deardorff, 2006; Sparks & Waits, 2011). It was also found that the Admissions Office plans to utilize a current student that speaks Chinese to attract more international students that speak the Chinese language.

During the second observation it was discovered that the special topics course curricula offered in the Political Science Department, and the culminating trips to Ecuador and Nicaragua that are embedded in it offer students one way in which they can “…draw connections…[and] think globally…,” as a faculty committee member noted during his presentation. Albani University students embark on new intercultural experiences and some may not be prepared to do so; therefore, the use of safeguards was evident in the observations. For instance, during the first observation, a GCC staff member shared with the committee that a particular study abroad program provider is not often approved for students due to the limited opportunities for local immersion. This system check in the program approval process was pointed out to the Committee members as being an essential way to control the nature and extent of students’ intercultural experiences when studying abroad.

To further assist in preparing students and faculty for intercultural experiences, the use of pre-departure orientations, student reports, and evaluation tools were described during the
observations. As part of the presentation on the trip to Ecuador, the faculty committee member distributed a Global Service Grant Report, which was almost entirely developed by his students. This report identified how Albani University students made interdisciplinary connections to both art and political science themes in his course, as well as how they met the civic-engagement and diversity proficiencies required in the Revised Core Curriculum. When discussing the challenges that he faced in implementing his program, he described the limited number of student evaluations that were completed. Student evaluations are intended to provide feedback about the study abroad program experience and help make constructive changes to future programming. Ancona (2012) pointed out that sensemaking “…involves moving from the simple to the complex and back again…The move to the complex occurs as new information is collected and new actions are taken” (p. 4). Sensemaking was discovered after observing a committee member who referenced an evaluation strategy that worked in his department on campus. He stated that the initial feedback the department received from students’ study abroad evaluations was not helpful. Therefore, his department revised the evaluation form to specifically ask the “tough” questions students may be reluctant to reveal. This allowed the department members to learn from student experiences and revise the program accordingly with the goal of ultimately improving student immersion in a foreign culture.

Focus Group and Interview Findings

Similar to what emerged from the extensive document review, the participants in the focus group and interview agreed that there has been a significant change in the mission at Albani University. The most recent strategic plan has involved making the campus more diverse. The strategic plan for diversity connects to Proposition I and the student preparation as well as the faculty development theme that emerged from the data analysis; internationalization
is a process that involves preparing faculty and students to embrace diverse cultures (Coryell, et al., 2012; Knight, 2004). The researcher discovered through the focus group that the term *diversify* is interpreted in varying ways across the larger campus community. James pointed out that the campus has “…used [the term] diversity more than internationalization…I think the campus was a little bit unclear. Officially…What that means, or what the goals are…there hasn’t been very specific language around internationalization…” During the interview, Gordon stated that internationalization is about:

…trying to get your students really prepared now for the global economy of tomorrow and that’s really what will help them…in the workplace…for the next thirty or forty years once they’ve graduated from college…now more so than ever…and that’s probably only going to increase.

Sensemaking involves coming to an understanding and putting it into action (Ancona, 2012). Gordon pointed out that internationalization at Albani University has become “… more serious …[and the senior administrators] upgraded…to create a dean position [in 2007]…so that it would be on equal footing with other deans.” Gordon continued, “…with the idea being that over time we would be developing and encouraging more study abroad participation as part of the strategic plan that was unfolding at that time.” Gordon posited that students’ post-graduate experiences are “going to be multicultural; it’s going to be global and so, in a sense, study abroad really fits in with that in terms of how to give students the experiences they’re going to need in their professional life.” Albani University is making strides toward preparing its campus to embrace diverse cultures, but some challenges in the process exist.

The focus group revealed that students and faculty are not necessarily prepared to embrace different cultures. Mary pointed out, “We’ve made strides diversifying the campus, but it’s still middle class, white students that come here.” James also agreed with Mary’s sentiment and stated that students don’t “get it [when they go abroad]…there’s an honest effort [to
internationalize] on the part of a lot of people, from faculty and staff.” During the focus group, James shared results from a recent campus climate report that was conducted to shed light on student readiness to embrace diverse cultures. James stated the report revealed, “Student’s who are of color…do not necessarily feel welcome most of the time, unless they are athletes.”

Moreover, James pointed out:

The non-athlete, non-white students…feel that they are not perceived…well…and that they are treated differently…I don’t think that’s necessarily unique to [Albani University], but I think we’re a bit behind the times…internally, of some of our peer institutions…we are not at the level of diversity and acceptance…and cultural understanding that a lot of other campuses are.

Study abroad evaluations have also shown that Albani University students that travel overseas are not surpassing the second stage of cultural immersion. James stated that students are not “getting past…the basic differences…They come back saying well, people are people everywhere…They’re not seeing any other set of cultural difference…I just read an evaluation today saying there was no difference…between Americans and Italians.” The focus group participants revealed that students who go to Latin America, the Middle East, and Asia identify cultural differences more than those who travel to Europe. This finding is consistent with the document review. However, overall the number of students who demonstrate an understanding of cultural differences after study abroad appears to be limited.

Although study abroad has consistently been the GCC’s “main task”, as Gordon noted, other critical roles emerged in 2007 when Gordon was hired. It became clear that GCC staff needed to fulfill more roles in order to internationalize Albani University. New tasks included assisting international students with their immersion into the campus community:

International students [were] arriving…[with] nothing, there was no one to talk to, no one designated to deal with them and so they really had no place to go or so they thought. No one was responsible for them. So that became also part of our…job, our focus was…[to]…create a welcome program…be an advocate for them…It was badly
needed…we had students arriving who…didn’t have clothes, or if they were from Nepal for instance didn’t have a winter coat…didn’t [know] what winter was and had never been told what to bring…[which] made it very difficult for international students to fit in and probably succeed and do well.

In addition, when Gordon was hired, he explained that he “could not find one word about international students on…the website after [the] international admissions application…we’ve been trying…to really deal with that over the last five years,” he stated. The focus group revealed that there has been some push to increase international student recruitment on campus.

It was evident from the document review of the Provost Letter written to the GCC Dean that international student recruitment was approved by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs. However, despite a call from the GCC Dean to increase international student enrollment by 5 percent over a seven-year period, the Provost Letter revealed the administrative Cabinet supported the recommendation, but could not commit to yearly increases. A finding from the focus group was that Albani University has not received any large endowments for international student recruitment and so these students aren’t drawn to the institution. Each year one individual from the Admissions Office travels to Europe, Asia, and Latin America. However, Chinese, Indian, and South Korean students are not enrolling because Albani University is not as attractive or well known compared to other popular universities in the northeast region; or even paying full tuition, which could supply financial resources. The focus group participants also noted that the university is predominately Catholic. Albani University is a Catholic institution, which might be a deterrent to some international students that may consider enrolling.

Competency is one of the approaches to promote internationalization and it “emphasizes the development of skills, knowledge, attitudes and values” (Qiang, 2003, p. 250). Mary noted that one core requirement for students is that they take a Western-focused course, which does not necessarily represent a global perspective. Kevin reiterated this point:
The curriculum is very Western focused…[not only] with the development of [the] Western [focused] course…but even just [with] other course options. You’re not going to find as many offerings that cover…world events…there is a Global Studies major…[that was] recently…approved as a department. So that’s…one step with the curriculum…

Furthermore, Kevin stated that when students and their parents consider study abroad options:

   Europe, Australia, and New Zealand have the perception of being safer and people just know a little bit more about those locations…with the curriculum here, not as many students are even learning about other locations where they might make their own decision to go to a less traditional location.

When Mary started at Albani University she noticed that the majority of students traveled to Europe through one provider and that the participation rate was very low. Based on the focus group data and the document review, the GCC currently uses 350 programs, or third party providers overseas in 47 different countries. James pointed out that they use third party providers due to their limited staff size and access to adequate advising resources; students need a high level of support to prepare them for study abroad. James also discussed the improvement of study abroad programs. The GCC is currently working with departments across the campus to integrate study abroad into course curricula. A list for every major on campus of “…required or strongly encouraged…study abroad options [that students can] choose from that are tied somehow to their major…” is being developed, James stated.

The document review, observations, focus group, and interview all revealed that faculty members play a role in preparing students to embrace diverse cultures. This connects to the faculty development theme that also relates to Proposition I. International programs that have been developed on campus include other short term programs that are designed based on a faculty member’s interest or background. For example, Kevin pointed out that the History Department has developed programs to Greece and Japan, which have been “pretty successful so
“far.” As a result, other departments have also started creating programs. However, it was apparent this is still in the development stages. Kevin noted:

> It’s just a matter of…how to start that…and being able to provide the resources for them to do that…we’ve seen more of an interest in service-learning…so some faculty have partnered with…another office on campus…that’s more…[a]…public community service office…to assist them in planning these programs…But within the field of study abroad, short term programs are really on the rise…[and] that might be an area that continues to develop here.

Hser (2005) posited international education should be considered a top priority. The researcher found during the focus group that faculty who choose to lead an overseas program usually have a connection to a particular location or external organization. For example, one faculty member in the engineering and physics department has done ample work with sanitation and is involved with a non-governmental organization. He leads a consistent program to Ghana every summer and has enabled student’s to work on sanitation projects through the non-governmental organization he is connected with. However, both the interview and focus group revealed that some faculty members on campus do not support overseas programs, which was also consistent with findings from the document review. Kevin asserted this is “getting less and less…the faculty don’t necessarily know how to promote internationalization…[Gordon’s] initiative to send faculty to some of the programs that we want to promote to students in those majors…have faculty development seminars.” Kevin noted further that “get[ting] more faculty out in the world…[so]…they can speak about it more, and try to encourage more students to participate” could benefit the internationalization initiative and prepare students and faculty to embrace diverse cultures. Kevin’s belief that faculty members may further encourage students to embrace diverse cultures and gain international skills relates to Weick et al.’s (2005) notion that sensemaking may at first appear insignificant and lead to a greater understanding of an event.
Through the focus group and interview findings, the GCC office was found to be a central resource to the campus community in their efforts to prepare faculty and students to embrace diverse cultures. This is reinforced by Coryell, et. al. (2012) who stated outreach efforts assist in coordinating programming for internationalization efforts. The GCC has become a “microcosm of the campus,” Gordon noted, “because we have to deal with every office…so in a way, we become like a mini-campus within the campus.” In addition to not only working with departments across the campus, anything related to internationalization is streamlined through the GCC office and its staff members who are charged with handling each request. Mary mentioned, “Even [individuals from]…outside [of the campus] will call this office.” James lamented, “Our office isn’t necessarily responsible for internationalization…I think people just hear international…and we’re in the clearing house for questions about other countries.” An example of the GCC working closely with other departments on campus to internationalize includes efforts to support non-native English speaking students. James and Gordon have worked with the Office of Academic Services to support these students on campus as well as the faculty who teach them. Olson, Green, and Hill (2006) identified that it may be necessary for faculty to alter their teaching practices to accommodate visiting international students or scholars. This was the case at Albani University when a focus group participant stated that they had hired a new ELL specialist. Both James and Gordon expressed hope that this position would become full-time. James stated this position on campus could be a “key player in some of the faculty’s…internationalization efforts…[but] faculty vary in terms of how much they want to be pro-actively helpful.” James also revealed, “Faculty [have] complain[ed] in the past…this student doesn’t speak any English. There’s nothing I can do for this student.” James questioned:
Is it that the student really doesn’t speak English, or is it that there are cultural differences there and the student’s not approaching the professor, or speaking with the professor, [or] asking questions to the professor the way an American student would?

Evidence from the interview and focus group suggested that many faculty members and staff do not have training to work with students from other cultures. It is challenging for students who are not native English speakers to receive support. James said:

Even [among] the professional staff, nobody [has]...a real background in working with students who aren’t native English speakers...in the past...the solution to that has been for me to go in and do some cultural training with them...[but] that’s only helpful to an extent.

Leaders must “secure and allocate resources” for internationalization efforts (Green, 2003, p. 17). James underscored this point when he stated that the approval for the ELL specialist position was the “result of a year of having meetings...collecting the data...and presenting that...to the Provost...and Assistant Vice Presidents.” James assured, “You [also] have to tie things to the strategic plan.” James also noted that attaining resources is very difficult and in order to acquire them, it must be presented in “such a way that the benefits...clearly outweigh the money that it will cost”. Furthermore, Kevin pointed out that after support through resources are gained, such as a new position, it is still unclear whether it has helped address the more widespread concerns. Kevin stated:

It takes so long to get a position, then once it’s in place...I think a lot of the time it’s kind of seen as problem solved...now you have every resource that you could possibly need...[and it] addresses some of the issues, but it’s not going to... solve all of the larger issues.

The data analysis revealed that the resources used by faculty and staff at Albany University depends solely on the specific goals they are trying to accomplish. Faculty or staff may reach out to their professional associations, research, or joint projects they have engaged in with scholars in the US or abroad to design an international-related initiative, or faculty-led
short-term program. In regard to GCC staff members, they have access to an abundance of networks that provide training, resource materials, and workshops to develop their own professional skills. One example pointed out by Gordon explained a new certification process for Study Abroad Advisors that has recently come out. This particular change in credentials has “increased professionalization of the field” and also demands the use of external resources.

Other resources used at the GCC are determined based somewhat on relevance, but mainly on cost. For instance, Gordon discussed the software selection process for tracking students abroad. One software program was significantly more expensive than the other, and noted the least expensive one was still “pretty good…but it doesn’t have all the bells and whistles.” Gordon stated, “…money becomes oftentimes an issue in terms of what you can actually afford to do…[and] in terms of travel we do…over the course of a fiscal year to see…what’s workable and manageable.” The data analysis revealed on multiple occasions that GCC staff possess concerns regarding the challenge of accessing resources due to limited funds.

Findings for Research Question 2

Document Review

Theme Three: Campus Community Engagement. The third theme connects to Proposition II and the second research question; internationalization is accomplished through “…regular and consistent faculty dialogue…” (Morris, 2009, p. 145). The second research question sought to discover the organizational decision-making processes and dialogue that GCC staff and campus administrators have engaged in to operationalize their internationalization initiative. It was discovered in the focus group that The International Programs Committee meetings “…is where…a lot of [internationalization] ideas get started.” The data analysis also revealed that the Committee was previously dormant before the GCC Dean was asked by the
Provost to “…resurrect it…[and it is] a good example of how to incorporate [others on campus]…” Internationalization can be operationalized when the campus community becomes engaged in the implementation process as a result of dialogue. The reinstitution and use of the International Programs Committee has allowed the GCC Dean and its members to enact actions (the third property of sensemaking) at Albani University that have led to implementing internationalization regardless of barriers, such as limited access to financial resources (Weick, 1995). As Weick et al. (2005) referred, “Actions enable people to assess casual beliefs that subsequently lead to new actions …Over time, as supporting evidence mounts, significant changes in beliefs and actions evolve” (p. 416).

Evidence of engaging the campus community was also found through the extensive document review. While only one representative from the departments on campus currently sit on the International Programs Committee, other faculty or staff members may attend and propose new faculty-led programs overseas. Specifically, during two staff meetings the researcher observed non-committee faculty proposing new study-abroad programs. The committee is responsible for overseeing policies and procedures of the GCC, but also engages in selecting international programs that reflect Albani University’s mission. Moreover, the GCC Dean initially began working with the Global Business Education Committee on campus to develop an appropriate program list for study abroad options. The Self-Study Report noted that an ample amount of time would be needed in order to collaborate with all faculty and departments in the larger campus community. The Self-Study Report revealed that only two or three departments are approached each academic year to determine an approved study abroad program list. The Self-Study Report revealed,

---

1 Not all departments are represented on the International Programs Committee
…the need to work closely with faculty about [curricular integration with study abroad] requires patience. A measure or public relations and diplomacy, and a realistic sense of doing what is possible at any one time while keeping in view the long-range goal of academic integration. (Self Study Report, 2013, p. 9)

In addition, some evidence of hesitation among faculty to develop their own proposal for an international short-term program was found in the document review. This was clear from the Self-Study Report and reinforced during an observation of an International Programs Committee meeting as well as during the interview. Developing and proposing a short-term, faculty-led program demands a high level of commitment. Although the extra academic semester in May might provide an ample opportunity for faculty and students to gain international skills and fulfill a Revised Core Curriculum proficiency, such as diversity, the GCC is currently unable to offer the support that is required to sustain all of the programs that are proposed. The supportive resources available for faculty interested in developing programs was widespread, as was evident in the investigation of the documents. Evidence of the resources, such as workshops, guidebooks, and approval process timelines were found in the Self-Study Report. However, the Self-Study Report documented the need for additional resources to prepare faculty through this process. Faculty will also need guidance to assist their students in selecting courses under the new Revised Core Curriculum to merge academic requirements with international skills.

The researcher also learned through the document review that support for Albani University and the GCC and its plans for internationalization were largely positive. For example, the external evaluation provider letter to the GCC Dean illustrated that the President and CEO reacted well to the onsite evaluation of the GCC. In this letter the President and CEO commended the GCC for its collaboration with the larger academic community at Albani University. In the Peer Review Report, it was clear that critical senior administrators, along with many department leaders and deans, all supported study abroad or have personal linkages to
cultural experiences. The Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs Letter written to the GCC Dean in response to his proposals for internationalizing Albani University also displayed evidence of administrative support in transforming Albani University by supporting all recommendations presented in the Dean’s 2008 Report.

Since the Revised Core Curriculum has been introduced and applied to study abroad programs, GCC staff members have been concerned with its affect on study abroad participation rates. The Peer Review Report noted the GCC’s efforts in working with departments to develop discipline-specific programs that are appropriate for student’s study abroad experiences. When approving programs, the two evaluators found that the GCC staff utilized the infrastructure at Albani University very well. For example, it was noted that, while working in conjunction with the Core Curriculum Committee, the GCC staff could evaluate the study abroad courses by cross-checking them with the Revised Core Curriculum requirements. It was found in the Peer Review Report that overlapping responsibilities across the institution among administrative and functioning units that support international activities may benefit the institution’s future growth. More specifically, the evaluators noted that a tighter collaborative commitment between administrative and functional areas at the Albani University to support the implementation of internationalization on campus would be critical. For instance, identifying the specific roles and responsibilities of the varying functional groups across the campus community may assist.

