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ABSTRACT

Campus internationalization is increasingly becoming a profitable strategy used by colleges and universities to counteract the transformative effects of globalization on higher education. As institutions begin to rely more heavily on this dimension of their organizational programming, it becomes essential that they engage in the best possible planning practices to ensure a systematic and sustainable initiative. Failure to plan effectively might derail expectations and compromise institutional viability. The literature investigation of this study suggests that organizational intentionality might be a useful strategy for systemic internationalization planning.

The purpose of this mixed-methods study, therefore, was to determine how organizational intentionality has impacted successful internationalization at public research universities in the United States. This investigation was framed on the three stages of the theory of strategic intent, which postulates the importance of leadership intentionality in creating a vision, committing stakeholders to its accomplishment, and inspiring practice toward realization.

Based on survey results from the study of seven public research universities in the Southeast region of the United States, outcomes of the first, quantitative, investigation indicated varying degrees of contribution of intentionality in the internationalization of
higher education. Findings also uncovered the degree of contribution of intentionality in each of the three stages of strategic intent at each of the institutions.

Secondly, results from the case study investigation conducted at the institution identified in the quantitative investigation as having the highest degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization uncovered strategic planning as the strongest indicator of intentionality vis-à-vis internationalization. Additionally, leadership commitment, resource allocation, vision in planning, structure establishment, employee engagement, competencies establishment, creativity and experimentation, a systematic approach to internationalization, and the development of change agents emerged as best practices of intentionality in internationalization. The analysis of this study shows the association of each of these outcomes with the theory of strategic intent.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of globalization has burst upon the worldwide scene with tremendous strength and impact. It seems to have become a buzz word for rapid change and progress, particularly in the economy. According to Vaira (2004), globalization is an environmental force that significantly impacts and defines today’s postmodern world. Tierney (2004) defined this phenomenon as worldwide economic and technological pressures to increase consumerism and profit-making. Some scholars posited that all aspects of human endeavor are being influenced by this widespread phenomenon (Beerkens, 2003; Burnett & Huisman, 2010; McCabe, 2001; Spring, 2005).

In addition to propelling global advancements of national interests (de Wit, 2002), often legislated through federal policies and transnational regulatory agreements (e.g., the General Agreement on Trade in Service and the North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement), in recent years, these understandings have triggered government expectations for increased efficiencies and effectiveness from colleges and universities (National Governors Association, 2002). Legislations of this nature are becoming increasingly prevalent and are requiring institutions to demonstrate outcomes by means of quantifiable data, an assessment approach mostly associated with private business enterprising (de Wit; Spring, 2005; Tierney, 2004). Performance-based budgeting policies, for example, are drastically shifting states’ already stringent appropriations distributions from enrollment-based to completions-based funding, and continued distributions are contingent upon the ability of institutions to quantify student success (Midwestern Higher Education Compact, 2009; National Governors Association, 2002).
Higher education institutions, especially public colleges and universities, dependent on the environment (particularly on federal and state governments) for resources (Hoy & Miskel, 2008), are now finding themselves grappling with the need to leverage operations in response to a new type of legislative agenda increasing competition for limited resources (National Governors Association, 2002). As a result, institutions are increasingly finding themselves being managed more like businesses (Fain, 2007). In this current environment of legislative and budgetary constraints, colleges and universities are being forced to explore alternative, including global (van der Wende, 2003), approaches to funding to meet actual and potential budget shortfalls (Bray, 2001; Fain; Johnstone, 2001; Livingston, 2005; Woodhall, 2001). Such tactics include offering online courses, recruiting international students, opening branch campuses in other countries, privatizing services, and tightening fiscal management (Johnstone; Livingston; van der Wende).

The U.S. government’s managerialistic approach to requiring excellence from colleges and universities (Vaira, 2004) is engendering market economics in higher education and intensifying competition among institutions. Consequently, these institutions actively seek to innovate to sustain viability (Clark, 1998) and increasingly pursue more entrepreneurial operational models (Couturier, 2005; Lyall & Sell, 2006). While politicians contend that the objective is to raise national academic achievement to assert and sustain the country’s international educational competitiveness and prominence (Hoy & Miskel, 2008), institutions feel overburdened by ever increasing government accountability requirements in such areas as program and accreditation reviews, data submissions, financial aid audits, and trustee oversight (National Governors
In this new dimension of post-secondary education, colleges and universities are experiencing unprecedented performative and constitutive changes influencing institutional values (Barnett, 2005), and educational researchers have cautioned that higher education is being forced into a state of commercialization (Couturier, 2005; Johnstone, 2001; Lyall & Sell, 2006; van der Wende, 2003). In a borderless world driven by the priority of profit-making, the traditional notion of the American society providing education to its citizenry as a public good is, therefore, spiraling into education being offered as an international commodity (Johnstone).

Consequently, as in the corporate arena, American higher education institutions have begun promoting the exportation of the product of education beyond national geographic borders for the sake of their own sustainability, economic competitiveness, and relevance in the marketplace. At the same time, the Government’s national security interest of spreading democracy globally is also exercising considerable influence on the operations of institutions (de Wit, 2002; Spring, 2005), and growing international demand for American higher education is expanding academic mobility (Altbach, 2004). Additionally, forces of globalization triggered by advances in technology, communications, and transportation are severely impacting the technical core of institutions and dictating instructional content, determining delivery mode, and constricting academic support services (Johnstone, 2001; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Spring; Tierney, 2004; Vaira, 2004).

Given this configuration of inescapable circumstances, higher education institutions are employing different strategies in their attempt to overcome the pressures
of globalization. According to Bruce (2009), however, “Most colleges and universities continue to struggle to find a place in the globalized environment” (p. 4). One solution proposed for addressing the new accountabilities is the diversification of sources of income, for which reason campus internationalization opportunities have surfaced as a viable strategy (de Wit, 2002).

Scholars have concurred that the term “internationalization” involves a large scope of services and activities conducted at, and by, colleges and universities to respond to the pressures of globalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Bruce, 2009; Burnett & Huisman, 2010; de Wit, 2002; Knight, 2004, 2008; Schoorman, 1999; Teichler, 1999; van der Wende, 1997). Consequently, the internationalization of higher education presents itself as a tremendous strategy to be used by colleges and universities to meet the challenges of globalization (de Wit), particularly the possibility of leveraging additional funding through international capacity building (van der Wende, 2003).

Internationalization activities range from the recruitment of foreign students to attend universities in the United States to opening branch campuses of American universities in other countries (Luijten-Lub, van der Wende, & Huisman, 2005). These engagements are the products of institutional endeavors ranging from random to systemic strategy (Burnett & Huisman, 2010). For this study, internationalization will be used as the preferred term to refer to all aspects of college and university programming that deal with international education in the areas of teaching, research, and service to successfully engage in and meet the challenges of globalization.

However colleges and universities choose to accomplish campus internationalization programming, Bruce (2009) cautioned that, to ensure a successful
undertaking, institutions will need to be intentional and systematic in their actions. While a fair amount of literature exits on the internationalization of higher education, there is a noticeable gap in research regarding strategies by colleges and universities to intentionally move their campuses from the absence of, or ad hoc (random), internationalization to systematic internationalization processes. This study, therefore, sought to identify strategies used by higher education institutions to intentionally internationalize their campuses in strategic response to the challenges of globalization.

Statement of the Problem

As U.S. higher education institutions seek to leverage the impact of globalization on education, strive to meet public accountabilities and expectations for increased efficiencies and effectiveness in educational deliverables, and endeavor to sustain government interests nationally and internationally, efforts have increasingly led to the professionalization of internationalization at colleges and universities. The process of campus internationalization has become an area of tremendous interest to educational scholars and practitioners who seek to analyze, explain, propose, and implement optimized strategy for this engagement. Research has revealed the benefits of internationalization to institutional capacity building and to campus prestige, and has proposed several models and approaches to steer its effective implementation.

Notwithstanding the number of studies supporting the importance of a methodical approach to internationalization to ensure systemic implementation, many colleges and universities still grapple with how to institutionalize an effective international education program. The level of strategic internationalization responses by institutions continues to range from ad hoc engagements to highly-strategized organizational endeavors, and many
institutions approach the process without any strategic planning whatsoever.