**Theme Four: Ownership and Commitment.** All of the documents collected displayed the ownership and commitment theme. This particular theme refers to the ownership and commitment demonstrated by administrators and faculty to make internationalization a success (Coryell, et. al., 2012) and operationalize internationalization. The data analysis revealed that senior administrators wanted to “…make [internationalization] more serious…[and the
GCC]…be[come] a department in its own right…” The second research question sought to discover the organizational decision-making processes and dialogue demonstrated by GCC staff and administrators to operationalize internationalization, and reflects their commitment and ownership to the initiative.

Strong examples of ownership and commitment to operationalize internationalization at Albani University came out of the Dean’s 2008 Report. Each of the 11 recommendations laid out in this document pointed to adjustments and reforms that could take place to further implement internationalization on the Albani University campus. As an overview, the recommendations were to (a) increase study abroad participants; (b) develop study abroad programs to fit all disciplines; (c) establish equal access to study abroad programs by establishing institutional merit and need-based financial aid as portable; (d) reintroduce a new tuition policy on campus; (e) adjust the current housing policy to ensure students attending study abroad are not obligated to pay full year costs; (f) increase international student enrollment so it reaches 5% in seven years; (g) consider need-based aide in conjunction with merit-based scholarships to ensure international students reach graduation; (h) retain a $1,000 cost limit for study abroad; (i) eliminate the use of program provider rebates to subsidize the GCC budget and shift funds to study abroad and student grants; (j) consider relocating the GCC on campus to a more visible and easily accessible place; (k) consider gifts and other support for the GCC and international programs on campus as a critical component of the Capital Campaign.

In reaction to the Dean’s 2008 Report, senior administrators expressed support for all of the recommendations with certain qualifiers. Study abroad was made more accessible at Albani University by establishing institutional merit and need-based financial aid as portable, reintroduce a new tuition policy on campus, and adjusting the current housing policy to ensure
students attending study abroad are not obligated to pay full year costs. However, students could make a full year commitment to the financial housing obligation while they are studying abroad. Higher-level administrators at Albani University, without any qualifications, also accepted to increase study abroad participants. The following recommendations were also accepted as noted in the Provost Letter; develop study abroad programs to fit all disciplines on campus, retain a $1,000 cost, eliminate the use of program provider rebates to subsidize the GCC budget and shift funds to study abroad and student grants, consider gifts and other support for the GCC and international programs on campus as a critical component of the Capital Campaign.

The senior administrator’s cabinet noted their support of increasing international enrollments in Recommendations 6 (f) and 7 (g); however, they could not commit to the yearly increments as stated. The ownership and commitment theme was also evident when the GCC staff members worked with the Admissions Office to develop a strategic plan to recruit and retain international students. The results of their efforts would further diversify the campus and connect with Albani University’s strategic plan. In regard to relocating the GCC, as noted in Recommendation 10 (j), the cabinet stated it had discussed this request, but did not yet make a decision on changing its location.

Both the Self-Study and the Peer Review Reports identified Albani University’s commitment to implementing internationalization across the larger campus community. The decision to utilize the external evaluation provider was the result of a NEASC accreditation that took place in 2007, as well as the development of a Continuous Improvement Program (CIP) under the Office of Academic Affairs. In order to promote development and improvement on campus, cyclical evaluations were required every 7-10 years per the CIP. The Peer Review Report conducted by the external evaluation provider served this purpose. The CEO and
President of the external evaluation provider stated Albani University displayed “…substantial conformity…maintains a dedication both to offering high quality programs in education abroad at a level of excellence acceptable to the larger academic community…” and successfully participating in the evaluation process (External Provider Letter, 15 October 2013).

Another example of ownership with implementing internationalization at Albani University was discussed in both the Self-Study and Peer Review Reports. Establishing a satellite religious studies program in Rome by partnering with a global education provider is one example of ownership and commitment. The program came into effect in 2009 and was achieved through collaboration between the Office of Academic Affairs and the Theology and Religious Studies Department on campus. A rotating resident director from the Theology Department volunteers each year and teaches core courses, or electives in Rome.

The enrollment numbers have increased, however higher percentages are evident in the spring semester. For example, in the Fall of 2012, there were six students who participated; however, in the Spring of 2013, 30 students enrolled. In the Peer Review Report, the evaluators noted that continued growth in this program would possibly require further administrative oversight and possibly a full-time director housed at the GCC.

The Spring 2014 Statistics document highlighted a recent contract change with this program. A partnership exists between the global provider in Italy and Albani University. This contract was renewed through the 2016-2017 year. The faculty resident director for this program was also reappointed through 2015 to assist in sustaining this program. The Peer Review Report highlighted that the GCC has a solid history of collaborative work with academic departments across the campus, and might assist in continually developing the Italy program in the future.
Theme Five: Communication and Dialogue. The communication and dialogue theme relates to both Proposition II and III. Communication is one component essential for a successful internationalization initiative, and involves a campus community becoming knowledgeable of international practices (Coryell, et al., 2012). The GCC Dean noted, “…over time it’s taken awhile for that to take place, but now, I think people really know us and they look to us…that’s been a good development…” The data analysis also exposed that “…develop[ing] department specific programs…[has]…helped in some way but I don't know if it's changed a lot of the faculty's thinking or understanding of why we've done that…some get it…” The process of developing department specific study abroad programs has required GCC staff and administrators to engage in dialogue to operationalize internationalization on their campus, which also relates directly to the second research question.

All documents that were reviewed displayed some evidence of the GCC staff and the larger campus community utilizing dialogue to implement internationalization. The Dean’s 2008 Report emphasized the importance of establishing collaborative networks among faculty, academic departments, and office outreach that would link the GCC to the larger campus community. More specifically, the GCC Dean outlined some accomplishments achieved by the center in establishing dialogue across the Albani University campus in his 2008 report:

- Promoting discussions between the GCC and the School of Business and Modern Language departments to develop strong academic study abroad programs
- Re-establishing the International Programs Committee on campus
- Outreach to faculty and departments to provide communication links and resources

As was evident in the Self-Study Report, Albani University was recognized nationally for its efforts. In 2012, Albani University was given a national award for its internationalization work.
More specifically, the university’s accomplishments in establishing collaboration between the Global Studies Program on campus and the GCC were recognized. This campus partnership serves to provide an example to other institutions on how to best establish a dialogue and collaboration across a campus community regarding internationalization. The Self-Study Report also noted the need for increasing the GCC’s visibility on campus to further promote it and make it more recognizable to the campus community.

The Self-Study Report also noted efforts to promote discipline-specific study abroad programs. The GCC staff pointed out its efforts to collaborate and communicate with departments to design a list of providers that will fit academic standards and offer students intercultural experiences. It is clear from this document that some challenges exist to institute this initiative fully, as some faculty and departments have displayed resistance. Based on this finding, the GCC recognizes that in some departments they have had a minimal impact on curricular integration.

The researcher found evidence of the GCC initiating conversations with other departments on campus to further understand student’s learning experiences while they participate in international study abroad programs. For example, as noted previously, the Wesleyan Intercultural Competence Scale (WICS) measurement was utilized during a study abroad semester to measure students’ intercultural development. The evaluation results of the summer semester are planned to be discussed with members of the Office of Academic Affairs.

The reemergence of the International Programs Committee on campus is strong evidence of “…regular and consistent faculty dialogue…” (Morris, 2009, p. 145) found in Proposition II. Although this committee did exist before the GCC was developed in 2007, it was only with support from the Provost that it was reactivated fully. The Dean and Provost are responsible for
appointing individuals on the committee, but some invested faculty members have also volunteered. The Self-Study Report identified a program check process that involves an annual review cycle of programs determined to meet established academic standards. Once the list of approved programs is determined by academic departments it is sent to be voted on by the Committee, endorsed, posted to the GCC website, and then scheduled to be presented at a study abroad fair. Students may also make a petition for a study abroad program not on an approved list. Committee members make decisions based on a thorough review of the program details. Since study abroad program decisions have become centralized at Albani University, the GCC has also been able to oversee program functions. For example, working with the Director of Emergency Management Safety, the Office of Academic Affairs, and the Office of the General Counsel, GCC staff members have ensured that a clear safety protocol is in place for study abroad programs.

The researcher found, based on the Peer Review Report, that the International Programs Committee played a significant role in preparing for the site visit from the external evaluation provider. The external evaluation provider’s standards of good practice in regards to education abroad were reviewed and discussed by the committee. The evaluators found evidence of conversations and sharing of the Self-Study Report as well. They found that institutional support for study abroad was strong and that their progress with developing international programs was “amazing” in a short span of time. The evaluators noted:

There are good direct communication channels between all levels of administration on the subject of international education. All who met with the review team were open and direct with their questions, answers and cross-referencing of information (referring to each other in their responses). A good level of awareness on all aspects of the functions of…[the GCC]…and other key aspects of study abroad was clearly present. (Peer Review Report, 2013, p. 3)

Observation Results
“...walking advertisements...” A main theme that emerged based on the observations was the importance of support for faculty during the internationalization process through “…regular and consistent…dialogue…” (Morris, 2009, p. 145). Although sensemaking incorporates action, Ancona (2012) asserted that an individual might be better suited to make small changes first. The researcher found that sharing international program experiences with the campus community helped demonstrate to students how they might fulfill their Revised Core Curriculum proficiencies, specifically diversity or civic-engagement as demonstrated with a faculty-led program in Ecuador discussed during the second meeting that was observed. One committee member mentioned students could become “walking advertisements” on campus for how courses or activities might fulfill certain standards. Furthermore, hiring of a part-time English Language Learner (ELL) specialist on campus was another decision that was observed. The ELL specialist is intended to support non-English speaking students, as well as faculty and staff who need to reach them in order to improve their academic experiences. This decision was rooted from the concerns that were reported to the GCC about faculty not being able to effectively reach students whose first language is not English. As a result of multiple conversations between faculty members, the GCC staff, as well as senior administrators a part-time ELL position was eventually secured. Although evidence of additional support to operationalize internationalization may be necessary based on an analysis of the observation, focus group and interview data, plausible stories of Albani University’s progress including faculty-led programs, a ELL specialist, and international student experiences will help evoke “Actions…lead[ing] to new actions undertaken…” on campus (Weick, 2005, p. 416).

Moreover, the Committee Chair assured that information about risk management was collected, and strongly encouraged faculty members leading student trips to use a particular
travel insurance company. The faculty committee member from the Political Science Department who led the trip to Ecuador mentioned that this specific insurance company was extremely useful, and now knows why the Chair highly recommended it after some of his student’s experienced tribulations, such as travel sickness, both in Ecuador and when they returned to the United States. The dialogue between the faculty member and the Committee Chair demonstrates commitment to operationalizing the internationalization initiative and acquiring knowledge of international practices (Coryell, et al., 2012). The Political Science Department faculty member also demonstrated his commitment during the observation to developing an international program that not only provides intercultural experiences to students, but also keeps them safe.

Weick et al. (2005) pointed out that sensemaking is grounded in communication. Ensuring that communication is streamlined across the campus community was a major point when discussing new initiatives and programs. For instance, the committee’s achievement in approving a timeline for faculty engaged in the program development process was a success because it demanded the Committee members “…to consider, review, and recommend plans, policies and programs relating to education abroad…” as noted on the International Program Committee’s Responsibilities and Guiding Principles document. However, attaining sensemaking can mean uncertainty, as it involves “…looking for a unifying order even if we are not sure if one exists” (Ancona, 2012, p. 5). Weick’s (1995) fifth property, ongoing sensemaking, illustrates that when individuals make sense of a situation the process neither begins nor ends. Based on the discussion observed on the re-approval process, it appears this decision will require additional time for the committee members to find a solution that will appease both administrators and faculty. Once programs are developed, ensuring they face
limited competition with other popular programs on campus is important for faculty to know as well when they promote a program. That may mean keeping prices as low as possible or comparable to other programs offered during similar times of the year is imperative. In addition, the responsibility of faculty members promoting their programs across the campus was clear. Gaining financial support through partners and resource centers on campus, such as the GCC, appears to be pertinent for success. However, faculty members have a duty to advocate for their programs on campus and collaborate with the GCC administration to develop their international program. Guidance supplied by the GCC administration can also assist them in promoting a program that aligns with the university mission.

**Focus Group and Interview Findings**

Ancona (2012) asserted that “sensemaking calls for courage” because it demands an individual to make conflicting situations in an environment comprehensible; however, “illuminating the change is often a lonely and unpopular task” (p. 4) and demands a strong leader to facilitate the change efficiently. The interview with Gordon was specifically conducted to gather detailed information about the dialogue and decision-making that GCC staff and administrators have engaged in to operationalize their internationalization initiative. It was found that decision-making processes used to implement internationalization at Albani University are either directed through the GCC Dean or the International Programs Committee on campus. Gordon acknowledged that he predominately assumes ownership of the internationalization initiatives at Albani University. Anyone on campus who develops a new initiative, or implements a short-term program will go through the GCC. Gordon noted:

> Having some designated center gives it that visibility that didn’t exist before…over time it’s taken awhile for that to take place, but now, I think people really know us and they look to us…that’s been a good development…there is now consciousness in the college.
As Morris (2009) pointed out, developing a structure that incorporates streamlining, consistent, and regular communication is pertinent in order to successfully implement internationalization. The communication and dialogue theme was largely represented in the interview and focus group data. Gordon explained in the interview that the International Programs Committee was “…resurrect[ed] and…[decisions are not]…just something I say, but it really becomes policy that’s approved by a group of individuals who…care and come together and work on” internationalization. He discussed some concerns that were raised regarding a study abroad program that involves traveling on a boat around the world. He stated that this program has created some tension on campus. He shared that there were some individuals who believed it was a true study abroad experience, while others, such as the GCC staff, did not. Gordon stated:

This [program was brought] up to the committee and every time it was always about petition and the committee would weight the merits of the individual going and what he or she intended to study and do…finally, the committee said, you know, we don't want to do any more of these petitions. Either we approve this program or we don't. Let's just cut bait…and move on here. And so they ultimately voted not to approve the program and then some students who applied after…[stated]...‘Well, why won't you let me go?’ I said, well, the committee decided and it's a committee of all the faculty [and] administrators so…it wasn't an individual decision, it was a group decision. And I have certainly been able to use that to defend the decision many times …So this has actually become a good way to make sometimes some hard decisions that are not always popular…you have the backing of the committee…if the committee wants to reverse that decision, that's going to be up to them.

Sensemaking is “continuously looking for and providing evidence…all while ‘playing the game’” (Ancona, 2012, p. 5). Utilizing the International Programs Committee is one example of how Gordon has made sense of the operationalization of internationalization on the Albani University campus. First, Gordon shared during the interview that in previous locations where he worked a Committee existed, and it has assisted in the decision-making process. Furthermore, Gordon assured he has utilized the multiple voices on the Committee that are
invested in the internationalization initiative to implement unpopular decisions. Gordon’s actions represent the second property in sensemaking, which is retrospection (Weick, 1995). Retrospection involves making sense of an uncertain environment through the use of a “...‘meaningful lived experience,’[and]...to capture the reality that people can know what they are doing only after they have done it” (Weick, 1995, p. 24).

Ancona (2012) and Choo (2002) both noted that sensemaking involves using belief to enact action. A way that the GCC staff and administrators make decisions at Albani University is through inter-departmental networks. Gordon described that he meets with the GCC staff every week, and then the Assistant Dean every two weeks. He noted:

We get a lot done that way in terms of the various things that are involved in the office and...we spend a lot of time with one another just talking things out and meeting about things...[to]...make sure things are going to work well.

Ancona (2012) noted that a group of individuals that ask, “...‘what’s going on out there,’ can lead to “...coordinated action...” (p. 6). The sensemaking process allows for the GCC staff to make decisions together about how they must align their programs with Albani University’s strategic plan and operationalize the internationalization initiative on their campus.

Aside from meeting frequently with GCC staff members, Gordon also conferences with the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, during which they ensure their agendas are aligning with one another’s as well as with the campus’s 2011-2015 Strategic Plan. Gordon posited that engaging in communication is critical. He stated that this is:

Probably the most important thing you can do on a college campus...[it’s]...really navigating all the different parties and offices and people that you need to work with and doing that in a way that, ultimately, can be productive and successful...You have to learn that...over time...the most important thing...[is this]...skill...[which]...you acquire...with experience.
In order to make sense of an uncertain environment, organizing equivocality, or ambiguity found within an organization through communication is necessary (Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2005). Changes that are made to existing programs at Albani University in order to introduce international programs are facilitated through its communication networks. The introduction of the Revised Core Curriculum might have impacted the GCC’s achievements in their study abroad goals. Gordon noted it “might actually discourage studying abroad or bring about a decline in study abroad enrollment.” Students on campus have reported that it “may be difficult for them…in certain majors or because of…core curriculum requirements that they have to do for their degree…” As a result of the concerns noted, Gordon expressed that he has been collaborating with the Core Curriculum Committee on campus to identify opportunities for students to select study abroad options that will allow them to meet major requirements as well as the required proficiencies. Although the Revised Core Curriculum is “more flexible…[it is]…less clear,” Gordon pointed out:

[It will take a] couple of years to work out, until we have enough experience with the new core and how study abroad will fit in well with that…So it’s [also] going to take awhile for the students to figure all that out and for us too working with that.

In order for internationalization to be successful, “develop[ing] and acquir[ing] intercommunication skills” will be essential throughout the process (Coryell, 2012, p. 90-91).

Developing an internationalization plan involves committed members from faculty, administration, and other critical partners (Morris, 2009). Campus community engagement was another theme that was supported by the interview data. Gordon noted that the GCC is currently the main functional unit on campus that leads all international initiatives, although there are a few select individuals in the Admissions Office who play a role in international student recruitment. Furthermore, the International Programs Committee, invested faculty and staff
members, as well as student organizations and clubs are all responsible for internationalizing Albani University. However, Gordon’s interview revealed that internationalization has also been largely developed on campus through faculty initiatives. Gordon pointed out:

> We’re trying to internationalize more faculty by giving them grants to do summer things abroad so that they can come back…incorporate that into a course, or a new course…[and] more and more, we’re trying to put more faculty into that discussion…[however]…it’s a slow process.

Chaos is the impetus for sensemaking, which can lead to individuals selecting cues from their environment about how to clarify the complex situation in front of them (Weick et al., 2005). Extracting cues is the sixth property in sensemaking and allows individuals to “...develop a larger sense of what may be occuring…” (Weick, 1995, p. 50). Weick et al. (2005) asserted, “Sensemaking is not about truth and getting it right…it is about continued redrafting of an emerging story…”, which illustrates more value is rooted more in “…plausibility…than accuracy” (p. 415); plausibility represents the seventh property of Weick’s (1995) theory.