While research has provided a fair amount of information on the processes to internationalize college campuses, the indicators of internationalization, and the outcomes and effects of internationalization efforts, it has left under-examined the role of organizational intentionality in internationalization planning. This study sought to research this gap in the literature by examining this shortcoming through the lens of the strategic intent theory.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

The purpose of this study was to determine how organizational intentionality has impacted successful internationalization at public research universities in the United States. These universities have been the most successful at attracting foreign students; in fact, the top 20 institutions enrolling 16% of all international students studying in colleges and universities in the United States in 2009/2010 were research universities, 14 of which were public universities (Institute of International Education, 2010b).

The purpose of this study was accomplished by analyzing the impact of strategic intent in the processes of internationalization at these institutions. Additionally, the purpose of this study was accomplished by examining internationalization through a variety of planning, implementation, and sustainability indicators, extracted from the literature research, at eight public research higher education institutions in the Southeast region of the United States (see Appendix A).

Ultimately, it is the expectation of the researcher that findings in this investigation might offer insights into the role of organizational intentionality in strategically internationalizing public research universities. In addition, the researcher sought to
identify best practices, based on the theory of strategic intent, at a public research university that had been notably successful in its internationalization vis-à-vis intentionality. Therefore, this study sought to answer the overarching question: What is the degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization at the eight public research universities in the Southeast region of the United States?

This question was addressed by the following sub-questions:

1. What is the strongest indicator of intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university?
2. What are best practices relative to intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university?

**Conceptual Framework**

Scholars have suggested that organizational intentionality plays an important role in enabling systemic implementation of internationalization (Bruce, 2009; Burnett & Huisman, 2010; Davies, 2001; de Wit, 2002; Knight, 2008). However, this strategy is not a prominent feature in existing models and approaches to internationalization. In fact, while existing research conceptualizes internationalization as a process of ongoing and continuous effort (Knight, 2004; Schoorman, 1999), it leaves unexamined the role of governance as “capability builders” (Bruce, 2009, p. 6). Of particular interest to this study was that inasmuch as the literature has informed that higher education institutions employ different strategies with varying degrees of commitment to internationalize (Siaya & Hayward, 2003), the research presented shortcomings in theory describing the impact of leadership intentionality.

In this literature investigation only one theory surfaced as a theoretical framework
to guide organizational planning through intentionality, which is the theory of strategic intent. This study, therefore, framed systemic internationalization as the outcome of organizational leadership successfully engaging the theory of strategic intent (see Figure 1.1).

![Research Conceptual Framework](image)

**Figure 1.1** Research Conceptual Framework

**Importance of the Study**

Aware of its importance to national interests, over the years the American government has consistently supported the internationalization of higher education through policy enactments, grant funding, and agreements with private enterprises and international entities, including governments. This level of support has recently become of particular significance at a time when organizational interdependence is redefining the perspectives of institutions and individuals within the global society, and reshaping
relationships among societies. With this growing need to become more internationally-focused, colleges and universities are progressively investing more time and resources into modifying their missions and restructuring operations to promote the internationalization agenda on their campuses.

While studies in higher education internationalization have provided organizational strategies and frameworks regarding best practices for internationalizing institutions, the study of organizational intentionality as a strategy has been neglected in research. Therefore, the significance of intentionality as a propeller of campus internationalization is unclear. This study examined the degree of contribution of organizational intentionality to public research universities in allowing them to move from ad hoc (or none) to systematic internationalization implementation.

Given the current relevance of the issue of higher education internationalization, the outcomes of this study will have theoretical and practical implications for a spectrum of entities in higher education and for the American society. In addition to strengthening the body of literature, outcomes should provide valuable insights to higher education practitioners, particularly those involved in international education decision making, regarding optimizing organizational intentionality to lead change, especially in systematizing internationalization. Institutions participating in this investigation will be interested in ascertaining whether organizational intentionality played a significant role in their internationalization efforts. Furthermore, to the public research universities, the results of this research should enhance their strategies in meeting government expectations for them to advance national interests of spreading democracy worldwide, to sustain the country’s global educational prominence, and to prepare citizens to function
proficiently in an increasingly pluralistic society.

Finally, it is the anticipation of the researcher that this study will elucidate the influence of organizational intentionality as a value added tactic in advancing internationalization at higher education institutions throughout the United States, and that outcomes would moreover serve to develop improved and more comprehensive institutional planning strategy. In addition to providing a basis for further research, findings in this investigation might also afford insight to organizations and associations that support professional development and increased efficiencies related to internationalization efforts at colleges and universities. Among these agencies are the following: NAFSA: Association of International Educators; the American Council on Education (ACE); the Institute of International Education (IIE); the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA); the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U); and the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC).

As a senior enrollment management officer in higher education, the results of this study are of major importance to the researcher as they will amplify the researcher’s knowledge scope and provide additional resources for leveraging increased recruitment, enrollment, and funding streams by means of international capacity building on campus.

**Procedures**

The research perspective that guided this investigation was a mixed methods approach. This approach was most appropriate for this study because multiple sources of evidence were used to examine a phenomenon in its real-life context (Creswell, 2009; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998; Yin, 2009). The researcher employed a sequential
explanatory design, consisting of two distinct research phases (Creswell; Glatthorn & Joyner, 2005), qualitative primary/quantitative first (quan-QUAL) (Morgan, 1998), to answer the research questions. The rationale for using this approach is that the results of the quantitative investigation would inform the qualitative investigation.

The population of study for the quantitative investigation was a senior international education officer at each of the eight public universities in the Southeast region of the United States. Seven members of this population participated in this phase of the research; one participant did not complete and return the survey despite several attempts by the researcher requesting participation.

In the ensuing qualitative phase of the investigation, purposeful sampling (Creswell, 2009) was used to select one of the institutions from within the population at which to conduct a case study. This was the university which the quantitative investigation showed as having the highest degree of intentionality in its internationalization planning. The rationale for selecting this sample was because it was considered information rich (Creswell; Patton, 2002) for having experienced the phenomenon of this study. Finally, representative sampling was used to select a range of officers involved in international education at the elected university to participate in the case study (Creswell).

Data were collected from two sources. First, the “Organizational Intentionality in Campus Internationalization Survey” (see Appendix B) was used for the quantitative investigation. Subsequently, during the qualitative investigation, four data sets, including a structured interview questionnaire (Creswell, 2009), was used to realize the case study. To conduct the case study, the researcher visited the university for two days for data
collection. Survey data were analyzed following descriptive statistical procedures to determine the degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization at each of the universities of the population. Data obtained in the interview transcriptions were coded and analyzed to ascertain the highest indicator and best practices of intentionality in campus internationalization. Field observations, and document and audio-visual reviews substantiated interview outcomes.

**Limitations & Delimitations**

This study was restricted by limitations and delimitations. The first limitation was that research on the topic of internationalization of higher education as a strategic response to the phenomenon of globalization was relatively new. Globalization itself had only gained prominence over the last two decades, most specifically just before the turn of the century.

Secondly, while the need for intentionality in organizational planning processes had been promoted, or alluded to, in the studies supporting this investigation, the researcher did not find in research any instruments that measured intentionality. This limitation was addressed by generating a data set specific for this study based on the postulations of the theory of strategic intent and the qualitative indicators of internationalization uncovered in this literature investigation. As a result, the outcomes of this study may not be transferable beyond the sample of study. However, the researcher has provided detailed descriptions of the participants and context of the study so that readers can make independent judgments concerning the transferability of results.

The third limitation affecting this research was the use of strategic intent as the conceptual framework for the study. This theory is a business concept which, based on
this literature investigation, had not previously been applied to higher education.

Regarding the delimitations of this study, first, while internationalization spans a gamut of indicators, successful internationalization was narrowly defined in this study to represent institutions with an enrollment of at least 1% of foreign students. Inasmuch as this criterion was aligned with the U.S. News & World Report’s (2010) survey results, which indicated that 78% of the research universities in the United States reported that at least 1% of their undergraduate student population was comprised of international students, enrollment of foreign students is only one indicator of internationalization. However, because enrollment of foreign students is generally accepted throughout the Academy as the most important indicator of campus internationalization, the researcher assumed that it was a valid indicator of successful internationalization.

The second delimitation of this study was that, while there are 175 public research universities in the U.S. (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, 2010), only eight comprised the population of this research, the reason being that they fell into the definition of “purposeful sampling” used for this study.