When Gordon was hired in 2007 there were no faculty-led programs, but since then, each year four or five run. This is a “nice new development…[because]…students here love things that are faculty offered and they really flock to them,” he stated. Gordon did mention that there have been challenges with implementing these programs. For instance, the staff to support the development of these programs just is not available. Gordon mentioned, “We could have a full time person…if we had the money…they’d have plenty to do.” He also stated:

> If you could dedicate more resources to it, you’d have many more programs…I think [there aren’t more programs] because we’re not able to provide a lot of the logistical support…or [the] faculty aren’t aware of a lot of the work behind it…[faculty] have actually backed out because we don’t give them the logistical support. Not that we don’t want to, we just can’t. So that discourages some of them from going ahead with what could be a really good…short term program…we’re seeing only about 50%...between those who follow through all the way and then those who back out and say well I don’t want to do that much work, it’s too much.
Similar to the interview findings, the focus group also revealed that many international program ideas do not come to fruition at Albani University due to its limited resources. This is reinforced by Green (2003) and Hser (2005) who both noted some barriers to successfully implementing internationalization can be related to funding and limited resources.

**Findings for Research Question 3**

**Document Review**

**Theme Six: Shared Goals.** Internationalization is achieved through a common understanding (Morris, 2009). The sixth theme relates to research question three and Proposition III, and emerged from the data analysis. Research question three was designed to understand how GCC staff and administrators have sought to achieve the institution's internationalization initiative throughout the campus community. The GCC Dean reported that there is now “… a young cohort of faculty…[that] are much more open [to internationalization]…So they're much more easy to work with. We don't have to convert them…” Faculty members that support international skills is an example of a shared goal that exists between the GCC and Albani University in regards to implementing internationalization. Shared goals were also found within the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs Letter, which was a response to the Dean’s 2008 Report. The GCC and Albani University’s missions connect and aim to alter the campus culture and the academics. It was clear, after reading the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs letter, that the efforts to enhance internationalization are shared between the senior administration and the GCC Dean. Specifically, the letter noted that the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Executive Vice President were delighted to endorse all 11 recommendations presented by the GCC Dean in 2008.
The mere reemergence and existence of the International Programs Committee on campus is another example illustrating that shared goals are valued during the internationalization process. Both administrators and faculty from various departments across campus participate in this committee and make decisions about policies as well as programs related to international education. Some of their responsibilities that require a shared vision include:

- Administering and advising GCC procedures and policies
- Reviewing and approving new faculty-led study-abroad program initiatives
- Reviewing and approving any petitions for education abroad programs from students

The ultimate goals for education abroad programs, as outlined in the International Programs Committee Responsibilities and Guiding Principles document, noted commitment to approving programs and policies for international studies. According to this document the programs approved by the committee are intended to maximize students’ intercultural experiences and language learning when they are immersed or exposed to diverse cultures.

The work toward collaboratively developing approved study abroad programs started with the GCC Dean and the School of Business in 2007-2008. A Global Business Education Committee was developed and programs that were congruent with four majors in this department were established. Decisions related to selecting international programs were made based on geographic location (integrating countries outside of Europe) and on resources. Considerations were made based on if the program provided diverse offerings, facilitation of direct enrollment, island programs, or field-based learning. Other departments across the larger campus community such as Biology, Foreign Language, Health-Policy Management, Psychology, Women’s Studies, Education (Elementary/Special) have also developed discipline-specific programs with the GCC. The Global Studies Department has also collaborated with the GCC,
though the education abroad component was already embedded as a program requirement. Since
the GCC staff began collaborating with departments, other draft lists have been developed with
additional departments on campus including Mathematics, Biochemistry and Chemistry, and art
studies (Music, Theater, Dance and Film). The Self-Study Report noted these examples of
collaboration across the larger campus community as first steps toward attaining shared goals.

Additional evidence of shared goals was found in the Revised Core Curriculum
requirements related to diversity and civic-engagement proficiencies and are discussed in
the Self-Study Report. Both of these proficiencies connect closely with education abroad
and intercultural learning goals. This has become even more apparent as students seek to
select courses and programs that will meet the diversity and civic-engagement
proficiencies mandated in the Revised Core Curriculum requirements. It was also
evident from the Self-Study and Peer Review Reports that GCC staff members are highly
knowledgeable about both the policies and the program providers, which has resulted in
the management of study abroad programs that will fulfill Revised Core proficiencies.

Student academic goals are closely aligned with their education endeavors abroad, and
this is overseen by GCC staff members. For example, the Peer Review Report highlighted
excellent advising practices that ensured students maintained alignment between their home and
study abroad experiences in terms of academic goals. Courses that students enroll in abroad
must be reviewed and approved by GCC staff. Course selections directly reflect a student’s
individual core courses of study, minor or major, as noted on their transcript. Although students
are encouraged to take ownership of their selections, there are “system checks” that are utilized
to ensure all course selections are appropriate and enhance the student learning experience.
**Theme Seven: Monitoring.** The final theme connects to the third research question and proposition and emphasizes that ensuring monitoring program processes should be a high priority (Knight, 2001) and will assist with implementing internationalization. After a thorough investigation of the documents, it is clear that monitoring is a practice that is highly regarded at Albani University. The GCC Dean asserted, “…You have to be a watch dog in a way in a sense you have to…tell people …that’s really not in …the best interests of the School of Business or…our students…” Evidence of both external and internal monitoring is apparent and has played a role in how GCC staff and administrators have sought to achieve the institution’s internationalization initiative.

Beginning with the Dean’s 2008 Report, the student enrollment statistics for study abroad in 2004, which included 87 students, was utilized to frame the GCC’s future goal of attaining a 30% participation rate, or 293 students. Study abroad rates at peer institutions were collected and used by the Dean to set participation goals at Albani University. Green’s (2003) point that enthusiastic leaders make efforts to “…identify and align resources, [and] remove barriers…” (p. 18) characterizes the Dean’s actions. The Dean utilized external resources, such as NAFSA and the Forum on Education Abroad, to understand the barriers that may exist for students who wish to study overseas and gain intercultural experiences. As a result, attempts have been made at Albani University to reduce such barriers. For example, new policies, such as the portability of financial aid and the new tuition policy, have led to an increase in study abroad applications since 2007.

Evidence of monitoring is also visible in the GCC office; the GCC 2013-2014 Statistics Report is a publication available to all visitors. This document presents a detailed look at the study abroad applications and international student enrollments. Study abroad locations were
listed and the number of students who studied were broken down by country. The largest number of students attended programs in Italy (94), England (54), Denmark (29), Ireland (28), and Spain (22) in the spring, fall, and yearly programs. The School of Business had 108 student participants, the School of Professional Studies had 46, and the School of Arts and Sciences had 155 students who traveled overseas during the 2013-2014 school year. It is clear from this document that most students from Albani travel to Europe to gain international experiences, and few travel to Africa, Asia, or Latin America according to the statistical reports reviewed. This fact may suggest students who participate in study abroad have limited intercultural experiences with individuals who live outside of Europe.

The Peer Review Report and external evaluator letter are two additional examples of the monitoring that has taken place to track progress with internationalization. Both the Self-Study and Peer Review Reports were conducted to investigate the mechanisms utilized to track quality assurance. The Peer Review Report found their efforts to be compliant with “Standards of Good Practice,” which is also highlighted in the External Evaluation Provider’s CEO and President letter to the GCC Dean in October 2013. The GCC’s implementation of internationalization were highly regarded and recognized for operating in line with their evaluation standards.

Substantial evidence of closely tracking Albani University’s safety and crisis management of the study abroad and faculty-led short-term programs (both credit and non-credit) by GCC staff was evident as well. The Self-Study Report contained a list of the study abroad program review schedules since 2007. On average, a GCC staff member or someone from the larger campus community in varying academic departments conducted program reviews two to six times per year. Eight departments were involved in this process at least once, including the Business, Biology, Modern Language, Education, Theology and the
Elementary/Special Education Departments. The researcher found that since 2007, GCC staff completed 22 of the 30 reviews. The last review conducted by a faculty member from the larger campus community was in October 2012.

Feedback from student evaluations were found in the Self-Study Report, although only one intercultural learning assessment was discovered, the Wesleyan Intercultural Competence Scale (WICS). A study abroad program evaluation is required by the GCC administration each year and includes four questions that measure intercultural learning. A background questionnaire was also used to monitor enrollment demographics, and asked two questions related to intercultural experiences. The WICS is a relatively new tool and has also been used by GCC staff to measure student learning two times while students are abroad. However, this evaluation tool is currently not mandatory. The GCC staff reported that a very small sample completed this assessment (20% of the 171 student study abroad participants), but it has provided some insight into intercultural learning. For example, the WICS intercultural assessment identifies how a student may have reacted when a local person does not understand what they say in their native language. The results suggest the student may have practiced adaptation, acceptance, integration, denial, or minimization in an intercultural situation. The level of effectiveness of this tool was not clear in the documents reviewed. However, GCC staff members were encouraged in the Peer Review Report to continue to use the WICS in order to monitor the levels of student learning and attainment of intercultural skills prior to, during, and after studying abroad.

**Observation Results**

‘…getting the message out…’ There is more to the process than simply developing an international program. Effective leaders “…engage others in their organizations in figuring out
how to play the game” (Ancona, 2012, p. 5). The Committee Chair reiterated the significance of promoting international programs several times during the second International Programs Committee meeting attended by the researcher. Aside from supporting the Italian film event financially, the Chair stressed the importance of ‘getting the message out’ to the larger campus community. Even after supporting the faculty member proposing the England faculty-led program with her revised budget, and a vote leading to it being approved, the Chair still reiterated the significance of faculty taking responsibility for promoting their programs. Furthermore, when asked about an orientation scheduled for the England program, it was not clear whether or not one had yet been planned, but the Chair mentioned that such orientations are standard practice for all faculty-led programs.

From the observations, it was also clear that there is another way in which Albani University has sought to achieve internationalization throughout the campus community. During the first observation, a committee member shared that a Chinese student is scheduled to manage a blog from the Admissions Office to attract more international students that speak Chinese. Currently, the percentage of Chinese speaking students is very low at the campus but this could serve as a means to increase recruitment, and ensure this student population is properly acculturated into the campus community.

**Focus Group and Interview Findings**

Making connections between the internationalization initiative and a post-secondary institution’s strategic goals is important (Morris, 2009). Both the focus group and interview shed light on how internationalization has been implemented at Albani University in accordance to the 2011-2015 Strategic Plan. The evidence discovered represents the communication and dialogue theme, and illustrates how GCC staff members have utilized the strategic plan to achieve the
institution’s internationalization initiative throughout the campus community. The International Programs Committee serves as a significant way that internationalization is implemented across the campus community. This was consistent in the document review, observations, interview, and focus group findings. Aside from the role of the International Programs Committee, the researcher found in the interview with Gordon that internationalization is implemented through, “piecemeal [but one way is by] making study abroad more accessible [to all students],” as noted by Gordon.

Sensemaking involves engaging others to install order (Ancona, 2012; Weick et al., 2005). This is a pertinent step to achieve the institution’s initiative to implement internationalization throughout the campus community. The shared goals theme revealed by the focus group and interview data also confirms this point. The process of engaging faculty in achieving the GCC’s internationalization goals has been gradual. In sensemaking, a major component is identifying uncertain events, such as the implementation of internationalization, to make the process comprehensible (Weick et al., 2005) to constituents on campus who might be learning about the process. Identity construction, the first property in sensemaking, is developed through “…the process of interaction…[and it is] a core preoccupation…” (Weick, 1995, p. 20). Gordon shared that GCC staff members have attempted:

To develop department specific programs...So that's helped in some way but I don't know if it's changed a lot of the faculty's thinking or understanding of why we've done that...some get it; probably half don't...[we are] trying to encourage [them] with...faculty seminars abroad in the summer. We don't have much money for that but we've been able to send roughly two people every year. So that's gradual too. We're [also] seeing more faculty incorporating international components into the core of their classes.

One example noted in the interview, was that a School of Business faculty member was encouraged to visit China and Japan in order to design an international marketing course, which
Gordon stated was a “perfect fit.” Although this process cost a lot of money, it was possible; however, Gordon stated this will be a “10 year project” to continue to open it up to more faculty members on campus. In order to implement internationalization at Albani University utilizing the resources at hand, the GCC Dean, “…act[ed] effectively simply by making sense of circumstances in ways that appear to move toward general long-term goals” (Weick, 2005, p. 415). Evidence of the GCC Dean’s effective actions were determined from the fact he has supported faculty travel and encouraged faculty-led programs, which are popular amongst Albani students.

Gordon has noticed that there are more faculty members being hired with international knowledge from study abroad or from their personal travel experiences. He stated:

We have a young cohort of faculty now who are much more open…So they're much more easy to work with. We don't have to convert them, they already say well how come we can't do that. They already believe in it. So the issue then becomes, you know, trying to help them do the kind of things they want to do…I like to use the phrase world college and [I hope]…to try to gradually make [Albani University] more and more a world college. So…our students are getting that kind of exposure and the faculty [are] as well…That takes decades probably to have that fully implemented…Whereas now…we're not quite there for sure. But we're starting, we're on a good start.

Overall, it was consistently found in the data collected that the GCC staff tries to work consistently with almost all departments across the campus to implement internationalization, whether it is to develop courses or whether it is to deal with international student issues. Kevin stated during the focus group that support quality for international students across the campus can be questionable and that this is largely due to the fact that:

No one on this campus is required to do any kind of diversity training…there’s nothing done to…prepare people for working with these groups…[although] everyone’s involved; it’s just a matter of how well they are involved, and how open to it they actually are.
After analyzing the documents, focus group, and interview data, it is apparent that the Albani University campus community is not equitably prepared to embrace diverse cultures.

In sensemaking, individuals must identify environmental cues, an essential step before integrating new information (Weick, 1995). Identifying factors in the environment that may require more attention relates to the monitoring theme, and connects to Proposition III; monitoring internationalization program processes will assist in achieving internationalization on a campus. A key finding in the focus group was that internationalization at Albani University is imposed on its constituents, rather than emerging from the ground up. As a result, GCC staff and their administrator have not fully achieved the institution’s internationalization initiative across the campus community. Although this is a challenge, the focus group participants shared that there are other ways that internationalization is achieved at Albani University. For instance, in regard to foreign student immersion, student orientations and mentorship programs are offered. The GCC staff members have also played a role in managing intercultural relations on campus by playing a part in diffusing intercultural conflicts in campus housing between international and domestic students.

In response to intercultural tensions that have emerged, particularly in housing arrangements, James reported, “I’ve presented at the…Dean and Director’s meeting a couple of times to do some intra-cultural training and…some explanations of…behaviors that some students from certain cultures might have and trying to put that into more context.” Moreover, to encourage intercultural relations, the GCC staff has continued to collaborate with residential life. Student housing applications now ask students whether or not they would be interested in rooming with an international student. As a result, out of one thousand students who applied for housing, there were 140 students who stated they would be interested in rooming with an
international student; the Spring 2014 Statistics document reported there were 80 international students enrolled at Albani University. This finding suggests that students are beginning to enter the first stage in intercultural competence, as described by Deardorff (2006), which begins with attitude and interest in learning about other cultures.

Consistent with comments made in the interview, the international students at Albani University face challenges. The focus group revealed that international students on campus tend to stick to themselves and they “don’t want to live with someone who’s different than them.” Kevin reiterated:

I think it is harder for international students to make other friends outside of going through the Board of Multi-cultural Student Affairs…a lot of…international students…choose to live in single…[housing] later…they are more independent than…other students on campus… the international students that come in as athletes are going to be within that community. And…nurtured…a lot of…students identify… with…whoever is like them.

The focus group participants agreed that specific and exclusive groups are developed on campus among domestic students, international students, and the athletes, which they noted as one reason why Albani University has pushed its diversity initiative in the 2011-2015 Strategic Plan. Further, James noted that although this initiative is pushed, the campus climate is not welcoming and it is “unprepared to…handle the diversity [they call for]…[and] there are few resources for these students…The kind of support…that they need…most people on campus don’t know how to even begin supporting these populations.”

A key discovery from the focus group was that internationalization is experienced on campus by faculty in varying ways. In addition to the evolving student population, only some faculty members are changing. Mary pointed out that a majority of the faculty on campus are over the age of 60 and may have more traditional perspectives than newer faculty classes. Kevin stated:
Just...[as]... there aren’t as many diverse students; there aren’t as many diverse staff members... looking at the different offices on campus and the different departments... there’s not a lot of internationalization or diversity... we’re really lacking in racial and ethnic diversity... across the population. And I think that is a... big factor... in tolerance. And then... there are definitely people who try to change the perceptions... [such as through a] a Black Studies program... [a]... Global Studies program and... [a] Women’s Studies... program. But unless students are studying those subjects, they’re not getting an interest in learning about those other groups. [These could be]... ways for people... to fulfill their diversity proficiency without stepping outside of their comfort zone with diversity.

It was also found that members of the Albani University campus who contribute to internationalization are key personnel in various departments across the campus. Major players include the GCC office, Academic Affairs, the Chief Diversity Officer, and a Dean for Multicultural Affairs. A poignant finding in the focus group was that although some individuals promote intercultural awareness on campus, some have shown resistance. As a result, others are wary and don't want to face professional risk and implement a new initiative. James stated:

... a lot of people either aren't empowered to do as much as they could or they don’t feel that it’s worth the professional risk... certainly if they’re on the staff side and they don’t have tenure... then it’s a risk... to... stick your neck out and make noise about something you perceive as unjust or unfair... or even just try to implement a new program.

Internationalization initiatives require the accountability of individuals tasked with facilitating the process (Morris, 2009). The GCC staff members are tasked with reviewing programs and making judgments about their quality and offerings to the students. Faculty members and deans across the campus also reach out to GCC staff and request approval for particular programs. However, sometimes the requests are “not a very good thing as in fitting with the academic mission of the college neither is it sustainable. If you can answer yes to both those questions, then don’t do it.” Gordon continued,

You have to be a watch dog in a way in a sense you have to... tell people ... that’s really not in... the best interests of the School of Business or... our students and so it’s not going... to lead to anything really productive or fruitful.
In order for internationalization efforts to be credible, valuable, and ultimately sustained, monitoring should be a top priority (Knight, 2001).