The narrow definition of “successful internationalization” and confinement of the study to public research universities through purposeful sampling, therefore, were delimitations of this study that minimize its transferability. However, the researcher has provided rich, thick descriptions and made liberal use of direct quotes so the reader can make a determination of transferability.

The researcher was also concerned that the survey instrument would indeed measure intentionality in internationalization, and sought to counteract this apprehension by having the survey piloted by the Assistant Vice President of International Studies at
Georgia Southern University. The researcher was also concerned that participation rates in the surveys and interviews, and limited availability of documents at the case study institution might further limit the investigation, and sought to overcome this limitation by establishing collegial contact with participants.

**Definitions of Terms**

*Ad Hoc Internationalization* – Ad hoc internationalization was the same as random internationalization. This was defined as marginal or low development of internationalization at a college or university. It was relatively unsystematic (Davies, 2001).

*Globalization* – Globalization was worldwide interconnectedness, interdependence, and effect resulting from transnational economic and technological forces working arduously to create, develop, promote, make accessible, and provide goods and services to consumers.

*Intentional Internationalization* - For this study, intentional internationalization is an approach to campus internationalization in which organizational strategy targeting campus internationalization was correlated to the theory of strategic intent in the form of a percentage.

*Internationalization* - For this study, internationalization was used as the preferred term to refer to all aspects of college and university programming that deal with international education in the areas of teaching, research, and service to successfully engage in and meet the challenges of globalization.

*Public Research Universities* – Public research universities were U.S. universities classified by the Carnegie Foundation as doctoral/research universities (Carnegie
Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, 2010). Of the 4,861 institutions of higher education in the U.S. (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2009), 296 universities are classified as research universities; of these, 175 were public (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning).

Strategic Intent – Strategic intent was a theoretical framework used to guide organizational planning that aligns all organizational efforts with the achievement of a prime-valued challenging goal. At the core of strategic intent were leadership vision and support, total commitment of all stakeholders, innovation in the development of core competencies, shared responsibility and flexibility at all levels within the organization, and organizational competitiveness and enthusiasm.

Successful Internationalization - For the purpose of this study, successful internationalization was based on international student enrollment, and was defined as a research university at which at least 1% of its student enrollment in the academic years 2009/2010 or 2010/2011 was comprised of international students. This criterion was aligned with the U.S. News & World Report’s survey results, which indicated that 78% of the research universities in the United States reported that at least 1% of their undergraduate student population was comprised of international students (U.S. News & World Report, 2010). Appendix A shows the percentage of international student enrollment at the universities corresponding to the research sample of this investigation. The names of the universities were substituted for the nomenclature SEU (Southeast University) 1 through 8.
**Systematic Internationalization** – Systematic internationalization was extensive or considerable development of internationalization at a college or university. It was well, and explicitly, supported and organized (Davies, 2001).

**Systemic Internationalization** – Systemic internationalization was a high level of sustainable systematization of internationalization at colleges and universities (Burnett & Huisman, 2010).

**Chapter Summary**

Campus internationalization is increasingly becoming a profitable strategy used by colleges and universities to counteract the transformative effects of globalization on higher education. As institutions begin to rely more heavily on this dimension of their organizational programming, it becomes essential that they engage in the best possible planning practices to ensure a systematic and sustainable initiative. Failure to plan effectively might derail expectations and compromise institutional viability. This literature investigation suggests that organizational intentionality might be a useful strategy for systemic internationalization planning.

The purpose of this mixed-methods study was to determine how organizational intentionality has impacted successful internationalization at public research universities in the United States. This study surveyed and interviewed international education officials at eight public research universities in the Southeast region of the United States. Outcomes of the study will strengthen the body of literature and provide valuable insight to higher education practitioners regarding the utilization of the strategy of organizational intentionality to plan for successful internationalization and to lead institutional change.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review delves into an understanding of globalization as a phenomenon that increasingly impacts higher education, and seeks to explain how colleges and universities engage in internationalization efforts to strategically respond to the pressures of globalization. The section begins with an examination of globalization and its implications for campus internationalization. Then, the review focuses on the specific role of internationalization in higher education, including a historical account of international education in the United States leading into internationalization becoming an agent of change and effectiveness in higher education. Subsequently, the study frames internationalization as a strategic process (Melin, 1992), identifies the different strategies utilized to internationalize campuses, and focuses specifically on the widely-recognized process approach to internationalization.

While the literature emphasized the importance of intentionality in successful internationalization planning, this activity was unaccounted for in the several models and approaches to internationalization, and is, therefore, conceived as a the gap in the literature. In pursuit of researching the gap in the literature review, the section ends with the presentation of theory to frame the role of intentionality in efforts to internationalize campuses.

Definition of Globalization

Even as researchers and scholars have proposed differences in the connotations of internationalization and globalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Beerkens, 2003; Bernstein & Cashore, 2000; Brustein, 2007; Knight, 2002, 2008; Marginson & Roaades,
Globalization itself is multifaceted and complex phenomenon and its influence far-reaching (Beerkens, 2003; Law, 2004; Vaira, 2004). Beerkens emphasized that the very word itself means “all-inclusive” (p. 137), and, according to Vaira, this fluid concept “is the main structural feature of the contemporary world” (p. 484). Furthermore, Knight (2008) declared, “It dominates the minds of policymakers, academics, and professionals/practitioners no matter what their sector or discipline” (p. 4).

Given its scope and impact, it has not been easy for scholars to interpret globalization, for which reason a variety of definitions have evolved; its meaning is variable (Burnett & Huisman, 2010), depending mostly on which of its aspects is being targeted. Notwithstanding, scholars are now beginning to coincide on the definition of this concept, especially when looking at it through the lens of its impact on higher education (Burnett & Huisman), and specifically to the internationalization of higher education.

Globalization has been conceptualized as the following: supra-territorial relations, such as trans-border exchanges (Scholte, 2000); increasing convergence and interdependence across societies (Burnett & Huisman, 2010); the collusion of worldwide
interconnectedness (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, & Perraton, 1999); increase in the flow of people, culture, ideas, values, knowledge, technology, and economy across borders (Knight, 2008); worldwide borderless social relations (Tierney, 2004); resulting standardization across cultures due to the dispersion of technology, migration, and education around the world (McCabe, 2001); and, a complex and multifaceted process which includes many heterogeneous forces operating at many different levels and resulting in many different effects (Burnett & Huisman). The common thread in these assertions is worldwide interconnectedness, interdependence, and effect; for which reason, living in a global world is not avoidable--everyone is affected by the phenomenon of globalization.

**Impact of Globalization on Higher Education**

Globalization is becoming increasingly meaningful to societies, including traditionally closed societies, and to the economic and political structures in the world as they become more and more intersected by forces of modernization such as technology, communications, and transportation (Knight, 2008; McCabe, 2001). Factored into these influencers are the current dominance of the knowledge society, increased labor mobility worldwide, greater promotions of the market economy and trade liberalization, and decreased public funding for education (Knight).

As open systems, educational institutions are tremendously and constantly influenced by their external environment; more significantly, their very survival is dependent on the environmental elements from which they acquire resources and into which they export their products (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Consequently, interdependence of colleges and universities with the environment is critical, and globalization surfaces as
one of those environmental factors that has a very profound impact on higher education institutions (Spring, 2005). This is particularly evident in public colleges and universities, which are embedded in nation-state decisions and shaped by public decisions (Vaira, 2004).

Forces of globalization, such as the outcomes (e.g., General Agreement on Trade in Services; North American Free Trade Agreement; and, Mercosur) of interactions between international organizations (e.g., the World Bank; the International Monetary Fund; the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; and, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization), intergovernmental organizations (e.g., the European Union, African Union, Asia Pacific Economic Council, and Caribbean Community and Common Market), and nongovernmental organizations (e.g., human rights education groups) are influencing nation-state decision making as these forces develop global laws, agree on transnational trade, and sponsor educational causes (Altbach, 2009; Spring, 2005).

A major impact on higher education resulting from this level of influence is that public officials in the United States are increasingly urging colleges and universities to become more efficient and to quantify educational productivity in areas such as quality of education, social equity, efficiency in cost management, and enrollment outcomes; something postsecondary institutions had never had to do in almost four centuries of American higher education history. Vaira (2004) described this impact as “the trend toward a more entrepreneurial and managerialist pattern of organizational change” (p. 488).