A Summary Analysis of the Document Review

The documents reviewed in Chapter 4 have provided some insight into all three propositions through the themes that emerged. Seven themes connected directly with the propositions, and all have a relationship to the three guiding research questions in this descriptive case study. Although much insight was gained with respect to research questions one and three through the document review, the same cannot be said for research question two. From the document review it appears that the decision-making and dialogue at the GCC and Albani University has been facilitated solely through the GCC. For example, when the GCC was developed in 2007, the GCC Dean gained support from the Provost to reestablish the International Programs Committee to enhance dialogue about internationalization. Furthermore, the Dean outlined additional ways to achieve internationalization in his 2008 Report, which included promoting discussions between the GCC and academic departments, outreach to faculty, and providing additional resources.

All academic departments play a role in internationalizing curricula at the post-secondary level (Pears, 2010). The Peer Review Report highlighted the excellent progress that the GCC has made in establishing communication links across the larger campus community since 2007, particularly by establishing various networks. However, it appears based on the Self-Study Report that the GCC staff and Dean are realistic about challenges that still exist. Integrating new curricula and determining study abroad provisions through collaboration with other academic departments on campus will take time. The Self-Study Report revealed that not all faculty members and departments have accepted a curricular integration model that requires students to
select only approved study abroad programs. The GCC staff reported in the Self-Study Report the importance of, “…doing what is possible at any one time while keeping in view the long-range goal of academic integration” (Self Study Report, 2013, p. 9).

A summary analysis of observation results from two International Programs Committee meetings is presented in the next section. Data are interpreted in terms of research question two and the study’s theoretical framework. The observation data analysis provided deeper insight into the dialogue and decision-making that faculty, staff, and administrators at Albani University have engaged in as they make sense of operationalizing the internationalization initiative.

**A Summary Analysis of the Observation Results**

**Faculty and Staff Perspective**

After attending the International Programs Committee meetings, it was evident that this functional unit on campus plays an intricate role in streamlining communication about internationalization to faculty members, administrators, and the GCC staff. According to the International Programs Committee Responsibilities and Guiding Principles document, members are charged with advising and approving new faculty-led programs abroad. The data obtained from the observations of two International Programs Committee meetings provide linkages to some tenets found in the sensemaking theory (Weick, et al., 2005). Weick, et al. (2005) pointed out that sensemaking can be described as a “…way station on the road to [a] consensually constructed, coordinated system of action…” (p. 409). The “…circumstances are ‘turned into a situation that is comprehended explicitly in words and that serves as a springboard to action’…” (Weick, et al., 2005, p. 409). Dialogue between the administrators, faculty, and staff observed at the International Programs Committee meetings represented some aspects of the sensemaking process presented by Weick, et al. (2005).
During the two observations, one faculty member, Deborah, who teaches in the English department, dialogued with the committee members which eventually led to a decision to institute a new faculty-led program. By attending the meetings her goal was to propose a new faculty-led program that would take place for two weeks on campus and one week in England during their May semester. Once reviewed by the committee and voted on, this faculty-led program would then be offered to students on campus. However, the decision to approve this program did not occur after one meeting. The dialogue observed to review and approve this program represents what Weick, et al. (2005) refers to as the organizational phase, which follows with “…reading, writing, conversing, and editing…[which are] crucial actions that serve…” to achieve sensemaking (p. 409). The first observed meeting illustrates this point. Some committee members expressed their concerns with regard to the price of this program, as it appeared too high when compared to other programs that are run similarly. For example, the Greece program includes two weeks abroad while this program to England would only include one week. Committee members pointed out that the Greece program is very popular on campus, and stated that this new program in England might not be sustainable if the price was too high.

A discussion regarding possibly eliminating some activities offered during the trip was also discussed among the committee members as a way to lower costs, therefore making the program more attractive to students. It was clear that this faculty member (Deborah) wanted to retain some activity selection autonomy, as the activities connected directly with the course themes. Another suggestion made by a committee member was to make the price lower first while it is in its trial run as a new program offering, and then raise it when it is advertised again in the future. As a result of limited time and the number of voting members present during the
first observation, an official vote to approve this faculty-led program was held off until the next meeting.

Weick et al. (2005) posited that sensemaking could also be achieved through action that may at first appear insignificant; “Small structures and short moments can have large consequences” (p. 410). During the next meeting, the faculty member seeking to implement the new faculty-led program to England visited the committee once again. This time she arrived with a revised budget plan. This faculty member identified new savings in the areas of travel costs in country; accommodation rates and tips were also readjusted. Other examples of the dialogue and decision-making of staff and faculty committee members during this observation involved upcoming international programs on campus. Each of the following events may also be viewed as a small event, or decision that had a large impact in internationalizing the campus community. These programs included a viewing event of an Italian film that was presented at the Rome Film Festival and Paris Human Rights Film Festival. The faculty member organizing this event noted he would spread the message of the event to both the Albani University campus community, as well as the surrounding post-secondary institutions locally. The specific vehicle used to communicate the Italian film event to the campus community was not clear from the observation. It was clear that the financial support needed to implement the program was supplied by the GCC, since this committee member thanked the GCC Dean for his support.

The observations of a committee member who teaches in the Political Science Department, Brian, provided an example of connecting a course to the internationalization mission at Albani University. The process of connecting course requirements to the mission at Albani University and the Revised Curriculum requirements relates to the labeling process in the sensemaking theory (Weick, et al., 2005). He described his process in developing a course that
incorporates international travel, and requires students to demonstrate proficiencies linked to intercultural understanding. This committee member presented the result of a recent trip to Ecuador with students who were taking his Global Service Learning course. This course was made possible through grant funding provided by an external partner. This external partner has supplied international program grants to Albani University since 2010-2011 in order to provide opportunities for students to fulfill both the diversity and civic-engagement proficiencies mandated in the Revised Core Curriculum. This special topics course included collaboration with another faculty member on campus, who led a similar trip to Nicaragua. The committee member stated that his students were challenged and pushed out of their comfort zone, which ultimately led to them gaining intercultural experiences. He acknowledged that opting to get a special topics course approved was more effective, in regard to time, than trying to build a new course through the existing infrastructure on campus. Determining the student’s learning outcomes from their travel experiences and the course development processes can illustrate that “…noticing and bracketing…” has occurred; therefore, a more organized circumstance, or sensemaking, has occurred (Weick, et al., 2005, p. 411) and might also be applied in the future.

The presentation observed during the meeting demonstrated a few points where the presenter displayed retrospection (Weick, et al., 2005), the second property in sensemaking (Weick, 1995). Ancona (2012) noted “Sensemaking involves not only trying out new things but also trying to understand your impact on a system as you try to change it” (p. 11). Based on the second observation, committee members were engaged with this in-depth presentation because they asked several questions about the content shared. The presentation included a poster display and a video that showcased several images of students as they experienced a remote village in Ecuador. He also shared a thorough student report with the committee members that
documented their experiences, daily itinerary, and a course syllabus. The presenter noted the significance of collecting and sharing student experiences in order to learn from the details for future programming. This committee member identified how the course curricula and service-learning was achieved through the various activities that students participated in while they were in Ecuador. One Committee member asked about student preparation for international travel through the course curricula. The presenter pointed out that he believed students learned more by experiencing the trip with fewer preconceived notions about international travel and intercultural understanding. He did not require the students to read anything specific about the country prior to leaving. During the trip, and when appropriate or even necessary, the faculty/committee member mentioned that he provided all students with political and cultural information. Assigning a reading about Ecuador prior to leaving may result in students choosing not to read the material. He did offer a one and half hour orientation prior to leaving, which was found to be a common practice for faculty members leading a program overseas that covered the logistical details.

Sensemaking assists individuals in making complex situations into ones that can be understood (Ancona, 2012). One aspect of sensemaking involves “…connect[ing] the abstract with the concrete…” and considering an individuals’ insight into a particular situation based on cues (Weick, et al., 2005, p. 412). To illustrate this point further, during the second observation, the International Programs Committee Chair facilitated a closing discussion about the possible criteria needed to reapprove existing faculty-led programs. The dialogue demonstrated during this conversation links to Weick, et al. (2005) claim that sensemaking is “…social and systemic…” (p. 412); the fourth property in Weick’s (1995) theory is social sensemaking. Multiple discussions with the committee members during this meeting might play a role in
impacting individual understanding of the uncertain environment across the institution (Weick, et al., 2005), however, it is not entirely certain from this observation if that is the case at Albani University. Many committee members’ took part in this discussion demonstrating shared reasons why the re-approval process might need to be conducted. For instance, they agreed that if changes in the political, economic, or environmental climate in a host country were to arise that affected the safety of program participants, then it would need to be reapproved. In addition, if there were major changes in budget or accommodations, revisiting program details would be necessary. There was consensus about the lengthy process that faculty need to undergo for approval. One committee member noted that it takes great ownership from faculty to even begin and then follow through with the approval process. She mentioned that there is significant “bureaucratic hassle” to deal with and questioned why faculty members might need to undergo this process again when it was already approved by the committee. Another committee member mentioned that faculty members might be more willing to go through a re-approval process if they could learn from it or improve their existing program.

**Administrator Perspective**

Sensemaking “…requires that leaders have…the ability to deal with cognitive complexity, and the flexibility to go between ‘what is’…and the ‘what can be’ of visioning…[and] be able to engage others in…figuring [it] out…” (Ancona, 2012, p. 5).

Evidence collected from the second observation revealed that the Committee Chairperson has collaborated with other individuals to make sense of internationalization on the Albani University campus (Ancona, 2012). The Committee Chairperson was only present for the second meeting that was observed. He displayed a positive rapport with each committee member as they entered the room. Before the meeting began, he discussed upcoming
international programs scheduled with the members and encouraged them to communicate with the campus community about the events. He also referenced his role as a liaison to senior administrators on campus multiple times during the meeting. Examples include sending the results of International Program Committee votes to various offices, as well as gaining senior administrator approval for a faculty-led short-term international program timetable that was previously developed by its members to provide faculty with guidance on how to develop and implement international programs. He also acknowledged that he tasked a GCC staff member to gather risk management information that could be useful for developing and sustaining future programs.

Weick, et al. (2005) presented two questions that are essential to sensemaking; ‘’what’s going on here?’…[and]…’what do I do next?’…” (p. 412). The data gained from the second observation illustrates that the cycle of action and talk (Weick, et al., 2005) between a faculty member and the Committee Chairperson has led to sensemaking. After Deborah, the faculty member seeking approval for the faculty-led program to England presented her new budget proposal and exited the second meeting, the Committee Chair led a vote on her program, but he did not participate. The committee approved this program, and the Chair noted he would share their decision with the Office of Academic Affairs as well as other senior administrators. Following the vote, the Chair discussed his close collaboration with this faculty member as she worked on getting her faculty-led program proposal prepared for review by the committee. The Chair shared that this faculty member worked extremely hard to get her program revised based on their suggestions from the previous meeting. He acknowledged that she was hesitant to keep pushing forward to get her program approved. However, the Chair mentioned that she was very thankful for his guidance and noted that she revealed that she might not have continued through
the process without his support. However, he stated that it would be up to her to promote the program across the larger campus community. The outcome of the collaboration between the Chair and Deborah reflect Weick, et al.’s (2005) assertion that “…talk…leads to a continual, iteratively developed, shared understanding…and the persuasive talk that leads to enlistment in action…” (p. 412).

Another item that engaged the committee in future decision-making regarding internationalization on the Albani University campus was a discussion regarding criterion for reapproving faculty-led programs. Although there was some evidence of a shared understanding of when a program would need re-approval, such as a travel warning or a significant change in budget, the committee seemed to express some discord about expecting faculty to engage in such a lengthy process twice. In response, the Chair pointed out that if a faculty member changed a few years after the program was approved, they may not be an appropriate choice, therefore, engaging in the re-approval process may be necessary. As result of these two points, a committee member suggested that a faculty-led program could be required to answer five questions every three years to ensure its critical components have remained consistent. Every five years, the program could go under the formal review process regardless of any changes that may have occurred. The conversations between the committee members connect with (Weick, et al.’s (2005) belief that individuals may consider relevancy, people involved, or traditions of an organization. Following this observation, no definitive decision was reached from this discussion, but the Chair noted plans to continue the decision making process, which represents the fifth property, ongoing sensemaking, of Weick’s (1995) theory. Weick (1995) noted, “Sensemaking never starts. The reason it never starts is that pure duration never stops. People are always in the middle of things…streams of problems, solutions, people, and choices flow
through organizations and converge and diverge independent of human intention” (p. 43-44). Therefore, further insight into the decision-making processes and dialogue engaged in at Albani University to make sense of implementing internationalization was necessary through an analysis of the focus group and interview findings.

**A Summary Analysis of the Focus Group and Interview Findings**

According to Green (2003), internationalization needs to be “consistently articulate[d]…[and] attention [needs to be] focused on the issue” (p. 17). The findings from the focus group and interview consistently referenced Albani University’s 2011-2015 Strategic Plan. The findings from the data analysis call for more diversity across its campus in order to prepare their students for intercultural understanding and the global economy. It was clear through the document analysis that GCC staff members have attempted to make sense of implementing internationalization by “coming up with plausible understandings…; testing them with others…via action;…then refining…or abandoning them in favor of new ones that better explain a shifting reality…” (Ancona, 2012, p. 5). A close examination of the data revealed a calling for GCC staff and the Dean to make sense of the ambiguity of implementing internationalization, related to further developing intercultural skills, constraints of limited resources, and the need for faculty development. Internationalization demands a substantial investment from all stakeholders, including human and financial resources on a campus (Knight, 2001), which were also found essential based on findings in this case study.

The results of the data analyses indicated that organizational decision-making across the institution to operationalize internationalization are centralized mainly in the GCC. However, financial and human resources appear to be scarce and this has impacted how internationalization programs have been implemented at Albani University. Regardless of some barriers, Gordon
identified decisions that he has made to send a few faculty members overseas to receive training that will enable them to make their courses more international. Moreover, from the data analyzed it is clear that both GCC staff and the Dean view this as a necessary component to implementing internationalization on their campus. Gordon asserted during the interview, “We don’t have enough faculty with that interest or aptitude…the students really are the ones who suffer at the end of the day.”

The data analysis also revealed that internationalization efforts are received inconsistently on the Albani University campus. This might be the result of some constituents in the campus community having limited knowledge about internationalization practices and the implementation process. As Proposition III states, internationalization can be achieved on a campus when knowledge of international practices is attained (Coryell, et al., 2012). Ancona (2012) pointed out that small decisions might better suit an individual who attempts to make sense of a disorderly environment, such as a post-secondary campus that has not yet achieved internationalization fully. Weick (1995) also noted that sensemaking involves individuals identifying environmental cues. It was vastly apparent from the data collected that the GCC Dean and staff members were concerned about international student assimilation at Albani University. One decision that was exhibited involved hiring a part-time ELL specialist, who could assist in addressing classroom and intercultural relation issues. Overall, it was found that further addressing this issue would be dependent on accessing additional resources to institute more robust support systems.

A Summary of Cross-Data Collection Findings

To conclude, a summary of the data collection methods and research questions was developed from the final phase of the data collection analysis process (see Table 4.1). Table 4.1
includes an overview of the research questions and corresponding findings from all of the data collected.

Table 4.1

*Overview of Research Question Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Research Questions (RQ)</th>
<th>Evidence From Data Collection Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document Review</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured Interview</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RQ3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**

X= Evidence indicating direct connections to the research questions:

RQ1- How do GCC staff and administrators at one post-secondary institution understand their campus’s internationalization initiative to prepare faculty and students to embrace different culture?

RQ2- What organizational decision-making processes and dialogue have GCC staff and administrators engaged in to operationalize the internationalization initiative?

RQ3- How have GCC staff and administrators sought to achieve the institution's internationalization initiative throughout the campus community?

O= No Evidence
Table 4.2 presents a collection summary to illustrate how the research questions in this case study are aligned with the data presented in Chapter 4. Themes that emerged support the three guiding research questions and propositions. The themes include (a) faculty development (b) student preparation (c) campus community engagement (d) ownership and commitment (e) communication and dialogue (f) shared goals (g) monitoring.

Table 4.2

Data Collection Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question (RQ)</th>
<th>Summary of Document Review</th>
<th>Summary of Observations</th>
<th>Summary of Semi-structured Interview</th>
<th>Summary of Focus Group</th>
<th>Emergent Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ownership and Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication and Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Communication and Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shared Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:

X = Evidence indicates the following research questions:
RQ1 - How GCC staff and administrators at one post-secondary institution understand their campus’s internationalization initiative to prepare faculty and students to embrace different culture.

RQ2 - Organizational decision-making processes and dialogue that GCC staff and administrators have engaged in to operationalize the internationalization initiative.

RQ3 - How GCC staff and administrators have sought to achieve the institution's internationalization initiative throughout the campus community.

O = No Evidence

A discussion of the two constructs that framed this case study will be presented in Chapter 5: the internationalization initiative as an organizational change and the decision-making processes of GCC staff and campus administrators. Interpretation of the findings as they relate to the theoretical framework and literature will be presented. The significance of the findings to practitioners, scholars and institutions will be discussed. Finally, recommendations for institutions seeking to implement internationalization initiatives will be detailed and suggested areas for future research will be proposed.
CHAPTER 5:
INTERPRETATIONS, SIGNIFICANCE OF RESEARCH, AND SUMMARY

The closing chapter is structured to connect the research findings to the literature review and theoretical framework discussions. The findings are organized around three themes: preparing faculty and students to embrace diverse cultures; decision-making to operationalize an internationalization initiative; achieving an internationalization initiative across a campus community. The following five sections are presented in Chapter 5: (a) the interpretation of the research findings, (b) the practitioner and scholarly significance of the research, (c) recommendations for educational practice, (d) suggestions for further research, and (e) concluding remarks.

The Interpretation of the Research Findings

The first section presented in Chapter 5 provides an overview of the interpretation of the research findings based on the data analysis discussed in the previous chapter. Overall, three findings emerged from the data analysis:

1. Students and faculty across the campus community are not yet fully prepared to embrace diverse cultures.

2. In order to operationalize internationalization across the campus community, faculty members will need additional support and guidance to become fully engaged.

3. Limited resources have impeded administrators and staff from fully implementing internationalization across the campus community.
Finding One: Preparing Faculty and Students to Embrace Diverse Cultures

Students and faculty across the campus community are not yet fully prepared to embrace diverse cultures.