This new paradigm of managing higher education is being used to demand
excellence, and, as such, establish a framework for competition among institutions. This is especially significant to public campuses as appropriations are increasingly becoming tied to outcomes. According to Tierney (2004), “Whereas the state once had the role of protecting those who were not powerful and enabling them to gain access to voice, in a globalized system, the power of the state evaporates” (p. 14). Rivzi and Lingard (2000) declared that globalization would accentuate social divides and that many would be victimized by the global economy. Opponents to this level of public intrusion are concerned that this new market economics scenario will discourage many from pursuing higher learning, and threaten access and the public good of higher education. Johnstone (2001), for example, asserted, “The political inclination is to seek private solutions to what used to be viewed as public problems” (p. 4).

The movement toward decentralization (and ultimately privatization) is a direct consequence of globalization (Spring, 2005). Decentralization and privatization are continuously accelerating as institutions providing public good, such as universities, find themselves increasingly constrained by limited budgets and begin looking for opportunities to supplement shortfalls. Vaira (2004) pointed out that, as it diminishes its appropriations to higher education institutions, the government will also reduce its regulative role to one that is more of an evaluative function.

With public appropriations continuing to decrease, colleges and universities are increasingly leaning toward a market approach for sustainability (Clark, 1998; Knight, 2008; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). As a consequence of decreased government control, the entrepreneurial model is taking root (Vaira, 2004), and privatization and competition are growing out of it. Woodhall (2001), referencing the 2001 World Bank Task Force
Report, stated, “The University of Makerere in Uganda moved from a situation where none of its students paid fees to one where seventy percent do” (p. 1). Universities in India, Hong Kong, China, and Singapore have also begun instituting and raising student fees as a solution to budget shortfalls (Bray, 2001).

Private colleges, therefore, are beginning to play a stronger role in meeting the demand for higher education and in relieving the public burden of providing it, and these institutions are increasing considerably throughout the world. Woodhall (2001) informed that private higher education is becoming very prevalent (and in some cases even dramatic) in Africa and Asia as countries such as Kenya, Mozambique, Uganda, Zimbabwe, China, Indonesia, Thailand, and Vietnam have recently established private universities. The same is being seen in many European transition economies. Tierney (2004) reported that for-profit education is the fastest growing sector of postsecondary education, especially as certifications for specific skills (particularly technological competencies) are becoming increasingly required by businesses for employment and professional development.

In the age of globalization, with budget cuts prevailing on the one hand and with privatization of education looming as a solution on the other, scholars of public higher education finance are offering strategies to institutions on how to deal with dwindling budgets (Fain, 2007; Johnstone, 2001, 2005; Schmidtlein, 2001; Winston, 2001; Woodhall, 2001). Such strategies include decreasing their operational costs by offering more distance education and online courses, eliminating non-productive programs and services, reducing consumables, engaging in cost-sharing with other institutions and companies, and tightening fiscal management (Johnstone). Institutions are also exploring
alternative sources of funding, such as social foundations, private corporate sponsorship, commercialization of research, and trans-border educational enterprising, which includes increased recruitment of international students (Knight, 2008).

Slaughter and Leslie (1997) stated that globalization is changing the structure of academic work. In addition to corporate training and extension courses as potential profit centers, privatization of selected university services is also presented as a tactical way to cut operational costs (Livingston, 2005). Fain (2007) suggested that colleges and universities should run themselves more like businesses. Noticeably, all of these approaches are geared toward the administration of higher education institutions like private business corporations. Stromquist (2007) stressed that, as businesses and educational institutions develop strong links with each other, the tendency is for the education environment to imitate the business environment. Magrath (2000) emphasized, “If the globalization evident in business, communication, and finance is inevitable, how can universities that have provided so much of the intellectual capital for these developments not be affected--and indeed change themselves” (p. 257).

The problem for the United States, where the provision of education as a public good is exercised by the states, is that in a now borderless world, transnational economies (with priorities of profit making over public good) are increasingly driving the action. Knight (2008) declared that the viewpoint of some individuals is that the only way to preserve education as a public good will be for institutions to pursue market-oriented funding over traditional public funding. Consequently, state policies related to education are taking on the appearance of profit-driven corporations, and, as a result, privatization of the public good of education is fast becoming more prevalent (Tierney, 2004).
As the commercialization of higher education continues to grow and expand, privatization is leading into increasing competition among institutions (Couturier, 2005; Lyall & Sell, 2006). Colleges and universities are competing for similar pools of students, competent faculty, diminishing public funds, research grants, private donations, prestige, and market share in their entrepreneurial ventures (Couturier). Of the 4,861 higher education institutions in the United States, 1,347 (28%) are private for-profit. Of the remaining 72%, 1,728 (36%) are private non-profit, and the other 1,786 (36%) are public (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2009). Therefore, as it stands, almost two-thirds of the colleges and universities in the United States are private.

Traditionally, competition in the higher education landscape has been mostly among private for-profit colleges and universities. Recently, however, as these institutions have increased in number, many are coming together to form conglomerates with the objective of augmenting market share, both nationally and internationally, particularly through segmentation. On the other hand, with funding diminishing for public institutions, they too are beginning to compete ever more increasingly with the private institutions in an even larger scale, especially since the arena has now become the global stage (Bruce, 2009).

Globalization dynamics linked to economic and technological factors, and ranging from transnational agreements to institutional enterprising, are stimulating responses from colleges and universities, known collectively as “internationalization” (Stromquist, 2007). Given the divergent ways in which globalization is impacting higher education, colleges and universities are increasingly embracing internationalization as a centralized focus to coordinate institutional responses to global challenges (Childress, 2009).
Altbach and Knight (2007) noted that internationalization is comprised of policies and practices undertaken by educational institutions to cope with the global academic environment. The objective of institutions engaged in internationalization, therefore, is to proactively and strategically develop and increase competencies and efficiencies that allow them to convert the pressures of globalization into opportunities to build institutional capacity. Altbach and Knight referred to the internationalization tactic as coping with globalization and reaping its benefits.

One of the most prominent internationalization activities on college campuses is international student recruitment. This effort is becoming increasingly intensified (Stromquist, 2007). Burnett and Huisman (2010) found that, not only did international student recruitment rank highest in importance relative to institutional responses to globalization, but that revenue generation ranked very high among the reasons for recruiting international students. Altbach and Knight (2007) highlighted that a key motive for internationalization is financial. NASFA: Association of International Educators (2011b) reported that foreign students contributed $18.8 billion to the U.S. economy during academic year 2009-2010. According to Stromquist, “Business schools throughout the U.S. are indeed making significant efforts to reach overseas students” (p. 90), and colleges and universities are establishing overseas recruitment operations to increase marketing efforts to international students. Stromquist described this current innovative strategy of internationalization of student recruitment as “the new form of entrepreneurism” (p. 92).

Van der Wende (2003) also pointed out that colleges and universities seek to offset budget gaps by exploring new resources globally. As a result, many institutions of
higher education in developed countries, especially the United States, have strengthened their international recruitment efforts by opening branch campuses in other countries, including underdeveloped countries, where the demand is great for the American brand of higher education, or where national supply is constrained by limited capabilities. The current literature investigation suggested that these strategic ventures intensify the need for intentional internationalization planning at these entrepreneurial institutions (Bruce, 2009; Burnett & Huisman, 2010; Goodin, 1996).

Globalization is also impacting what knowledge is needed and taught in society, and advances in technology are increasing knowledge production and demand (Vaira, 2004). The flow of communications through mass media is augmenting—at unprecedented rates and volume—the information transmitted across the world geography, and this information is having a tremendous effect on the lives of individuals. As a result, there is heightened awareness and interest in every society concerning trans-border events. Consequently, the role of the school in transmitting national culture is being severely undermined by technology and mass media’s incursions into societies and their creation of hybrid cultures (Spring, 2005).

A corollary of the influence of mass media is its confluence with advances in transportation resulting in increased mobility of individuals across borders, and mass migration of peoples throughout the world, many of whom are seeking higher education, particularly in the United States. As a result of the increased presence of international students on U.S college campuses, issues of multiculturalism and multilingualism are becoming increasingly prevalent (Spring 2005). As such, these features have become of added importance to campus internationalization efforts by, particularly, creating
pressure to hire faculty from abroad (Stromquist, 2007), or faculty otherwise competent in these areas, and, therefore, capable of “supporting global training opportunities” (Olsen & Kroeger, 2001, p. 133).

Globalization, therefore, has a tremendous impact on the operations of colleges and universities (Vaira, 2004). As it reshapes cultures and the diversity debate, it is forcing the immediate need for curricular and support services changes at institutions of higher education (Tierney, 2004), which are being faced with the need to accommodate the various cultures on their campuses (de Wit, 2002). As a result, campus internationalization efforts are increasingly required to become more strategized (Knight, 2008), which require a great deal of intentional planning. The planning urgency is moreover exacerbated by the immediacy of new and unprecedented types of accountability requirements placed upon the institutions, particularly by legislatures, accrediting agencies, the business community, and citizens.

**Pressures of Institutional Accountability**

In pursuit of global competency, nation-states are increasingly exerting pressure on higher education by incorporating global imperatives in their higher education policies (Vaira, 2004). Scholars of higher education internationalization have sustained that global forces are pushing in the direction of decreased public funding, rising operational costs, and increased accountability and competition for public institutions, including colleges and universities (Alexander, 2000; Knight, 2008; Vaira). In today’s landscape of constrained finances and increased public concern regarding a nation’s global competitive edge, governments are linking the quality of their education to accountability measures (de Wit, 2002).
The United States government, for example, is incorporating into its aid approach quality academic outcomes as an accountability contingency; it is being called “performance-based budgeting” (Midwestern Higher Education Compact, 2009; National Governors Association, 2002). Hoy and Miskel (2008) warned that, because of their concern for the country’s competitiveness in the world, politicians, business groups, and citizens are demanding high academic achievement outcomes from the U.S. education system.

In addition to these stakeholders’ interests in the knowledge products of education, accountability today, being a prevalent element in public policy, agency accreditation, and institutional assessments, is very much associated with opportunities to diversify sources of income. The internationalization of higher education presents itself as one of those opportunities; as such, the development of internationalization quality review instruments is of relevance to the scholars of this process (de Wit, 2002).

As colleges and universities contemplate how to steer internal policies, practices, administrative structures, and innovative financing toward meeting government expectations while leveraging opportunity, they will need to attend more closely to issues they may have previously taken for granted. These issues include leveraging quality and access; public satisfaction with higher public education; and, the viability of their current business procedures (Stampen & Layzell, 2001).

**Knowledge Society**

As the forces of globalization increasingly stimulate entrepreneurialism in higher education, this new administrative archetype is increasingly steering the discourse regarding the knowledge needed in society (Vaira, 2004). In this environment, scholars
agree that the new paradigm for higher education is the production of innovative knowledge, not in response to its value as a societal good, but rather as a response to the societal good of economic competitiveness and development (Delanty, 2001; Gumport, 2000; Vaira). Higher education institutions increasingly affirm the need to prepare students to be internationally competent so that they can function professionally in more and more culturally diverse settings (Knight, 2008), and be more competitive in international markets (Stromquist, 2007).

In addition to stimulating economic competitiveness, international collaboration among nations and institutions are essential to solving a gamut of global problems, such as environmental, health, and crime-related issues. For this reason, steering research and knowledge production toward an international dimension has become a key rationale for internationalization higher education (Knight, 2004), and a major propeller of the knowledge society.

As institutions of higher learning internationalize their campuses, in part, in response to knowledge society needs, increasing and pervasive use of information and communication technologies is resulting in the development of virtual universities. A student from anywhere in the world can attend classes at these universities, obtain academic support services, conduct research, and earn a degree without leaving the confines of his or her own home (Vaira, 2004). Knight (2008) sustained, “Information and communication technologies, especially the internet has highlighted the need for deeper knowledge and understanding of the world and has provided new opportunities for gaining that understanding” (p. 29).

The concept of knowledge society has emerged, therefore, from the impact of the
economic and technological forces of globalization on higher education teaching and research. The outcome of this modern-day dynamic is the pace at which knowledge is accelerating. Consequently, the educational delivery paradigm of colleges and universities is increasingly shifting from the exclusive production and dissemination of knowledge to a pattern of technological transfer of knowledge. This phenomenon has become known as the “knowledge society” (de Wit, 2002), a dynamic, uncontested, contemporary mechanism increasing worldwide capacity to address the intricacies and nuances of global citizenship and multiculturalism.

**Preparation for Global Citizenship and Multicultural Competence**

Globalization and internationalization are redefining the context of citizenship by blurring the geographical dimensions of nation-states, particularly through their capacity to inescapably interconnect individuals and societies and make them interdependent in unprecedented manner and pace. Individuals around the world are, therefore, becoming increasingly more exposed to the ways of life of others and their societies. This level of international awareness and interconnectedness is engineering increased global consciousness, solidarity, and engagement, and propelling global citizenship (Gacel-Avila, 2005). According to Capalbo (2011), “Globalization has created the need for global citizens that have a keen awareness of the political, economic, social, and environmental concerns of our time” (para. 1).

McIntosh (2005) defined global citizenship as the ability to see oneself as part of the world, and to understand and still see plurality while comparing and contrasting diversities in world realities and languages. Moreover, it is the comprehension that there is method to power relations, and that one needs to balance one’s reality with the realities
outside of one’s self. Ultimately, it is important to remain true to the positive values of global society development and multicultural tolerance (McIntosh).

On the other hand, however, since globalization has exposed the cultural differences among societies, revealed inequalities among nations, and evidenced exclusion, marginalization, and exploitation, global citizenship has also configured itself as advocacy for prompt intervention in eliminating the negative impacts of prejudice, intolerance, and injustice in the world society (Gacel-Avila, 2005). Capalbo (2001) summarized that, in addition to understanding and caring about global issues, the global citizen also empathizes with the issues. Furthermore, Friedman (2000) highlighted that in a globalized world, which is simultaneously wired into networks, individuals are super-empowered and are able to now have direct and immediate influence on economic and political systems, “unmediated by a state” (p. 33).

In this context of global citizenship, higher education institutions find themselves increasingly trying to integrate international components into their curriculum to meet students’ expectations for developing global competencies so that they can be successful in a world society in which they share common trans-border interests with others (Capalbo, 2011; Gacel-Avila, 2005). At any given point in time, besides countless numbers of scholars, degrees, and universities, there are currently 2.5 million students moving around the globe (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009).

Such vast diverse demand for higher education internationally is challenging the ability of higher education institutions to best prepare global citizens. Colleges and universities are increasingly creating opportunities to enhance the knowledge and skills of students and faculty regarding internationalization, and investment in faculty
development have augmented (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008). As a result, it has become critical for educators and educational administrators to educate and equip themselves with adequate tools in these emerging areas so that they, in turn, can provide an education to students in an increasingly pluralistic society. In their study of global competency and intercultural sensitivity, Olsen and Kroeger (2001) found significant need for ongoing and comprehensive global and intercultural training for faculty and administrators, preferably involving participants’ immersion into another language and culture.

Further, Olson and Kroeger’s (2001) recommendations for practice at higher education institutions, in terms of preparation in these competencies, include internationalizing the faculty and staff as a crucial first step in internationalizing the campus, creating an administrative infrastructure to support professional development initiatives oriented toward internationalization, and internationalization of the curriculum.

According to Gacel-Avila (2005), “The solution to international problems requires a global approach and planning process” (p. 123). Gacel-Avila also advised of the need for paradigmatic reform in the ways of thinking, and asserted, “The development of a new consciousness--a global consciousness--among people is a key aspect of this reform, however, it requires a change in mentality and therefore a change in educative paradigms” (p. 123). This type of approach is paramount to the ability of higher education institutions of sustaining economic competitiveness in an increasingly global marketplace.

**Sustaining Economic Competitiveness**

Over the years, the American government has been very keen regarding the impact of educational policies on the quality of educational outcomes, largely due to the
generally accepted principle that the educational talent of a country is directly linked to its rank in global dominance. Managing the most powerful country in the world, U.S. politicians support and pass education legislation intended to result in the country’s maintenance of its international prominence. In today’s global economy of fierce competition, this is even more essential, and one reason for which educational reform has been a constant issue of concern and vigilance of the presidents of the United States, particularly since the Soviets launched the Sputnik I, the world’s first satellite in space in 1957.