The initial finding from the data analysis relates to the first research question and proposition presented in this descriptive case study; How do GCC staff and administrators at one post-secondary institution understand their campus’s internationalization initiative to prepare faculty and students to embrace different cultures? Coryell, et. al. (2012) and Knight (2004) noted internationalization is a process that involves preparing both students and faculty to embrace diverse cultures. Following an in-depth analysis relating to the decision-making of GCC staff and an administrator at Albani University, it was discovered that neither students nor faculty are fully prepared to embrace diverse cultures. McTighe-Musil (2006) touted it is imperative that students “…understand diverse cultures...to communicate…” in a global society (p. 6). Opportunities for students and faculty to interact with diverse cultures at Albani University include study abroad, faculty-led programs, courses that have integrated global curricula, and a limited international student presence on its campus. The data analysis revealed that faculty and students have received these opportunities dissimilarly. The focus group specifically exposed that the strategic plan to diversify has been interpreted many ways and that faculty and staff have “…used [the term] diversity more than internationalization…” Moreover, while some students engage in study abroad experiences, the focus group also revealed that not all students gain intercultural understandings based on the evaluation data that has been collected. Furthermore, student exposure to international curricula on campus may also be limited based on the current Western-focused core course requirements. The attainment of intercultural skills, or competence among students and faculty were not fully apparent from the
data analysis. This finding is consistent with the noted disparity between the increased intention to promote internationalization on post-secondary campuses (Knight, 2001) and the actual progress made to prepare students to engage in globally interconnected work through various curricular and programmatic efforts (ACE, 2012; CIGE, 2012; Duncan, 2010; Friedman, 2007; Green, 2003; Hunter, 2004; Zhao, 2011).

Internationalization is a non-linear process that creates confusion (Jordan, 2008) and “…[it] defies orderly, organized…analysis…” (Leask, 2011, p. 1). The process toward achieving internationalization on a post-secondary campus has been accomplished through varying paths (Leask, 2011). Albani University’s 2011-2015 Strategic Plan aims to diversify its campus, and integrate more global perspectives into the Western-focused courses it offers. The data analysis revealed that the recent strategic plan has led to multiple interpretations, but the causes for this remain unclear from the evidence collected in this case study. However, the GCC Dean and staff members are dedicated to the work of understanding this process as well as supporting members of the campus community as they implement internationalization. The GCC Dean and staff at Albani University have attempted to “…make sense of equivocal inputs and enact this sense back into the world to make that world more orderly…” (Weick, et al., 2005, p. 410), and therefore, comprehend and act with best practices when implementing the internationalization initiative throughout the campus community. For example the GCC Dean has been the Chairman of the International Programs Committee (IPC) since it was reinstituted in 2007 to organize international initiatives on campus. The reemergence of the IPC on the Albani University campus is an example of Weick’s (1995) third property (enactment of a sensible environment) found in the sensemaking theory. Furthermore, the fourth property (social sensemaking) and the fifth (ongoing sensemaking) are also demonstrated (Weick, 1995) through
the consistent use of the IPC by various faculty, staff, and administrators from across the institution. The IPC members have made decisions related to implementing internationalization on their campus, such as how they have discussed and planned to develop a re-approval process protocol for faculty-led programs.

Since 2007, the larger campus community at Albani University has consistently looked to the small number of staff members available at the GCC for direction, support, and resources for all international related initiatives. It was concluded from the data analysis that internationalization responsibilities appear to have been placed solely in their hands. However, the researcher discovered during the document analysis that the GCC Dean and staff were reported as making significant progress, according to external and internal reviews. The GCC Dean and staff members have understood the process of operationalizing internationalization by increasing the number of study abroad participants, assisting in the development of faculty-led programs, engaging in cross-departmental collaborations, and learning about the new Revised Core Curriculum requirements that relate to internationalization (e.g., diversity and service-learning proficiencies). However, according to a recent climate report and study abroad evaluation, both of which were described by focus group participants, many students are not yet fully demonstrating that they have embraced diverse cultures through the internationalization initiatives currently in place at Albani University.

“Sensemaking starts with chaos” (Weick et al., 2005, p. 411). The focus group, the interview, and the observations all revealed that the process of making sense of internationalization has been undertaken through various vehicles, but these efforts have not been entirely successful. Implementing internationalization has created some challenges for faculty, staff, and administrators. Weick, et al. (2005) noted that social behaviors impact
sensemaking amongst the individuals involved. From a close examination of campus climate reports and study abroad evaluation data, active participation in an International Programs Committee, as well as collaborative work with departments have all led the GCC Dean and staff to “furnish a raw flow of activity…[to]…extract certain cues for closer attention” (Weick et al., 2005, p. 411). Extracting cues is the sixth property found in the sensemaking theory (Weick, 1995), and GCC staff have concluded that many students have not obtained intercultural competence from the internationalization initiatives that have been offered on their campus thus far. Evidence was found in both the interview and focus group data analysis that provided examples of how the participants perceived more students and faculty could become prepared to embrace different cultures; sending faculty overseas for training in order to infuse more international skills into the classroom and examining the existence of Western focused core course requirements on their campus are a few examples that were found in the data analysis.

Intercultural competence involves a willingness to learn about different people, to gain the knowledge and skills to understand others, and a willingness to demonstrate empathy or flexibility when interacting with individuals from varying cultures (Deardorff, 2006). According to the focus group, study abroad evaluation reports and monitoring campus experiences have demonstrated that students, faculty, and staff at Albani University have not yet fully achieved intercultural competence. The focus group revealed that faculty and staff are not required to partake in diversity trainings, but GCC staff assured that some of their work to provide guidance in intercultural understanding has assisted with internationalizing other departments across the larger campus community. The GCC staff members identifying that training is a necessary component of their internationalization initiative relates to Weick et al.’s (2005) point that the early stages of sensemaking involve identifying raw activity, or experiences that can lead to
future decision-making.

As a result of retrospection and the identification of cues, GCC staff members have retained information to use in the future to further internationalize their campus. For example, after several incidents between international and domestic students in student housing, GCC and residential life staff decided to modify the student housing application to include a question asking domestic students if they have an interest in living with international students. The GCC staff revealed during the focus group that collaborating with residential life and modifying the housing application was an attempt to encourage intercultural relations among students who are willing to room with an international student on campus and promote positive interactions.

An international curriculum should be designed to lead students toward understanding world cultures and attaining intercultural skills (Jordan, 2008). Accreditation guidelines and student learning discussions have all popularized the internationalization of curricula (Ivan, 2011). The public diplomacy programme in the United States State Department’s goal has been set to,

…support the achievement of US foreign policy goals and objectives, advance national interest, and enhance national security by informing and influencing foreign publics and by expanding and strengthening the relationship between the people and Government of the United States and citizens of the rest of the world. (Olzer, 2013, p. 15).

International education, as Olzer (2013) pointed out, is a critical aspect of public diplomacy and “…higher education institutions are at the core of this discourse…” (p. 15), which suggests post-secondary campuses should offer more internationalized experiences to its students. Results of the data analysis found that Western-focused courses are still the norm at Albani University; therefore, it can be concluded that many students are not gaining international skills through the existing curricula. Some faculty members have provided international opportunities either by leading short-term programs overseas, or by integrating global themes into their classroom. It is
clear from the data analysis that these strategies are challenging to acquire fully due to limited resources and are not widespread across the campus.

Weick’s (1979, 1993, 1995) suggestion that an overload of tension may prevent flexibility and inhibit future change could possibly explain the challenges to fully implementing internationalization at Albani University. There are some faculty members that are utilizing the GCC for support with integrating global themes into their teaching practice and it is evident to both GCC staff and the Dean. However, the reasons why some faculty members have not internationalized their classrooms still are somewhat unclear from the data analysis. However, references to the need for diversity trainings and more resources were apparent. The data analysis also revealed that both international and domestic students struggle with demonstrating intercultural skills at Albani University. Moreover, the data revealed that some faculty members are struggling to teach non-English speaking students. The decision to hire a part-time English Language Learner (ELL) specialist to address these challenges are connected to the labeling process found in sensemaking that involves identifying a collective vision to eliminate equivocality (Choo, 2002). The hiring of a part-time ELL specialist also closely relates to Weick et al.’s (2005) assertion that the extraction of cues in an unstable environment can lead to sensemaking.

Moreover, Weick et al. (2005) stated, “…the ways in which events are first envisioned immediately begins the work of organizing because events are bracketed and labeled in ways that predispose people to find common ground” (p. 411). Bracketing and labeling was evident when GCC staff advocated for faculty who sought assistance with reaching their non-English speaking students by bringing these concerns to senior administrators. Advocating for faculty support involved a year of collecting data and meeting with the senior administrators to get a new part-
time ELL position approved. Albani University’s acquisition of one part-time ELL specialist was an initial step toward responding to a call from faculty to support students whose first language is not English. As Weick (1995) noted in his final property of sensemaking (plausibility); “…accuracy is nice, but not necessary…” (p. 56). Weick (1995) asserted, sensemaking that is “…coheren[t]…memorable… embodies past experience and expectations …” is critical (p. 60). Both the focus group and interview revealed that the GCC Dean and staff hope the ELL position becomes full time, which would further internationalize the campus.

In the focus group, GCC staff members acknowledged that faculty members across the campus are still in need of additional support and guidance in order to fully implement internationalization. Although Albani University might still have room for growth with implementing internationalization and further preparing faculty and students to embrace diverse cultures, the GCC Dean and staff members have displayed efforts in laying the groundwork for future development. Weick (1995) posited, “…an obsession with accuracy seems fruitless, and not of much practical help… symbolic trappings…such as myths, metaphors, platitudes…paradigms…” could be more beneficial in creating a detailed roadmap for individuals to utilize for future sensemaking (p. 61).

**Finding Two: Decision-Making to Operationalize an Internationalization Initiative**

*In order to operationalize internationalization across the campus community, faculty members will need additional support and guidance to become fully engaged.*

The next finding is rooted in the second research question and proposition that framed this descriptive case study and is based on interview and focus group data from the GCC Dean and GCC staff. The research question that grounded the second finding addressed the following; What organizational decision-making processes and dialogue have GCC staff and campus
administrators engaged in to operationalize their internationalization initiative? The data analysis revealed that faculty members play a role in implementing internationalization at Albani University. Similarly, Crose (2011), Leask (2001), and Mak and Kennedy (2012) all underscored that faculty members are a critical component in any effort to facilitate classroom activities that could develop a students’ international skills. Making sense of an unstable or uncertain environment involves “…connect[ing] the abstract with the concrete” (Weick et al., 2005, p. 412). The GCC Dean displayed the second sensemaking property (retrospection) (Weick, 1995) when he discussed how he facilitates decision-making with the IPC members. The GCC Dean identified during the interview that he experienced success with utilizing a committee to make tough decisions both at Albani University and a previous campus. The use of the IPC at Albani University has assisted the GCC Dean and staff with implementing internationalization resulting in some students and faculty becoming prepared to embrace diverse cultures.

The data analysis revealed that the GCC Dean and staff have made successful efforts to transform internationalization goals into realities. The GCC Dean revealed that Albani University students are drawn to faculty-led international programs and initiatives on the campus. In an effort to sustain their progress toward internationalizing the university, the GCC has provided support by offering workshops to faculty in order to guide them in developing short-term programs overseas. However, it was evident in the document review that only a few faculty members have actually utilized this resource.

Discovered through the data analysis was that the GCC Dean and staff members have collaborated with some departments across the campus community to develop an approved list of study abroad programs that connect with the Revised Core Curriculum. Identity construction
(first property of sensemaking) was discovered in the GCC Dean and staff’s actions to engage others across the campus to develop department specific programs. The goal of these study abroad programs is to ensure students have the opportunity to receive international experiences that foster intercultural skills. The data revealed that the GCC Dean and staff members believe that if more global curricula is integrated into core courses on campus, then students will in turn receive increased international experiences and skills; however, it was clear that engaging all faculty and staff members has been a slow process and that participation has been minimal.

Crose (2011) argued that ensuring educators possess an open mind as they prepare their instructional environments to accommodate intercultural exchanges is an important initial step. Green (2003) also reiterated this point by asserting that the delivery of internationalized curricula might require faculty members to possess a new skill set that is different from what they acquired when they first began teaching. Additionally, research on faculty development in this area suggests that often faculty remain unfocused in their application of global themes in the classroom and in their understanding of how well these themes will prepare students for 21st century work environments (Jordan, 2008; McTighe-Musil, 2006). Both the focus group and interview data suggest that although more recently hired faculty members possess international experiences, many faculty with longer tenure do not. Thus, it is apparent that more support and guidance is needed to further internationalize students’ experiences at Albani University. The focus group and interview data also revealed that intercultural trainings are not required and faculty do not understand international student backgrounds, which may be related to the need to foster international skills in the classroom. These points are reinforced by the findings of Kedia and Englis (2011) and Colville-Hall and Adamowicz-Hariasz (2010) who found that faculty need adequate training in order to fully integrate global themes meaningfully into their classrooms.
The data revealed that decisions have been made to implement faculty development initiatives designed to contribute to furthering internationalization efforts. In conjunction with the 2011-2015 Strategic Plan, support for internationalizing curricula has been largely dependent on guidance supplied by the GCC Dean and staff. The data analysis exposed that the GCC Dean and staff members have successfully prepared some faculty members to lead short-term programs overseas, or financially supported their attendance at overseas trainings that could lead to the integration of international skills into the classroom. As McTighe-Musil (2006) urged, “Without…coordination and alignment [across the campus] students will continue to experience episodic and unconnected opportunities for global learning” (p. 9). Support from the GCC Dean has resulted in the establishment of connections with departments across the larger campus community to foster international skills that will benefit student learning experiences. For example, the GCC Dean found financial support to send a Business Department faculty member to Asia to receive training in developing an international business course. The broader goal was for this faculty member to relay information learned in Asia directly to colleagues and students such that more internationalization efforts within the department would be initiated. The GCC Dean alluded to the point that the process of getting all or even more faculty members on board with internationalizing curricula and their classroom will take time, but supporting some faculty members with international travel is one step toward achieving that goal.

The GCC Deans’ actions and communication appeared to be the central components in sensemaking processes and, regardless of order, both may be a “…starting point to the destination” (Weick et al., 2005, p. 412) of achieving internationalization fully. The Dean’s plan to send only a few faculty members overseas for international training is one example of how sensemaking can be referred to as topsy-turvy, as Choo (2002) pointed out, which refers to
planning with the future in mind. The GCC Dean believed that sending even a few faculty members overseas could benefit the internationalization initiative through the transition of international skills from faculty to students. Furthermore, if the efforts to send some faculty members overseas to receive international training appears to improve the achievement of internationalization across academic departments, the GCC Deans’ decisions could then help individuals make sense of internationalization with an event “…to which people can orient…” (Weick, 1995, p. 41).

Finding Three: Resources are Critical to Internationalize Across the Campus Community

Limited resources have impeded administrators and staff from fully implementing internationalization across the campus community.

The last finding connects with the third research question and proposition; How have GCC staff and administrators sought to achieve the institution's internationalization initiative throughout the campus community? Weick et al. (2005) identified “…communication as an ongoing process of making sense of the circumstance in which people collectively find [themselves] and of the events that affect them…” (p. 413). Social sensemaking, the fourth property, (Weick, 1995) relates to the processes that GCC staff and the Dean have taken toward achieving internationalization throughout the campus community at Albani University. The focus group and interview both revealed that the GCC Dean and staff recognize their pivotal role in engaging others across the campus in making sense of internationalization.

The reemergence of the International Programs Committee (IPC) on campus in 2007 provided a location where discussions about internationalization could take place. Weick (1995) noted that social sensemaking involves “…a lot of attention to talk, discourse, and conversation because that is how a great deal of social contact is mediated…” (p. 41). One example of the
social property in the sensemaking theory (Weick, 1995) was noted during an observation of an IPC meeting. In an effort to un-complicate the re-approval process for faculty to lead short-term programs overseas, the GCC Dean led a discussion with committee members to identify, discuss, and make decisions regarding the re-approval guidelines. The goal was to streamline communication between the GCC and the larger campus community and simplify the existing complicated process required of faculty members who are interested in leading international programs. The IPC members represent varying departments across the larger campus community, and thus provide one measure that has been taken to ensure internationalization processes are closely monitored and kept a top priority (Knight, 2001) at Albani University. It was clear from observations of the second meeting that all members were not yet in full agreement of terms for re-approval guidelines due to some expectations of the process being noted as unreasonable by a committee member. The outcome of this discussion remains uncertain based on the observation data analyzed in its attempts to clarify the internationalization process for faculty members across the campus community that could lead to increased levels of international programs, or provide intercultural experiences. However, it was evident there will be future discussions to make sense of the re-approval process for faculty leading short-term programs overseas. The International Programs Committee members’ actions displayed Weick’s (1995) assertion that sensemaking involves “reasonableness” and “…socially acceptable and credible” decisions (p. 61). Their actions embodied not only social sensemaking, but also the ongoing tenet of Weick’s (1995) theory. The committee members demonstrated their commitment to engage in additional discussions during a future meeting to make a decision about the process.
Internationalization is achieved when a campus community acquires knowledge of international practices (Coryell et al., 2012) and reaches a shared understanding (Morris, 2009) of goals. Evidence from the document review, particularly the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs Letter, demonstrated that a shared understanding of the internationalization initiative has been achieved between the GCC Dean and Albani University’s senior administrators. For example, the senior administrators noted their support of all recommendations proposed by the GCC Dean in his 2008 Report to further internationalize the Albani University campus. However, there appears to be a disconnect between the university’s mission to diversify and internationalize Western-focused courses and how faculty and students have actually experienced this cultural shift on their campus. A disconnect was discovered based on the focus group data analysis that demonstrated Albani students are required to fulfill a Western focused course, and have limited opportunities to take courses that incorporate international skills unless they partake in a study abroad program.

Moreover, the focus group data analysis revealed that study abroad evaluations demonstrate that many students are not gaining intercultural skills while they are abroad. Furthermore, the interview data analysis exposed that half of the faculty that attempt to develop a short-term program overseas often back out due to limited support and resources that are often needed to develop an international program. The apparent disconnect may suggest that an overload of retention (Weick, 1979, 1993, 1995) has occurred, and may have inhibited Albani University’s flexibility in offering more opportunities for students to develop international skills within courses. Furthermore, the disconnect between the university mission and realities at Albani University may suggest the need for additional discussions and resource support for
faculty and staff members with how to best incorporate intercultural skill development into their current work practices.

It is essential for leaders to maintain focus on internationalization goals, particularly in the areas of accessing and harnessing resources (Green, 2003) that will assist with implementing internationalization. Resources can be faculty, staff, or monetary in nature and should originate from a GCC or academic departments on campus (Knight, 2011). Although the data analysis revealed there are examples of individual faculty members who have demonstrated achievement of the university’s internationalization goals, a strong call for more resources to fully support the initiatives that have been outlined in Albani University’s 2011-2015 Strategic Plan to diversify was evident from the focus group and interview data. The focus group and interview data analysis revealed that although there are more faculty that have become interested in leading short-term programs overseas, it is extremely challenging for the GCC to support all requests with a limited number of staff members and few resources. Moreover, the GCC Dean pointed out that half of the faculty members who express interest in developing a short-term program usually back out due to the extensive amount of work that goes into the process. This was reiterated by the focus group data. Weick’s (1995) final tenet of the sensemaking theory (plausibility) demonstrates that although perfection may not be achieved, relatable experiences may “…resonate with other people…” (p. 60) and assist others in making sense of internationalization. There is an apparent need for more guidance and support for faculty in order to support internationalization efforts in general and intercultural skill development in particular.

Accomplishing internationalization cannot be achieved through the sole efforts of an individual or office (Hser, 2005). Staff and administrators across an institution must work
collaboratively to offer a multitude of events and opportunities for students and faculty to gain international skills and experiences (Green, 2003). Although limited resources may be one barrier uncovered in the data analysis, Bonfiglio (1999) asserted that the development of an internationalized program does not depend on monetary resources, but rather on a commitment from faculty and administrators who ensure students make connections between learning and the real world.

**The Practitioner and Scholarly Significance of the Research**

This descriptive case study addressed a specific problem of practice. With the rise of technological advancements that have made the world more interconnected (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Duncan, 2010; Friedman, 2007; Jue, et al., 2010; Stromquist, 2002), nations around the globe have transformed educational systems in an effort to prepare students to thrive in the interconnected world of the 21st century (Clotfelter, 2010; Friedman, 2007; Rhodes & Torres, 2006; Stromquist, 2002; Wildavsky, 2010). Post-secondary students today must be prepared to work in a competitive global environment (CIGE, 2012; Crawford & Kirby, 2008; Duncan, 2010; Friedman, 2007; Hunter, 2004; Sparks & Waits, 2011). Therefore, US post-secondary institutions must ensure students possess not only content knowledge, but also intercultural skills that will enhance their ability to be effective contributors to the workforce in the current transnational economy (Breuning, 2007; CIGE, 2012; Clotfelter, 2010; Friedman, 2007; Guruz, 2011; Rhodes & Torres, 2006; Stromquist, 2002). However, only 51% of US universities have articulated a commitment to internationalization in their mission statement, and only 52% of universities have made internationalizing curricula one of their top priorities (CIGE, 2012). The findings uncovered from this case study have provided guidance as to how scholars and practitioners may address this problem of practice.
Progress toward internationalization at post-secondary institutions is neither widespread nor consistent (Green, 2003; Hser, 2005; Knight, 2001, 2004). This case study has contributed to the limited amount of research that currently exists regarding best practices for implementing and sustaining internationalization across a college campus (Li-Hua et al., 2010; Taylor, 2004). Furthermore, this descriptive case study may provide insight into how a post-secondary institution can avoid pitfalls and challenges in the process of implementing an internationalization initiative. More specifically, the decision-making processes of the GCC staff and the Dean at Albani University may assist other institutions with a similar mission by shedding light on those internationalization practices that have been successful and those that have presented challenges.

Overall, this case study sought to examine how GCC staff and the GCC Dean understand and operationalize an internationalization initiative across a campus community in the service of ensuring its future graduates are successful in the present global economy (Crawford & Kirby, 2008; Duncan, 2010; Hunter, 2004; Sparks & Waits, 2011). Proposition I helped frame this case study and stated that internationalization is a process that involves preparing faculty and students to embrace diverse cultures (Coryell et al., 2012; Knight 2004). Albani University’s 2011-2015 Strategic Plan includes preparing a campus culture to respect all diversities and exhibits an appreciation for them. This case study exposed that the GCC Dean has collaborated with senior administrators to provide opportunities for more students to participate in study abroad. Furthermore some faculty members have led short-term programs overseas, while few were given financial support to receive training abroad to disseminate information to colleagues and students when they return. However, the study showed that students and faculty are not yet fully prepared to embrace diverse cultures. Furthermore, the discovery that students and faculty have
yet to thoroughly attain intercultural competence supports research conducted by Deardorff (2006), Holmes and O’Neil (2012), and Harrison (2012). Deardorff’s (2006) research included a cyclical model that emphasized that an individual and their interactions play a role in how they may attain intercultural competence. The cycle begins with an individual’s attitude and openness to learn about other cultures, followed by their process toward gaining skills and knowledge of others in order to possess a new level of competence (Deardorff, 2006). Holmes and O’Neil (2012) noted that competence is achieved when an individual demonstrates an understanding of how to behave in an intercultural exchange. While Harrison (2012) identified an individual’s adaptability is important to any intercultural situation.

The first and second findings in the case study relate to curricular integration and confirmed research presented by Teekens (2003) that identified learner responsibilities, and the need for an individual to harness a new attitude when understanding another culture. Faculty-led programs can facilitate intercultural experiences, as found in the observation data analysis, particularly the second observation. During the second observation the Political Science Department faculty member described his trip to Ecuador in detail, and discussed how Albani students were immersed into the local community. The implementation of international curricula and learning-abroad programs may spark future discussions among scholars and practitioners on additional ways international skills may be attained in a post-secondary environment both on and off a college campus. The document review revealed that conversations have already begun at Albani University about the best ways to measure intercultural skills while students are studying abroad. The data analysis also revealed that the Wesleyan Intercultural Competence Scale (WICS) is one tool used to measure intercultural skills of some study abroad participants.
This case study was designed specifically to investigate the decision-making and dialogue of GCC staff and the GCC Dean as they operationalize an internationalization initiative. Proposition II helped frame this case study and incorporated Morris’ (2009) assertion that internationalization is accomplished through frequent communication. In addition, ownership and communication trends across the campus by GCC staff and the GCC Dean was embedded into the second proposition and research question to understand how a successful internationalization initiative could be achieved (Coryell et al., 2012). This case study revealed that in order to operationalize internationalization across the campus community, faculty members will need additional support and guidance to become fully engaged. The focus group and interview data illustrated that although “…regular and consistent faculty dialogue on the subject of internationalization lead[s] to a shared understanding of…goals…” (Morris, 2009, p. 145), Albani University presented some exceptions to this claim based on focus group data that revealed the Strategic Plan to diversify the campus is interpreted in varying ways across the campus.

Qiang (2003) pointed to competency as one approach to achieving internationalization, “…emphasiz[ing] the development of skills, knowledge, attitudes and values in students, faculty and staff” (p. 250). Ethos was also emphasized by Qiang (2003) and refers to fostering a culture that will support international skills and intercultural development. A campus culture that supports international initiatives can provide students with skills needed for a successful future in the current transnational economy (Crawford & Kirby, 2008; Duncan, 2010; Hunter, 2004; Sparks & Waits, 2011).

Finally, this case study looked at how GCC staff and the GCC Dean have sought to achieve an institutional initiative to internationalize. The notion that internationalization can be
achieved when a campus community acquires knowledge about international practices (Coryell et al., 2012), reaches a shared understanding of the process (Morris, 2009), and makes monitoring a top priority (Knight, 2001) was used as a backdrop for investigating the problem of practice. The evidence suggests that, in addition to a campus community understanding international practices (Coryell et al., 2012), sharing an understanding of goals (Morris, 2009), and monitoring the process (Knight, 2001), additional support is necessary to implement internationalization fully. Limited resources appear to have impeded this post-secondary institution from fully achieving internationalization; therefore finding alternative ways to overcome such barriers is critical to success. Practitioners and scholars may be able to utilize this finding to identify specific areas where faculty and staff may need support with internationalization so they can effectively implement it on their post-secondary campus.

**Recommendations for Educational Practice**

The findings that were discovered from this descriptive case study have implications for existing educational practice. Specifically, the findings have provided insight into areas that may require further attention to address the problem of practice investigated by the researcher. The literature review has provided a foundation from which to build upon the findings that were revealed in the data analysis and will be discussed in this section. The three primary study findings were:

1. Students and faculty across the campus community are not yet fully prepared to embrace diverse cultures.
2. In order to operationalize internationalization across the campus, faculty members will need additional support and guidance to become fully engaged.
3. Limited resources have impeded administrators and staff from fully implementing internationalization across the campus community.

**Finding One**

The results related to the first finding suggest the need to provide intercultural opportunities such as increased activities and learning programs throughout the campus for faculty, staff, and students that can foster international skills. Leaders must “…consistently articulate the importance of internationalization…” and engage the campus community, while also identifying others who will support the initiative (Green, 2003, p. 17). As discovered in this case study, the presence of limited staff responsible for international initiatives on campus creates challenges. Therefore, it will be necessary for leaders of the initiative to continue engaging others in the process toward achieving internationalization goals, while also facilitating more opportunities for faculty and staff development on campus. Group programs provided to faculty and staff interested in intercultural learning could provide guidance and information to other departments to further internationalize the larger campus community. As Ancona (2012) pointed out, effective leaders “…engage others in their organizations in figuring out how to play the game” (p. 5). Internationalization has confusing processes (Jordan, 2008), but Leask (2011) asserted that barriers could be overcome with how the process is discussed and developed.

Internationalization initiatives that can engage all faculty, staff, and students on campus may provide ways that graduates can contribute positively to the world around them (Kreber, 2009). Internationalization initiatives may include integrating international curricula into the classroom or offering campus programs that promote positive intercultural relations and understanding between domestic and foreign students. Internationalization leaders may find it helpful to raise awareness of international themes and issues on a campus by first reaching out to
past study abroad participants. Former study abroad participants can discuss their involvement during workshops, fairs, or in the classroom and demonstrate to other students how they not only met academic standards, but also how they may have gained valuable intercultural experiences. Next, internationalization leaders may also reach out to respective academic faculty members that have made progress in integrating global curricula or intercultural skills into their classrooms, or successfully led an overseas program. Faculty members may promote their progress and successes to other interested departments or faculty members on campus to provide a model or guidance in how to engage in the process.

Targeting students (both international and domestic) that possess an interest in global themes to promote understanding and acceptance across the campus community may be beneficial to developing international skills among other students in programs or classrooms. Harrison (2012) found that domestic students may understand what is ‘right’ or ‘good’ relative to adapting effectively to a situation when they interact with international students in a classroom environment; thus demonstrating they possess ‘cultural intelligence.’ (p. 228). Increasing the presence of international students and scholars on campus could not only encourage the development of intercultural skills among domestic students, but also contribute additional financial resources for future initiatives, as was suggested by the focus group data. The document review revealed there was an inequitable distribution of international students across the campus; the largest number of international students in the Spring 2014 originated from Canada (13 students) and Vietnam (13 students). There were 35 other countries represented on campus and one student originated from each, totaling 54 additional international students on campus. Therefore, administrators should develop a strategy to increase international student
recruitment efforts as doing so may create additional opportunities for domestic students and faculty to develop intercultural skills.

Ethos is one approach to internationalization presented by Qiang (2003) that relates to organizational culture. Qiang (2003) explained an international initiative is dependent on a post-secondary institutions’ culture, and therefore, an environment must place value on intercultural or global views. Emphasizing ethos (Qiang, 2003) as an approach to internationalization may lead to fully embedding internationalization at a post-secondary institution. The focus group data analysis revealed that Albani students have developed exclusive groups across the campus, which is a reason why the Strategic Plan has pushed to diversify the campus community. The GCC Dean noted that a welcome program was put in place by the GCC for international students, because they had limited support when they first arrived on campus. However, staff and faculty who have a vested interest in internationalization may further support and sponsor additional programs that raise diversity awareness throughout the campus community in order to promote positive intercultural relations throughout the academic year. International activities or events sponsored by student clubs or groups might provide opportunities for all faculty, staff, and students to come together regardless of their background, race, ethnicity, or country of origin. For example, offering campus programs such as international gatherings, speakers, or meetings would promote intercultural relations and develop international skills (Green, 2003) across the campus community. These efforts could further foster intercultural skills and elevate levels of understanding and acceptance among faculty and students (Deardorff, 2006; Sparks & Waits, 2011). Providing multiple opportunities to demonstrate that value has been placed on fostering intercultural skills and global issues on campus will help sustain internationalization, and such efforts may serve as a model to other campuses engaging in a similar initiative.
Finding Two

A recommendation stemming from the second finding is to provide more opportunities for faculty development in the areas of international themes and intercultural skills. Sensemaking involves engaging individuals in the process of creating order (Ancona, 2012; Weick et al., 2005). Engaging faculty in the internationalization process is a necessary step to ensure the larger campus community, outside of the GCC, can make sense of the process and eliminate the uncertainty that comes from implementing the institution’s Strategic Plan. Foreign language is not the only intercultural skill that may benefit a future graduate in the current global economy; a stronger emphasis and incorporation of soft skills will also be necessary (Sparks & Waits, 2011). Sparks and Waits (2011) emphasized that the integration of soft skills into learning includes critical thinking, analysis, problem solving, communication, teamwork, leadership, and the ability to work in diverse and changing environments; all are pertinent in a 21st century work environment. Therefore, it may be useful for department leaders or campus administrators to offer professional development related to teaching students the soft skills that were identified by Sparks and Waits (2011). The development of such skills may serve as another way to prepare students to function effectively in the increasingly interconnected and global economy (Bonfiglio, 1999).

The GCC investigated in this case study serves as a lifeline for faculty and staff members who wish to promote international initiatives. More faculty members are seeking assistance with internationalizing; therefore, a GCC should offer additional support and guidance with implementing internationalization across the campus community. Since limited human resources often make this a challenging endeavor, it may benefit a GCC to help faculty access resources that provide online tutorials, blogs, websites, or virtual libraries that may provide international
trainings. The use of external resources and expert communities that specialize in global education and internationalization practices may prove beneficial to faculty and staff. Utilizing external resources and expert communities may also be cost effective ways for faculty to have access to strategies that will assist them in teaching international students in their classes; an area which was found to be a challenge in this case study.

Leaders in internationalization initiatives play an essential role (Green, 2003) and can assist in eliminating confusion during cultural shifts on post-secondary campuses; communication is necessary to make sense of an uncertain environment (Weick et al., 2005). As more faculty and staff express interest in internationalizing programs it is critical that campus administrators disseminate clear communication (Green, 2003; Morris, 2009) of the expectations, as well as provide insight into the possible outcomes. Moreover, rewarding faculty for their successes in seeking international opportunities for teaching and scholarship should be acknowledged; this is a critical component of a successful internationalization process (Hser, 2005; Morris, 2009).

Finding Three

Recommendations from the third finding suggest the need to identify alternative ways to overcome barriers to accessing funding and other resources. Barriers to internationalization are often related to issues of limited funding and other resources (Green, 2003; Hser, 2005). It is critical for institutional leaders to ensure resources are set aside and supplied, and frequently communicate the importance of the internationalization initiative (Green, 2003). Qiang (2003) also noted there is a call to intensify tracking of intercultural competencies, and this was also apparent from the data analysis. Therefore, additional efforts in tracking how international skills are instructed and assessed throughout the campus community may be necessary.
Students need to gain more international skills in their learning experiences, both on campus and from study abroad programs. A recommendation for existing educational practice is to seek internationalization experts and invite them to assist in strategizing ways to overcome barriers to fully implementing the initiative throughout the campus community. A campus community that is provided with international opportunities (e.g., programs or international trips) may facilitate changing the culture of an institution with limited direction from leadership (Coryell et al., 2012). Although Albani University offers short-term programs to its students that are led by faculty members whom assume responsibility for organizing overseas travel, more internationalized curricula offered in courses on campus is recommended. This is echoed in Crose (2011), Leask (2001), and Mak and Kennedy’s (2012) research that faculty members play a pivotal role in facilitating activities that can develop a student’s international skills.

Outreach efforts to a local community are one outcome of internationalization (Morris, 2009) and can assist in coordinating international programming (Coryell et al., 2012) on a post-secondary campus. Targeting local experts in international issues or locations from the surrounding community to support international initiatives can also help foster intercultural skills. Local experts in international issues or locations may connect directly with course curricula and provide students and faculty with rich intercultural experiences in the classroom. Inviting a scholar or a leader of an international organization may be another cost-effective strategy for overcoming barriers to achieving internationalization fully on a campus. For example, diversity organization leaders, and an international scholar or student who wishes to share their personal stories or experiences can be beneficial to promoting an international perspective in a course. Furthermore, positively acknowledging students and faculty who have promoted or experienced internationalization in some way (Hser, 2005; Morris, 2009) may
encourage other faculty and students to focus their efforts on developing international skills. Such grass roots efforts may offer another avenue for changing the campus culture, to one that embraces internationalization as a goal.

A final way that barriers to accessing additional funding and resources to achieve internationalization goals can be overcome involves accountability. Morris (2009) pointed out that stakeholders must be accountable for internationalization goals, while Knight (2001) noted monitoring should be a top priority. Although faculty may align course curricula and learning outcomes with an institution’s internationalization agenda (McTighe-Musil, 2006), without holding stakeholders accountable for the established goals, there are limited ways in which to identify whether or not they have been met and no understanding to what extent staff and faculty are prepared to embrace diverse cultures. According to the data, faculty are not required to take any diversity trainings and this may help explain the limited success in fully implementing the internationalization initiative throughout the campus community. Therefore, it is recommended that faculty and staff members participate in a required internationalization training that is specifically related to their work on campus. Without alignment between a university’s overarching internationalization goals and its course curricula, students will not be equally able to receive opportunities to attain international skills (McTighe-Musil, 2006).

**Suggestions for Further Research**

The findings from this descriptive case study answered the three research questions posed by the researcher. The data analysis and findings also left some questions unanswered that pertain to the role of senior leadership, organizational culture, and the varying perceptions and experiences of others in the campus community regarding internationalization. Suggestions for further research will be outlined in this final section for scholars and practitioners who are
interested in internationalization research. Three points will be discussed: (a) senior leadership, (b) organizational culture, and (c) perceptions and experiences across the campus community.