One of the most profound pressures of globalization is to prepare students for a labor market that is beyond national geographic boundaries (Bruce, 2009), and for jobs that have not yet been invented. Whether institutions meet this challenge through the recruitment of international students, by means of cooperation or partnerships with foreign universities, or by internationalizing their technical core with the establishment of branch campuses in countries around the world, they will be advancing their competitive edge through cooperate rationales (Luijten-Lub, van der Wende, & Huisman, 2005). However they choose to accomplish their goals, to successfully undertake these engagements, institutions of higher education will need to be systematic and intentional in their actions to internationalize their programming (Bruce) and leverage competitiveness.

**The Role of Internationalization in Higher Education**

Scholars concur that the term “internationalization” refers to college and university programming that deal with international education in the areas of teaching, research, and service to successfully engage in and meet the challenges of globalization
(Altbach & Knight, 2007; Bruce, 2009; Burnett & Huisman, 2010; de Wit, 2002; Knight, 2004; Schoorman, 1999; Teichler, 1999; van der Wende, 1997). As such, this study has used it as the preferred term to refer to all aspects of higher education programming that deal with international education. These aspects include the following: consortia, partnerships, collaborations, and agreements with overseas universities and organizations to advance higher learning, scholarly research, and professional assistance; branch campuses and franchises; study abroad; recruitment of foreign students, faculty, and other professional expertise; internationalization of the curriculum and of the educational experience; foreign language acquisition; distance education; extracurricular activities, including intercultural events; and, acquisition of global skills and competency, and intercultural sensitivity to live in a globalized world (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Beerkens & van der Wende, 2007; Bell, 2008; Brustein, 2007; Cudmore, 2006; de Wit, 2002; Edwards, 2007; Knight, 2004, 2008; McCabe, 2001; Olsen & Kroeger, 2001; O'Connor, 2009; Stromquist, 2007; Tierney, 2004; Tochon, 2009).

While the term “international education” was traditionally more often used by American authors to qualify the process, “internationalization” has been the preferred term used by writers in other parts of the world to refer to efforts by colleges and universities to address the challenges of globalization. One early researcher who was very influential on American literature regarding the study of internationalization of higher education, Maurice Harari (1977), used the two phrases interchangeably (de Wit, 2002), and, in many instances, this is how the two terms have been used throughout the literature.

Butts’ definition (as cited in Harari, 1977) underscored international education as
a deliberate program. Harari, then, further defined international education as, “the international content of curricula, the international movement of scholars and students concerned with training and research, and the arrangements that engage a system of education cooperation programs beyond its national boundaries” (p. 2293). De Wit (2002) credited Harari’s works in the 1970s and 1980s for the development of internationalization of higher education in the United States.

Over the years, other authors have added to the meaning of internationalization in the following ways: Halls (1990) thought of it as the study of teaching multicultural groups and the study of the work of institutions dedicated to international education; Lambert (1989) and Vestal (1994) saw it as the introduction of international studies into curricula and the promotion of study abroad; for Husén (1994), it meant the study of international issues in response to the interconnectedness of globalization; van der Wende (1997) defined it as systematic efforts geared to making higher education responsive to the challenges of globalization; Grünzweig and Rinehart (1998) referred to it as the field of international academic exchange; Schoorman (1999) described it as comprehensive educational programming occurring in an international context (each society operating as part of a global world) of knowledge and practice; Knight (1999) declared it as a response to the impact of globalization, and added that it was a process that integrated international and intercultural dimensions into its activities; Altbach and Knight (2007) concluded that it involved policies and practices by academic institutions to cope with the global academic environment; and, Stromquist (2007) sustained that it was a college or university’s collective response to “the economic and technological features of globalization” (p. 100).
There is no one definition that has been agreed upon by the scholars of internationalization. However, the different connotations offered in the literature suggest that this concept refers to a process focusing on the programming of higher education activities in the areas of teaching, research, and service to successfully engage in and meet the challenges of globalization.

**History of Internationalization in Higher Education**

According to de Wit (2002), internationalization of higher education represents a specific phase in the development of international attention to education. Prior to the twentieth century, attention to international education was random, and the occurrence only became known as “international education” in the twentieth century as the United States engendered the phrase for foreign policy use. “Internationalization of higher education” surfaced in the latter decades of the century, toward the end of the Cold War, as the United States started looking at international education in a more strategic way and began linking it to the phenomenon of globalization. Consequently, the term became contextualized as a core function of universities and its use became proliferated worldwide.

Between the end of World War II (WWII) and the mid-1980s, the flow of students was mainly from the world’s Southern Hemisphere to the North--mainly the United Kingdom, France, Germany, the Soviet Union, and especially the United States, which, with its enviable system of higher education, still maintains this level of prominence today. de Wit (2002) described this period as one in which internationalization became more of an organized endeavor. This was possible especially because of governments’ interests to expand higher education within their borders as well
as overseas (Kerr, 1994). For example, the Fulbright Program was created in 1946 by the U.S. Government to promote educational and cultural exchanges between the United States and other countries, and its administration was given to the Institute of International Education (IIE). The Fulbright Program has since become the U.S. Government’s flagship international exchange program (Institute of International Education, 2010a).

During the period of the Cold War, particularly during the first part if it--from the end of WWII to approximately 1965, private corporation investment to build international capacity and increased government spending to strengthen military power fueled promotion of the internationalization of higher learning; research universities especially benefited from the incredible surge in research grants. For example, the Ford Foundation’s International Training and Research program contributed greatly to building America’s capacity internationally during the 1950s and 1960s with approximately a quarter of a billion dollars. The purpose of the program was to set the tone for long term internationalization (Ruther, 2002).

Later, and in response to the Soviet launch of Sputnik I, the American government immediately passed the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), which provided additional funding for students to pursue math, science, and foreign language education to ensure that Americans would be highly trained to compete with the Soviet Union in scientific and technical fields (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). The Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations also became tremendous contributors in funding the advancement of internationalization of American higher education. Additional funding also came from the international divisions of the National Institutes of Health.
(NIH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF), while the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) continued strengthening its relations with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (Rutherford, 2002).

As a consequence of the Vietnam War, however, the United States’ impetus on international education was reduced until the time of the end of the Cold War, around 1980 (de Wit, 2002). The 1980s, then, surged as a time of tremendous relevance to the historical development of the internationalization of higher education and to the institutionalization of the term. A convergence of four crucial world events occurred during this period that changed the global context and catapulted the advent of globalization as a mainstream world concept. Those events included the fall the Soviet Union (USSR), the creation of the European Union (EU), the rise of Japan as a superpower, and the beginning of increasingly spiraling developments in technology. The last of which severely influences the knowledge societies of the entire world (de Wit).

Additionally, and as a corollary to the disintegration of the USSR, communism collapsed and borders became open in unprecedented fashion to increased trade, business ventures, and external cultural influences that propelled the globalization phenomenon. According to Friedman (2000), globalization became the international system that replaced the Cold War system, and began reshaping domestic politics, commerce, the environment, and international relations, by means of its unique feature of integration. As a result, nation-state monopolies began diminishing, global competition increased, the United States began sharing the world stage with several other nations, and transnational educational agreements took on an accelerated dimension (de Wit, 2002).
Fearing the EU's competitive edge, President George H. W. Bush convinced Jacques Delors, president of the European Commission (EC), of the need for transatlantic cooperation between the EU and the U.S. (de Wit, 2002). This prod resulted in the Transatlantic Declaration of Relations between the two entities in 1990, central to which was educational, scientific, and cultural cooperation (U.S. Department of State, 1990). The Declaration then produced a pilot program in 1993-1994 that heavily invested in student and educational expertise exchanges between the United States and European Commission countries, and partnerships between higher education institutions and associations (de Wit).

The aforementioned pilot program also came on the heels of the U.S. government once again passing legislation, in 1991, supporting the internationalization of higher education. The National Security Education Act (NSEA) provided additional federal funding enabling higher education students to pursue foreign language and area studies to acquire competencies relevant to U.S. national security interests and global competitiveness. The NSEA also established the National Security Education Program to administer the determinations of the Act (National Security Education Program, 1991).

In an effort to reform education, President Clinton stressed the need for America to affirm and sustain its leadership role in the processes of globalization. This prompted him, in the “Goals 2000: The Educate America Act,” to advance multicultural education and language diversity, and to establish high educational standards and testing mechanisms as a means of evaluating educational progress and ensuring the sustainability of economic power (Goals 2000: Educate America Act, 1994).