**Senior Leadership**

Similar to the reports in the existing literature (Coryell, et al., 2012; Ellingboe, 1998; Green, 2003; Morris, 2009) the findings from this research study revealed that despite the call by leadership to implement internationalization on the campus, there was not enough concrete support from leadership to fulfill this initiative. Additional research examining the role of senior leadership in supporting internationalization initiatives seems warranted. Furthermore, employing a multi-site case study methodology to examine the role of leadership in US and overseas post-secondary institutions with respect to internationalization could provide additional insights into this area. A multi-site case study could also be leveraged to identify characteristics of effective senior leaders and the role they play in overcoming barriers to implementing an internationalization initiative both at US and overseas institutions.

**Organizational Culture**

It was clear in this case study that members of the larger campus community at Albani University are not yet fully prepared to engage in and promote internationalization or to embrace different cultures. Furthermore, it was found that there is a disparity between the strategic goals of the internationalization initiative and the actual experience of Albani faculty, staff, and students with respect to internationalization on their campus. An investigation of the organizational culture at an institution that is fully engaged in internationalizing may benefit other GCC’s on post-secondary campuses who seek to support the larger campus community with the implementation process. Furthermore, case study research that examines the organizational culture within a post-secondary environment as they implement
internationalization on their campus could also contribute to the existing literature. Understanding details about the leadership, faculty, and student culture of an institution as it embarks on the process of implementing international programs could be most helpful to assist other institutions involved in a similar initiative of their own. Moreover, examining faculty development practices, leadership conferences, and student programs that focus on internationalization or on developing international programs could also be useful to those seeking to conduct research in this area.

**Perceptions and Experiences Across the Campus Community**

The results of this case study left the researcher wondering about the perceptions and experiences (both positive and negative) of faculty members, staff, students, and senior administrators as they strive to implement internationalization on their campus. Understanding the perceptions and experiences of this broader slice of the campus community as they seek to internationalize their institution should offer a better sense of the scope, depth and nature of the changes that must be considered in order to successfully implement such an initiative. As the results of this case study revealed, all faculty members are not contributing equally to the internationalization initiative on campus, therefore it would be beneficial to conduct further research into the reasons for this disparity across departments. Moreover, research that uncovers faculty, staff, student, and administrator perceptions and experiences with respect to internationalizing, could shed light on the successes and challenges encountered by these stakeholders. Lastly, an examination of how institutional goals may be aligned with those of each academic department on campus, may be a useful line of inquiry. This line of research may offer insights and concrete solutions regarding how various academic departments can overcome common barriers to implementing a campus-wide internationalization initiative.
Concluding Remarks

The descriptive case study examined the processes of understanding, operationalizing and implementing an internationalization initiative at a post-secondary institution. This case study investigated GCC staff and the GCC Dean’s process toward making sense of implementing internationalization at one northeastern, post-secondary institution, in part to provide a model for other campuses that wish to engage in an internationalization initiative. There were three critical findings that were uncovered through the data analysis. The first highlighted that post-secondary staff and faculty members, as well as students are not yet fully prepared to embrace diverse cultures. The second illustrated that it is critical to the internationalization process that additional support and guidance be provided to faculty and staff. Finally, the third finding revealed that limited resources have impeded this university from fully achieving internationalization uniformly across the campus community. Therefore, in order for the internationalization initiative to be successful, it will be necessary for the institution to overcome the barriers that were revealed by this study.

This study has presented pertinent conclusions by not only contributing to current research in the area of internationalization, but also by providing guidance to other practitioners in the field who may implement internationalization on their campus. The findings from this case study may be able to assist other campuses to achieve internationalization more comprehensively by providing all students and faculty with opportunities to embrace diverse cultures. Ensuring faculty and students reach a full understanding of different cultures can be achieved through ongoing efforts made by administrators and staff to make sense of implementing internationalization, and by engaging with one another throughout the process (Weick, 1995). Identity construction and extracting cues in the sensemaking theory (Weick,
1995) are also essential to understanding the demands of an internationalization initiative. Therefore, in order to operationalize internationalization across a campus community, faculty members will need additional support and guidance to become fully engaged in the implementation process. Individuals that fixate on perfection may not be helpful (Weick, 1995); thus, utilizing successful internationalization initiatives may instead assist administrators and staff in creating a roadmap for future sensemaking across a campus community. Overcoming barriers and making resources more accessible may reverse the impediments that administrators and staff have faced trying to implement internationalization on their post-secondary campus.
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Appendix A: Conceptual Framework

Conceptual Framework: Case Study Propositions & Research Questions

Proposition 1
Internationalization is a process that involves preparing faculty and students to embrace diverse cultures (Coryell, et al., 2012; Knight, 2004).

Research Question #1:
How do GCC staff and administrators at one post-secondary institution understand their campus’s internationalization initiative to prepare faculty and students to embrace different cultures?

Diagram Key
→ Direct relationship
← Reciprocal relationship

Proposition 2
Internationalizing a post-secondary campus is accomplished through “...regular and consistent faculty dialogue...” (Morris, 2009, p. 145); Communication and ownership demonstrated by administrators and faculty is pertinent for success (Coryell, et al., 2012).

Research Question #2:
What organizational decision-making processes and dialogue have GCC staff and administrators engaged in to operationalize the internationalization initiative?

Proposition 3
Internationalization can be achieved when a campus community acquires knowledge of international practices (Coryell, et al., 2012), reaches a common understanding of internationalization (Morris, 2009), and when monitoring program processes is a high priority (Knight, 2001).

Research Question #3:
How have GCC staff and administrators sought to achieve the institution’s internationalization initiative throughout the campus community?
## Appendix B: Document Review Table Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Evidence P1: Internationalization is a process that involves preparing faculty and students to embrace diverse cultures (Coryell, et al., 2012; Knight, 2004).</th>
<th>Evidence P3: Internationalization can be achieved when a campus community acquires knowledge of international practices (Coryell, et al., 2012), reaches a shared understanding of internationalization goals (Morris, 2009), and when monitoring program processes is a high priority (Knight, 2001).</th>
<th>Code(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document 1:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Example Text:</strong> “Annual workshop for faculty interested in developing short-term programs abroad…annual fall Welcome Program for new undergraduate international students.” “Over one dozen invitations and meetings for our faculty and departments with major study abroad program providers.” “Financial support to faculty…but site visits and evaluations (e.g., China, France, Mexico in AY 2007-08).”</td>
<td><strong>Example Text:</strong> “…must address long-standing institutional…deterrents to the internationalization of the campus…” “Renewed and increased role of the International Programs Advisory Committee.” “Discussions with [two] department[s] to establish new study abroad…options that…enhance curriculum integration…faculty confidence, and…provide greater…geographic diversity than previously.”</td>
<td><strong>Code(s):</strong> A LCC R SU GCS GCC G INTL INTCL FIN K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>September 2008</strong></td>
<td><strong>GCC Dean’s 2008 Report</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>Theme(s):</strong> Shared Goals; Ownership and Commitment; Communication and Dialogue; Student Preparation; Monitoring; Faculty Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Twenty-three pages</strong></td>
<td><strong>Internal Publication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document 2:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Example Text:</strong> A contract with the global education provider to continue a satellite religious studies program in Rome was renewed through 2016-2017. A faculty member was reappointed as the Director of the Rome program for the 2014-2015 school year.</td>
<td><strong>Example Text:</strong> 2014-2013: Applications: 377 Total Students: 293 Class Size: 982 Participation Rate: 30% 2007-2008: Applications: 194 Total Students: 145 Class Size: 1,064 Participation Rate: 13.5% International Students: 80 Countries Represented: 37</td>
<td><strong>Code(s):</strong> INTCL G INTL A GCS GCC G1 P3 LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2013-2014</strong></td>
<td><strong>Albani University Spring 2014 Statistics</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>Theme(s):</strong> Monitoring; Communication and Dialogue; Ownership and Commitment; Student Preparation; Campus Community Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two pages</strong></td>
<td><strong>Internal Publication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document 3:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Data Source</strong></td>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Example Text:</strong> 2012-2013 Applications: 362 Total Students: 231 Class Size: 1,103 Participant Rate: 21% International Students 2013-2014: 81 Student Athletes: 29</td>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Statistics of study abroad applications and enrollment from 2007- Present are found in this document. Albani University Rome Theology participants are included in statistics from 2011-2014. International student enrollment statistics from 2013-2014 are included.</td>
<td><strong>Code(s):</strong> INTCL G INTL A GCS GCC P1 P3 LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2013-2014</strong></td>
<td><strong>GCC 2013-2014 Statistics Report</strong></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td><strong>Theme(s):</strong> Monitoring; Communication and Dialogue; Student Preparation; Campus Community Engagement; Ownership and Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Evidence P1: Internationalization is a process that involves preparing faculty and students to embrace diverse cultures (Coryell, et al., 2012; Knight, 2004).</td>
<td>Evidence P3: Internationalization can be achieved when a campus community acquires knowledge of international practices (Coryell, et al., 2012), reaches a shared understanding of internationalization goals (Morris, 2009), and when monitoring program processes is a high priority (Knight, 2001).</td>
<td>Code(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document 4:</td>
<td>GCS A</td>
<td>International Programs Committee (IPC) Members</td>
<td>Description: The International Programs Committee prepares faculty and students to embrace different cultures by discussing, reviewing, and approving campus programs that will meet this goal.</td>
<td>Description and Example Text: Reaching a shared understanding at Albani University about internationalization is through the IPC; 12 departments are represented, including the international student population. “…consider, review, and recommend plans, policies and programs…”</td>
<td>LCC SU A GCS GCC INTL P1 P2 P3 FIN G INTCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One page</td>
<td>Internal Publication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document 5:</td>
<td>GCS A</td>
<td>International Programs Committee (IPC) Responsibilities and Guiding Principles</td>
<td>Example Text: “International study is an enriching educational experience …that is most beneficial when it is fully integrated with the academic curriculum and learning of students.” “Education abroad programs should …prepare[s] students to be responsible and…serve the [local and] greater world community…[and receive]…cross-cultural exposure and, immersion experiences…Approved program options should seek to maximize these benefits for students.”</td>
<td>Example Text: “Advise on administrative policies/procedures, for the…[GCC]” “Review of and recommendations for the Recognized List of education abroad programs” “The [GCC] seeks program options of high academic quality and rigor that include excellent student support services, and that are a good institutional fit for …[Albani University].”</td>
<td>LCC SU A GCS GCC INTL phosphorus P1 P2 P3 FIN G INTCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One page</td>
<td>Internal Publication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document 6:</td>
<td>GCS A</td>
<td>External Evaluation Provider Letter</td>
<td>Example Text: “The Peer Reviewers have…provided[ed] their reactions and consultative advice on how [Albani University] can improve its education abroad program.” “…maintains a commitment…to offering high quality programs in education abroad at a level of excellence acceptable to the larger academic community…”</td>
<td>Example Text: “…maintains a commitment and dedication…to continuous assessment and improvement.” “…meets all the requirements for recognition…for its adherence to good professional practices under the standards outlined in the Peer Review.”</td>
<td>P1 P2 A GCC phosphorus LCC SU R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15, 2013</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One page</td>
<td>External Publication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Evidence P1:</td>
<td>Evidence P3:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Date, Length, Publication Status-internal/external)</td>
<td>GCS</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Internationalization is a process that involves preparing faculty and students to embrace diverse cultures (Coryell, et al., 2012; Knight, 2004).</td>
<td>Internationalization can be achieved when a campus community acquires knowledge of international practices (Coryell, et al., 2012), reaches a shared understanding of internationalization goals (Morris, 2009), and when monitoring program processes is a high priority (Knight, 2001).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Source (Retrieved from)</td>
<td>Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs Letter</td>
<td>Example Text: “Without exception or qualification, the Cabinet endorses Recommendations #1...2...8...9... and 11...” “The Cabinet favors the recruitment of international students (Recommendations #6 and #7)...”</td>
<td>“I am happy to report that the Cabinet has endorsed, in principle, all your recommendations…” “In concert with the Admissions Office, a plan for the recruitment and retention of international students should be developed.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GCC Self Study Report</td>
<td>Example Text: “Initial efforts to assess the student study abroad learning and intercultural experience.” “...the [Revised Core Curriculum]...could have special application for students considering study abroad...the new Diversity proficiency in cross-cultural study is a great fit for study abroad...Civic Engagement proficiency could well be completed as part of a study abroad or international service-learning program.”</td>
<td>“Collaboration with academic departments and programs to develop major or program specific education abroad options, by discipline, to foster and enhance curriculum integration.” “Tracking of the [university’s] short-term programs (credit &amp; non-credit) by the [GCC] to enhance...safety and crisis response management.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External Evaluation Provider Peer Review Report</td>
<td>Example Text: Albani University’s “…education abroad activities support and enhance the mission. [GCC’s] approved program offerings provide students with opportunities for academic and cultural learning in service of its four stated goals.” Albani University’s GCC “…makes good use of campus academic infrastructure…”</td>
<td>“…administrative integration and coordination across the campus is commendable.” “…life transforming first-hand international experiences by key senior administrators...foster very active support for all experiences abroad.” “…involvement in the Wesleyan Intercultural Competence Scale is a solid effort to assess intercultural development...”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document 7:**
- **Date:** September 24, 2009
- **Type:** One page
- **Publication:** External
- **Source:** Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs Letter

**Document 8:**
- **Date:** March 2013
- **Type:** Fifty-five pages
- **Publication:** Internal
- **Source:** GCC Self Study Report

**Document 9:**
- **Date:** April 15-17, 2013
- **Type:** Eleven pages
- **Publication:** External
- **Source:** External Evaluation Provider Peer Review Report
Document Review Table Summary Codes:
Proposition 1 (P1), Proposition 2 (P2), Proposition 3 (P3), Global (G), International (INTL), Intercultural (INTCL), Global Cultural Center (GCC), GCC Staff (GCS), Administrator (A), Resources (R), Knowledge (K), Operationalize (O), Larger Campus Community (LCC), Shared Understanding (SU), Financial (FIN)
Appendix C: Observation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Observation</th>
<th>Individuals Present</th>
<th>Summary of Observational Event</th>
<th>Comparison of Observational Events</th>
<th>Summary (Emergent Themes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dialogue and Decision-Making</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication/Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/29/14</td>
<td>6 International Programs Committee Members GCC Assistant Dean 1 English Faculty Member</td>
<td>-English Faculty member proposed a new faculty-led program that would take place in May on campus and in England. -Committee members noted the Greece program on campus is very popular. Some members stated the England program might not be sustainable if the price is too high. -A suggestion made by a committee member was to make the price lower first, and then raise it in the future. -A conversation regarding eliminating some activities was discussed among the committee members as a way to lower costs, therefore making the program more attractive to students. -Following this observation, no definitive decision was reached from this discussion. -It was also found that the Admissions Office plans to utilize a current student that speaks Chinese to attract more international students that speak the Chinese language.</td>
<td>-The GCC Assistant Dean facilitated the first meeting. The Committee Chair, who also serves as the GCC Dean, was not present. -The vote and decision to approve the England program did not occur after the discussion observed at the first meeting. -As a result of limited time and voting members during the first meeting, an official vote to approve the England program proposed by the English Faculty member was held off until the next meeting on 2/25/14. -The GCC Assistant Dean discussed the significance of study abroad experiences incorporating local immersion, therefore gaining intercultural skills; The GCC administrators do not often approve programs that do not have an intercultural component. -The significance of a new ELL position hire was discussed. Faculty members have sought support with reaching students whose first language is not English. -The GCC Assistant Dean distributed the Albani University Spring 2014 Statistics. The statistics document displayed 80 international students were enrolled on campus. One student came from each of the 37 different countries listed. The largest percentages of students were from Vietnam (13) and Canada (13).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30-4:30 pm Albani University Seminar Room Seminar room was located in a building adjacent to the GCC office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ownership/Commitment Monitoring Student Preparation Shared Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2/25/14    | 2:30-4:00pm| Albani University Seminar Room                | Seminar room was located a few floors above the GCC Office in a central building on campus. English Faculty member attended again with a revised budget plan; identified new savings in the areas of travel costs in country; accommodation rates and tips were also readjusted. A committee member noted an Italian film event; he would spread the message both at Albani University and other local institutions. Political Science Faculty member presented his Global Learning course; incorporates travel to Ecuador (possible with external provider funding) and proficiencies linked to intercultural skills; believed students learned more by experiencing the trip with fewer preconceived notions; did not require the students to read anything specific about the country prior (believed students may not read it); a 1 ½ hour orientation to cover logistical details was offered. Political Science Faculty member acknowledged that opting to get a special topics course approved was more effective, in regard to time, than trying to build a new course through the existing infrastructure on campus. Committee Chair, and GCC Dean referenced his role as a liaison to senior administrators on campus multiple times; sending the results of International Program Committee votes to various offices; gaining senior administrator approval for a faculty-led short-term international program timetable that was previously developed. GCC Dean acknowledged that he tasked a GCC staff member to gather risk management information that could be useful for developing and sustaining future programs. It was clear that the financial support needed to implement the Italian film event was supplied by the GCC, since this committee member thanked the GCC Dean for his support.
|            |            |                                               | -The Committee Chair and GCC Dean was not present at the 1/29/14 meeting; at the 2/25/14 meeting he conducted the vote on the England program. -The Political Science Faculty member discussed the Global Learning course program and student experiences in Ecuador as they relate to the Revised Core Curriculum proficiencies; this connects with my observation of the English faculty member and her discussion of course requirements and proposed learning experiences for students. -A budget proposal document for the England program was distributed during the second meeting for committee members to review; a discussion of the dialogue between the GCC Dean and faculty member was shared. |
|            |            |                                               | -The Chair led a vote on the England program. Following the vote, the Chair discussed his close collaboration with this faculty member to work on getting the faculty-led program proposal prepared for review by the committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Preparation</th>
<th>Communication/Dialogue</th>
<th>Faculty Development</th>
<th>Monitoring</th>
<th>Engaging the Campus Community</th>
<th>Ownership/Commitment</th>
<th>Shared Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25/14</td>
<td>2:30-4:00pm</td>
<td>Albani University Seminar Room</td>
<td>Seminar Room was located a few floors above the GCC Office in a central building on campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Some evidence of a shared understanding of when a faculty-led program would need re-approval, such as a travel warning or a significant change in budget; faculty members might be more willing to go through a re-approval process if they could learn from it or improve their existing program.  

- The committee members seemed to express some discord about expecting faculty to engage in such a lengthy process twice; one committee member noted it takes great ownership from faculty to even begin and then follow through with the approval process; there is too much “bureaucratic hassle”  

- A committee member suggested that a faculty-led program could be required to answer five questions every three years to ensure its critical components have remained consistent.  

- Every five years, the program could go under the formal review process regardless of any changes that may have occurred.  

- Following this observation, no definitive decision was reached from this discussion.  

- The Committee Chair acknowledged that the English faculty member was hesitant to keep pushing forward to get her program approved; the Chair mentioned the faculty member was very thankful for his guidance and noted she might not have continued through the process without his support; the Chair stated that it would be up to the faculty member to promote the program.  

- International Programs Committee Chair facilitated a closing discussion with the committee members about the possible criteria needed to reapprove existing faculty-led programs. Based on the dialogue between committee members, the Chair pointed out that if a faculty member changed a few years after the program was approved, they may not be an appropriate choice, therefore, engaging in the re-approval process may be necessary.  

- Following this observation, no definitive decision was reached from this discussion.  

- Detailed insight into some of the ways that Albani University has operationalized internationalization on their campus was gained from observing the second meeting.  

- A closer look into the use of monitoring, as well as the decision-making and dialogue used to implement internationalization, was gained by observing the second meeting.  

- There was a brief discussion during the second meeting about how to keep a program’s effective for student intercultural learning; student evaluations were noted as being important to ask questions such as ‘what didn’t you like about program?’; the need to develop a structured way to ask these questions for future planning was noted; one example of how to approach this concern was shared by a committee member.
## Appendix D: Focus Group Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Summary of Interview with the Focus Group Participant</th>
<th>Comparison to Interview with the GCC Dean</th>
<th>Summary (Emergent Themes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transcript #1</td>
<td><strong>James</strong> GCC Assistant Dean</td>
<td><strong>Example Quote:</strong> “…we're a bit behind the times...internally, of some of our peer institutions...we are not at the level of diversity and acceptance...and cultural understanding that a lot of other campuses are.” “Even [among] the professional staff, nobody [has]...a real background in working with students who aren’t native English speakers...in the past...the solution to that has been for me to go in and do some cultural training with them...[but] that’s only helpful to an extent.”</td>
<td><strong>Example Quote:</strong> “…trying to get your students really prepared now for the global economy of tomorrow and that’s really what will help them...in the workplace...for the next thirty or forty years once they’ve graduated from college...now more so than ever...and that’s probably only going to increase.” “our...job, our focus was...[to]...create a welcome program...be an advocate for them...It was badly needed...[which] made it very difficult for international students to fit in and probably succeed and do well.”</td>
<td>Faculty Development Student Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript #2</td>
<td><strong>Kevin</strong> GCC Study Abroad Advisor</td>
<td><strong>Description and Quotes:</strong> “The curriculum is very Western focused...[not only] with the development of [the] Western [focused] course...but even just [with] other course options. You’re not going to find as many offerings that cover...world events...there is a Global Studies major...[that was] recently...approved as a department. So that’s...one step with the curriculum...” “It’s just a matter of...how to start that...and being able to provide the resources for them to do that...we’ve seen more of an interest in service-learning...so some faculty have partnered with...another office on campus...that’s more...[a]...public community service office...to assist them in planning these programs...but within the field of study abroad, short term programs are really on the rise...[and] that might be an area that continues to develop here.”</td>
<td><strong>Description and Quotes:</strong> “Having some designated center gives it that visibility that didn’t exist before...people really know us and they look to us...that’s been a good development...there is now consciousness in the college.” The International Programs Committee was “…resurrect[ed] and...[decisions are not]...just something I say, but it really becomes policy that’s approved by a group of individuals who...care and come together and work...” “If you could dedicate more resources to it, you’d have many more programs...I think [there aren’t more programs] because we’re not able to provide...support...[faculty] have actually backed out because we don’t give them the logistical support...we’re seeing only about 50%...” done.</td>
<td>Ownership/ Commitment Communication/ Dialogue Campus Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript # 2 (Continued)</td>
<td>Kevin GCC Study Abroad Advisor</td>
<td>Description and Quotes:</td>
<td>Description and Quotes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“get[ting] more faculty out in the world…[so]…they can speak about it more, and try to encourage more students to participate” could benefit the internationalization initiative and prepare students and faculty to embrace diverse cultures.</td>
<td>The GCC has become a “microcosm of the campus,” Gordon noted, “because we have to deal with every office…so in a way, we become like a mini-campus within the campus.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript # 3</th>
<th>Mary GCC Administrative Assistant</th>
<th>Description and Quotes:</th>
<th>Description and Quotes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary pointed out that a majority of the faculty on campus are over the age of 60 and may have more traditional perspectives than newer faculty classes.</td>
<td>“We have a young cohort of faculty now who are much more open…So they're much more easy to work with. We don't have to convert them, they already say well how come we can't do that. They already believe in it. So the issue then becomes, you know, trying to help them do the kind of things they want to do…I like to use the phrase world college and [I hope]…to try to gradually make [Albani University] more and more a world college. So…our students are getting that kind of exposure and the faculty [are] as well…That takes decades probably to have that fully implemented…Whereas now…we're not quite there for sure. But we're starting, we're on a good start.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“We’ve made strides diversifying the campus, but it’s still middle class, white students that come here.”</td>
<td>Sometimes program requests are “not a very good thing as in fitting with the academic mission of the college neither is it sustainable…You have to be a watch dog in a way in a sense you have to…tell people …that’s really not in …the best interests of the School of Business or …our students and so it’s not going…to lead to anything really productive or fruitful.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary noted that one core requirement for students is that they take a Western-focused course, which does not necessarily represent a global perspective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary mentioned, “Even [individuals from]…outside [of the campus] will call this office.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When Mary started at Albani University she noticed that the majority of students traveled to Europe through one provider and that the participation rate was very low. Based on the focus group data and the document review, the GCC currently uses 350 programs, or third party providers overseas in 47 different countries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ownership/ Commitment     | Communication/ Dialogue           | Campus Community Engagement | Shared Goals Monitoring |
Appendix E: Email Correspondence to Focus Group Participants

Hello,

My name is Kimberlee Johnsen-Smith and I am a doctoral student at Northeastern University. You are receiving this email because your professional experience and knowledge on internationalization in higher education can contribute immensely to my research. For my dissertation I am investigating how administrators and global cultural center (GCC) staff understand and operationalize an internationalization initiative across the larger campus community. Therefore, your insight would be invaluable. I would like to arrange a focus group made up of 3-5 GCC staff members to discuss the internationalization initiative, and how it is implemented on your campus.

The focus group will be scheduled in a convenient and private location on campus and will take no longer than 90 minutes. Please know that your responses will not be personally identifiable nor will the institution or the GCC. Your participation is entirely voluntary.

If you are interested in participating in the focus group, please respond to this request by emailing me at johnsen.k@husky.neu.edu or by calling (401) 862-2161. Please respond no later than X date.

Sincerely,

Kimberlee A. Johnsen-Smith
Appendix F: Email Correspondence to Interview Participant

Hello,

My name is Kimberlee Johnson-Smith and I am a doctoral student at Northeastern University. You are receiving this email because your professional experience and knowledge on internationalization in higher education can contribute immensely to my research. For my dissertation I am investigating how administrators and global cultural center (GCC) staff understand and operationalize an internationalization initiative across the larger campus community. Therefore your insight would be invaluable and I would very much appreciate being able to schedule an interview with you. Participation is completely voluntary and confidential.

Interviews will be scheduled in a location and time that is most convenient for you and may take up to 60 minutes, but will last no longer. Please know that your responses will not be personally identifiable nor will the institution or the GCC.

If you are interested in participating in the interview please respond to this request by emailing me at johnsen.k@husky.neu.edu or by calling (401) 862-2161. Please respond no later than X date.

Sincerely,

Kimberlee A. Johnson-Smith
Appendix G: Focus Group Protocol

Research Questions

• How do GCC staff and administrators at one post-secondary institution understand their campus’s internationalization initiative to prepare faculty and students to embrace different cultures?
• What organizational decision-making processes and dialogue have GCC staff and campus administrators engaged in to operationalize their internationalization initiative?
• How have GCC staff and administrators sought to achieve the institution's internationalization initiative throughout the campus community?

Opening Statement

I want to first thank you for taking time from your schedule to meet with me. The next hour and ½ will be invaluable to my doctoral thesis work and to more deeply understand the process of internationalization on US college campuses. Please know that a pseudonym will be used in lieu of your real name and the name of the institution and the GCC will also be changed. A consent form will be provided and reviewed in a few minutes and only with your permission will a tape recorder be used during this focus group in order to accurately capture your input. You may stop or exit the focus group at any time for any reason.

I would like to briefly discuss my interest in conducting this focus group. I am interested in learning more about how GCC staff and administrators at your institution understand and operationalize your internationalization initiative across the larger campus community. The questions I am going to ask are designed to gather detailed information about your experiences with this process. Now, let’s review the consent form so that you can sign it before we begin.

Questions for Interviewees:

Introduction Questions:

• What is the nature of your work?
• Tell me about your experience with internationalization at this institution.
  • How has internationalization changed the nature of your work?
Research Question One:

• In detail, please describe how internationalization has been defined at this institution.

• How are faculty and students prepared to embrace different cultures?

• Describe the international programs that have been developed at this institution.

• Tell me about internationalization resources that are used by faculty and staff.

• How are resources selected before they are implemented on campus?

Research Question Three:

• How is internationalization implemented across the larger campus community?
  
  • Please share a specific experience or example that illustrates how the larger campus community has received internationalization.

• How do faculty members experience internationalization on campus?
  
  • What members of the larger campus community contribute to internationalization?

• Explain what is still needed to fully implement internationalization on campus.
Appendix H: Interview Protocol

Date:
Place:
Time of interview:
Interviewer:
Interviewee name, title, and division:

Research Questions

• How do GCC staff and administrators at one post-secondary institution understand their campus’s internationalization initiative to prepare faculty and students to embrace different cultures?
• What organizational decision-making processes and dialogue have GCC staff and campus administrators engaged in to operationalize their internationalization initiative?
• How have GCC staff and administrators sought to achieve the institution's internationalization initiative throughout the campus community?

Opening Statement

First, I would like to thank you for taking time from your schedule to meet with me. The next hour will be invaluable to my doctoral thesis work and to more deeply understand the process of internationalization on US college campuses. Please know that a pseudonym will be used in lieu of your real name and the name of the institution and the GCC will also be changed. A consent form will be provided and reviewed in a few minutes and only with your permission will a tape recorder be used during the interview in order to accurately capture your input. You may stop or exit the interview at any time for any reason.

I would like to briefly discuss my interest in conducting this interview. I am interested in learning more about how GCC staff and administrators at your institution understand and operationalize your internationalization initiative across the larger campus community. The questions I am going to ask are designed to gather detailed information about your experiences with this process. Now, let’s review the consent form so that you can sign it before we begin.

Questions for Interviewees:

Introduction Questions:

• What is the nature of your work?

• Tell me about your experience with internationalization at this institution.
  • How has internationalization changed the nature of your work?
Research Question One:

- Tell me about internationalization resources that are used by faculty and staff.
- How are resources selected before they are implemented on campus?

Research Question Two:

- Please share a specific experience or example that illustrates the decision-making processes used to implement internationalization.
- Explain how changes are made to existing programs on campus in order to introduce international programs.
  
  - Who are the main internationalization players on campus and what are their roles?
  - Please share a specific experience or example that illustrates how new internationalization initiatives are developed on this campus.

- Who takes ownership of new internationalization initiatives across the campus?

Research Question Three:

- How is internationalization implemented across the larger campus community?

  - Who is responsible for monitoring and evaluating internationalization?

- Explain what is still needed as a result of implementing internationalization on campus.
Appendix I: Informed Consent Form

A Qualitative Study on Implementing Internationalization: How a Post-Secondary Environment Understands and Operationalizes the Process

I. INTRODUCTION

I appreciate you taking the time to participate in this research case study. Before you begin the interview, you must understand the potential risks and benefits. This consent form will serve to provide information you need to know about this case study. As the interviewer, I will answer any questions that you have about my case study. If you sign this consent form, you are agreeing to participate in the case study voluntarily. You may withdraw at any time.

II. PURPOSE

I am a doctoral student at Northeastern University in the College of Professional Studies Doctor of Education Program. I plan to describe how Global Cultural Center (GCC) staff and administrators at one northeastern post-secondary institution in the U.S. make sense of an internationalization initiative on their campus and provide insight as to how they not only understand and operationalize the process, but implement it across the larger campus community.

Below are my research questions:
1. How do GCC staff and administrators at one post-secondary institution understand their campus's internationalization initiative to prepare faculty and students to embrace different cultures?

2. What organizational decision-making processes and dialogue has a GCC staff and administrators engaged in to operationalize the internationalization initiative?

3. How have GCC staff and administrators sought to achieve the institution's internationalization initiative throughout the campus community?

III. PROCEDURES

During this case study up to 10-15 documents will be collected that reflect the internationalization initiative at this institution. An observation of at least one staff meeting will also take place to allow the researcher to write field notes. Next, interviews with 1-2 campus administrators will be conducted for up to sixty minutes in a location that is most comfortable for the participants will take place. A focus group session with 3-5 GCC staff will also be scheduled in a private location on campus for up to ninety minutes. Following the interviews and focus group session an email will be sent with a summary transcription of the focus group and interviews. Each participant will have 14 days to review and comment to ensure clarity and accuracy.

IV. POSSIBLE RISKS

This study does not pose a risk to participants; however there is always a potential risk that data or documents could be stolen or hacked on a computer source. The real names of the participants and the site location will be replaced with pseudonyms, so even if interview data/information was stolen or hacked the participant and location names are protected. This event is very unlikely to occur.

Several steps will be taken during this study to ensure that the rights of all participants are protected. Prior to the interview and completion of the self-study, participants will be informed about the nature of the study and its procedures. They will be given the opportunity to ask...
questions and will be able to participate voluntarily. Participants will be made aware that they can withdraw their participation from this study at any time. The research process will follow all of Northeastern University’s Office of Human Subject Research’s guidelines.

V. POSSIBLE BENEFITS

Although the direct benefits are minimal to the study participants, the description of their experiences with implementing an internationalization initiative on their post-secondary campus may be great to both their institution and other campuses engaging in this process. The findings that derive from the research could benefit their future work in this initiative, and may provide a model of best practices to other institutions as they work toward implementing an internationalization initiative of their own. Both GCC staff and administrators may become aware of their successes and challenges to improve their work in the future.

The research will reveal how the GCC staff and administrators implement internationalization across the larger campus community, so the results can benefit any U.S. post-secondary campus implementing this process.

VI. COSTS

No costs are associated with this case study, or any participant partaking in it.

VII. COMPENSATION

GCC staff and administrators at the post-secondary institution will not be compensated for participating in this case study.

VIII. RIGHT TO WITHDRAW FROM THE STUDY

Your decision to partake in this case study is completely voluntary, and you may decide to exit as a participant at any time for any reason. The data collection for this case study through all activities will be confidential and used for research purposes only.

IX. CONFIDENTIALITY OF RESEARCH RECORDS
Each interview participant will have the opportunity to choose the site location, which is private. The focus group will be scheduled in a private and convenient location on campus. Only the researcher, Kimberlee Johnson-Smith, and her research committee will have access to the data. The data will be used to determine how the GCC staff and administrations understand and operationalize an internationalization initiative, and how it is implemented across the larger campus community.

After each interview, the digital recordings will be transcribed immediately on a professional transcription site (Rev.com). The raw data will be stored on the flash drive and backup drive and stored in a locked safe prior to being validated for their accuracy and clarity. Raw data will also be stored on the password protected computer and website.

All data gathered during the study, including names, will be coded to ensure confidentiality of the participants and their institution. Any identifiable information will be removed; including but not limited to names, dates, and locations. Pseudonyms will be used rather than the participants' real name.

X. QUESTIONS

I am available to answer questions about the procedures and case study at any time. Please contact Kimberlee Johnson-Smith at (401) 862-2161 or by email at johnson.k@husky.neu.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights in this research, you may contact Nan C. Regina, Director, Human Subject Research Protection, 960 Renaissance Park, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115. Tel: 617.373.4588, Email: n.regina@neu.edu. You may call anonymously if you wish.
XI. SIGNATURES

Once this consent form is signed, you as the participant acknowledge that you have fully read this informed consent document presented and reviewed by the researcher. You also confirm that you understand all parts of this informed consent form, and you agree to participate in this case study. Your legal rights are not extinguished after signing this form. Once signed, a copy will be provided to you in order to keep on record that you have agreed to participate.

__________________________
Participant (Print Name)

__________________________
Signature

__________________________
Date

XII. RESEARCHER STATEMENT

As the researcher and doctoral student, I certify that all parts of the case study as represented in this informed consent form have been discussed in full to the individual who has provided a signature above. All questions presented to the researcher have been answered to the satisfaction of each participant.

__________________________
Investigator (Print or electronic type name)

__________________________
Signature

__________________________
Date

APPROVED

NU IRB
VALID THROUGH 12-31-18

Northeastern University - Human Subject Research Protection
Rev. 05/2013
Certificate of Completion

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research certifies that Kimberlee Johnsen successfully completed the NIH Web-based training course "Protecting Human Research Participants".

Date of completion: 03/17/2012

Certification Number: 889804
Appendix K: Phone Call Script to Interview Participant

Hi. My name is Kimberlee Johnson-Smith and I am a doctoral student at Northeastern University. I am following up with you after my initial email because your professional experience and knowledge on internationalization in higher education can contribute immensely to my research and to the larger body of knowledge about the internationalization of U.S. campuses. For my dissertation I am investigating how administrators and staff understand and operationalize an internationalization initiative. Therefore your insight would be invaluable.

I would like to conduct one interview that will be scheduled in a location that is most comfortable for you. The interview will take no longer than approximately 60 minutes. Please know that pseudonyms will be used for you, the institution, and the center. Once the focus group is complete you will receive a transcription summary and have 14 days to review it for accuracy.

If you are interested in participating, or receiving more information about the study, please contact me at (401) 862-2161. Thank you very much for your time and support. I look forward to speaking with you.
Appendix L: Northeastern University IRB Approval
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Date: December 11, 2013
IRB #: CPS13-11-10
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