Although to a lesser extent than the U.S.–EC agreement, the North Atlantic Free
Trade Agreement (NAFTA), primarily an economic treaty which took effect in 1994 between the United States, Canada, and Mexico, increased cooperation in higher education among the three countries. One issue of specific interest in the agreement, however, is the emphasis on higher education partnerships with businesses (North American Free Trade Agreement, 1994), surely a symptom of globalization effecting the commercialization of higher education.

Subsequent to NAFTA, the World Trade Organization (WTO)-sponsored General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) among member nations appeared on the world platform in 1995. The GATS was conceptualized as an international treaty liberalizing global commercialization. This agreement, bearing provisions for higher education services, served as undeniable confirmation of higher education’s place in the global marketplace, and further expanded the internationalization process on college campuses around the world. Of particular interest in this agreement was how highly it favored the privatization and entrepreneurialism of higher education (World Trade Organization, 1995).

In the United States, in 2000, President Clinton once again advanced the process of internationalization of higher education by issuing a memorandum to the heads of executive departments and agencies calling for international education policy to meet global demands. In addition to outlining several specific internationalization enhancers (e.g., increasing enrollment of foreign students studying in the United States and encouraging university programs that build international partnerships), the President directed the heads of these departments and agencies to work in collaboration with the private sector to accomplish the specified goals and charged the Vice-President with
coordinating the U.S. government’s international education strategy. The President further substantiated the importance to the nation of having almost half a million international students studying in U.S. colleges and universities and contributing $9 billion yearly to the American economy (Clinton, 2000).

While President George W. Bush’s interest was for the United States not to lose international educational dominance to competitors, he concentrated his educational efforts in strengthening primary and secondary education by means of the “No Child Left Behind” amendment (Spring 2005).

Through his American Graduation Initiative, President Obama established a goal to enhance U.S. global prominence with the highest proportion of college graduates in the world by the year 2020. Additionally, in an effort to increase access to higher education while balancing the competitiveness of community colleges online course offerings with those of private and for-profit colleges and universities, the President proposed a $500 million education plan offering free online courses to community college students across the nation (The White House, 2009). In support of the internationalization of higher education, the President has asserted that America’s economic competitiveness hinges on the country’s ability to provide each student with an education that would allow them to succeed in the global arena (The White House, 2010).

Over the years, and particularly after WWII, the objective of the United States Government has been to employ educational strategies that would bolster economic growth and keep the United States in its position of power in the world. For example, annually, the U.S. State Department, engaging in a joint initiative with the U.S. Department of Education, hosts an International Education week (IEW) to celebrate the
benefits of international education and worldwide exchanges, to promote programs that would prepare Americans in global competencies, and to attract global scholars to the United States (U.S. Department of State, 2011). Moreover, U.S. federal policy determinations are continuously being geared toward availing domestic students of the resources that would allow them to maximize higher education opportunity in acquiring the necessary competence to meet global expectations, demands, and challenges. At the outset, these endeavors have not only served to sustain America’s competitiveness and dominance in a globalized world, but have also incrementally internationalized American colleges and universities, particularly by shifting the knowledge paradigm.

**The Professionalization of Internationalization**

In addition to the government, the operations of higher education associations, organizations, and institutions also experienced steady increases in their internationalization efforts and activities during the second half of the twentieth century. These included increased foreign student recruitment, advisement, and advocacy, and increased promotions of study abroad and international student exchanges. They were also manifested in the following: increased interests in English language teaching and foreign language training; international and area studies curriculum development; transnational development cooperation and assistance; and, international scholarly collaborations and faculty development activities (de Wit, 2002; Knight, 2008).

These endeavors have led to the professionalization of international education (de Wit, 2002). The increasing volume, dynamics, and interrelatedness of these engagements have asserted internationalization as an agent of change in higher education (Knight, 2008), requiring policy determinations and operational guidelines and processes, and
further qualifying the need for administrative competence to manage internationalization on campuses.

De Wit (2002) asserted that the federal incentives, along with students’ concern for world peace and mutual understanding, pressures from politicians and business leaders, and faculty interests “drove American institutions of higher education in developing activities for the enhancement of the international dimension” (p. 34). According to Ruther (2002), the federal government and U.S. higher education systems have “created a solid foundation for building international capacity in higher education” (p. 193). Consequently, notwithstanding the impact of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, internationalization as both a generator and a catalyst of the knowledge society continues to be on the move. Since the 9/11 fallout, in which international student enrollment decreased from 582,996 in 2001-2002 to 564,776 in 2005-2006, foreign student enrollment in the United States has increased by 22% to 690,923 in 2009-2010 (Institute of International Education, 2010b).

Even though the U.S. government has increased its rigor in the screening and monitoring of international applicants and students, American higher education continues to be in great demand by foreigners, causing the increased professionalization of the area of internationalization in higher education, and moreover requiring strategic and purposeful attention from higher education administrators and stakeholders.

**Strategies for Internationalizing Colleges and Universities**

With a surge in transnational education during the latter half of the twentieth century, especially after the Cold War, higher education institutions began focusing on the strategic management of international education. Soon internationalization became a
prominent feature in the mission statements and strategic plans of colleges and universities throughout the world; internationalization had now officially become a strategic process in the realm of higher education (de Wit, 2002), and scholars became interested in being able to evaluate, understand, and explain the process. Knight (2008), for example, underscored the significance of clearly articulated institutional rationales for internationalization for the sake of defining benefits and outcomes, and implementing appropriate policy and investments to guide systemic implementation (see Table 2.1).

With their depiction of the emerging importance of internationalization, these rationales, furthermore, illustrate the increasing significance of internationalization to higher education. However, Holzner and Greenwood (1995) informed that, inasmuch as institutions flaunt internationalization in their mission statements, most colleges and universities still do not have well-defined and operationalized strategies to comprehensively approach internationalization on their campuses.

Nonetheless, there do exist a number of models and approaches for organizational internationalization that colleges and universities can utilize as intentional efforts to add international value to their technical core, research, services, and activities management (Knight & de Wit, 1995). While a model represents a distinctive design for internationalizing an institution (de Wit, 2002), an approach is more geared toward being able to analytically describe how the process of internationalization is strategically being implemented (Knight, 2008).

A review of literature has identified six prevalent models for internationalizing higher education institutions. These models were developed by researchers and scholars of higher education internationalization, and represent different theories available to
postsecondary education leaders and practitioners to frame a strategy for internationalizing their institutions (de Wit, 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rationales</strong></th>
<th><strong>Existing Rationales</strong></th>
<th><strong>Of Emerging Importance</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social/cultural</strong></td>
<td>National cultural identity, Intercultural understanding, Citizenship development, Social and community development</td>
<td>National level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political</strong></td>
<td>Foreign policy, National security, Technical assistance, Peace and mutual understanding, National identity, Regional identity</td>
<td>Human resources development, Strategic alliances, Income generation/commercial trade, Nation building/institution building, Social/cultural development and mutual understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td>Economic growth and competitiveness, Labor market, Financial incentives</td>
<td>International branding and profile, Quality enhancement/international standards, Income generation, Student and staff development, Strategic alliances, Knowledge production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic</strong></td>
<td>Extension of academic horizon, Institution building, Profile and status, Enhancement of quality, International academic standards, International dimension to research and teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Source—Knight (2008) – Used with permission from Dr. Jane Knight (Appendix C)*

Table 2.1 Rationales Driving Internationalization

The Neave model of higher education internationalization represents an archetype for international cooperation between institutions while the Rudzki model provides a framework for assessing levels of international activity within institutions. While these
two models focus more on internal and external activities, the other four place more emphasis on strategic programming. The Davies model, for example, stresses the importance of engaging organizational strategies at the very beginning of the process of internationalization. Moreover, the van Dijk and Meijer model proposes an extension of the Davies model by introducing three additional dimensions to the process: policy to guide efforts, support for activities, and method of implementation, whether ad hoc or systematic. Lastly, while both the van der Wende and the Knight models view internationalization as a process taking place within an institution, the Knight model emphasizes the process as a continuous circle that integrates internationalization into the college or university’s culture rather than a linear orientation of defining and accomplishing goals (de Wit, 2002).

In addition to the models, approaches to internationalization represent another way of implementing or analyzing internationalization strategy. According to Knight (2004), an approach is a way to describe the manner in which a college or university conceptualizes and engages in the process of internationalization. Knight (2008) underscored that an institution’s approach to internationalization is dependent on its mission, rationales, priorities, culture, politics, and resources. Additionally, an institution’s approach may change during the course of implementing a process of internationalization, or more than one approach may be engaged at the same time. This literature review has identified six approaches to internationalization.

The activity approach targets specific engagements, such as: study abroad, academic programs, recruitment of international students, international linkages among institutions, and the establishment of branch campuses. The outcomes approach focuses
on the desired results of engaging in internationalization. These include increasing the international competencies of students, the international profile of the institution, an international agreements and partnerships among institutions. The rationales approach is based on what is motivating the institution to internationalize. Such aspects include the improvement of academic standards, revenue generation, increasing diversity, and student or staff development. The ethos approach is concerned with creating a campus climate that promotes international and intercultural understanding. The abroad/crossborder approach entails delivering education to other countries. Lastly, the process approach focuses on the incorporation of internationalization in the three primary institutional functions of teaching/learning, research, and service (de Wit, 2002; Knight, 2008).

Since it integrates the research aspects of internationalization into its definition and functions, the process approach is most applicable to research universities, and, therefore, of primary interest to this research, which seeks to explore internationalization at public research universities. In addition, this approach is reflective of the preferred definition of internationalization being used for this study, namely: all aspects of college and university programming that deal with international education in the areas of teaching, research, and service to successfully engage in and meet the challenges of globalization.

The Process Approach to Internationalization

Among the approaches to internationalization, the process approach has surfaced as the most comprehensive of all approaches because it includes the widest range of international engagements (e.g., curricula, teaching, learning, research, and policies and
procedures), which are grouped into the two large categories of organizational strategies and program strategies (de Wit, 2002).

**Organizational strategies.** Organizational strategies are activities geared to institutionalize internationalization at colleges and universities (de Wit, 2002). They include fundamental aspects of governance such as strategic planning and administrative structure, and student and faculty services. In addition, they require permanent administrative commitment, which is of extreme importance to the sustainability of program strategies. According to Knight (2008), these strategies are critical to operationalizing institutional commitment to internationalize. Without these initiatives, program strategies can easily get derailed in the face of other competing institutional interests (Knight & de Wit, 1995).

**Strategic planning.** Strategic planning is a business concept that has become prevalent in higher education. According to Fain (2007), “Although some universities have been drafting them for at least forty years, their use has exploded over the last decade, particularly in the last two years. Now, virtually every institution, from research universities to community colleges, has a plan” (The Vision section, para. 1). Strategic planning is an integral part of college and university governance. In an environment of increasing competition and budgetary constraints, strategic plans have emerged as roadmaps for institutions to charter and sustain their viability in the higher education marketplace. These plans embody the missions of institutions, establish their priorities, and set their operational tone.

Planning strategically for intentional internationalization, therefore, is an express commitment on behalf of the senior administration of a higher education institution
regarding the institutionalization of the program. It sends a clear signal to all stakeholders and to the entire college or university community that this interest is relevant and that the administration stands ready to support it. With this being the case, internationalization would be reflected in the mission statement, strategic and budgetary plans, policy documents, and assessment processes of the institution and of the various departments at the institution (Knight, 1999). According to Siaya and Hayward (2003), internationalization appeared in most of the mission statements of U.S. research universities and were part of about half of the strategic plans.

**Administrative structure.** As a governance structure to administer internationalization, an office of international programs plays a very important role in the processes of international engagements, including the following: student recruitment and transnational agreements; management, oversight, and monitoring of programs, activities, and events; and, the assurance of policy compliances and accountabilities in these initiatives. It is usually the command center of the internationalization process and its creation is critical to the pragmatism of the commitment of the administration and the execution of strategic plans. Its operation is vital to the sustainability of internationalization as it serves as a connection between the students and the academic and service areas; and its advocacy role cannot be overstated (Knight, 1999).

**Student and faculty services.** Comprehensive support services for international students and for faculty engaging in international education are essential to the success of internationalization at colleges and universities. These services span several activities (e.g., advisement, orientation, registration, housing, student life, scholarship and fundraising, language and cross-cultural events, library services, international alumni
programs, professional development, rewards and promotions, etc.) and have a huge impact on the quality of the program (Knight, 1999).

**Program strategies.** Program strategies are the academic and services activities conducted within an internationalization framework at a higher education institution (de Wit, 2002). These activities can take the form of curricular, research, and other operations in support of the technical core (Knight, 1999).

**Curriculum and faculty engagement.** Internationalization of the curriculum is an indication of very strong commitment on behalf of the faculty to support and be engaged in the process of internationalization at a college or university. This accomplishment is crucial because it demonstrates the all-important buy-in of faculty. An internationalized curriculum includes the following: foreign language study; multicultural and multiethnic sensitivity and training; area and international studies; overseas and exchange programs; and, joint and double appointments for teaching (Knight, 1999).

**Research.** Research and scholarly collaboration are critical to the profile of the internationalization process. Engaging in these high competency activities is an indication that an institution values internationalization in its highest form. Initiatives tied to this strategy include: international research agreements, projects, publications, and conferences; joint research collaborations and centers; visiting lecturers and international doctoral students; and, mobility of faculty and staff for research development and support (Knight, 1999).

**Student Recruitment.** Global student recruitment is one of the most significant signs of internationalization (Cudmore, 2006). This activity has been traditionally associated with the exportation of knowledge (Knight, 1999). However, in the age of
globalization, it has also become increasingly tied to revenue streams and profit-making. For example, in the past nine years (2001 to 2010), foreign student enrollment has increased by 26% in the United States (Institute of International Education, 2010b), while revenue generated from foreign students has increased by 47% over the past six years (from $12.9 billion in 2003 to $18.8 billion in 2009) (NAFSA: Association of International Educators, 2011).

**Transnational engagements.** Transnational engagements include online, articulation, and offshore programs; international partnerships among colleges and universities; overseas branch and satellite campuses; and educational franchising in other countries (Knight, 1999). These endeavors promote, support, and advance entrepreneurialism in higher education. In addition to enhancing institutional profile nationally and internationally, these activities increase revenue for colleges and universities through the exportation of education.

In recent years, transnational agreements and engagements have become increasingly prevalent; technological advances in communications have played a very prominent role in these transactions as e-mail, cellular communication, net meetings, video conferencing, and online education have revolutionized linkages. According to de Wit (2002), “The growth of associations, consortia, and networks in higher education in the second half of the twentieth century, and in particular in the last decade, is a reflection of the globalization of society and the response of higher education” (p. 194).

Responses of this nature have accounted for the creation of associations in various countries that are oriented toward standards, advocacy, and professional development related to the internationalization of higher education. Such organizations for
practitioners include the Institute of International Education (IIE), NAFSA: Association of International Educators, and the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) in the United States; the Canadian Bureau of International Education (CBIE) in Canada; the European Association of International Education (EAIE) in Europe; and the Netherlands Foundation for International Cooperation in Higher Education (NUFFIC) in Holland.

Among many others, organizational networks of colleges and universities include: the International Association of Universities (IAU), a 650-member UNESCO-based network of universities and higher education associations from 150 countries aimed at promoting international networking in higher education; Network of Universities in the Capitals of Europe (UNICA); the Santander Group, a European Universities Network founded in Spain; the Utrecht Network, a network of 31 universities from 28 different European countries collaborating in different aspects of the internationalization of higher education; the Compostela Group of Universities (CGU), a network of 70 European universities that seeks to strengthen collaborations with other higher education associations; the Association of East Indian Research Universities (AEARU), a forum for presidents of research universities in that world region and a venue for the promotion of exchanges; the Association of African Universities (AAU), with 199 members from 45 African countries promoting higher education throughout Africa; Associación de Universidades Grupo Montevideo (AUGM), a network of 21 universities from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, and Uruguay established for the purpose of scientific, technological, educational, and cultural collaboration; and Consejo Superior Universitario Centroamericano (CSUCA), which promotes higher education throughout Central
Other networks in the United States aimed at fostering and supporting the internationalization of higher education include the Association of American International Colleges and Universities (AAICU), the Association of American Universities (AAU), the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU), Education Testing Service (ETS); Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU), Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities (MUCIA), South-East Consortium for International Development (SECID), Illinois Consortium for International Studies and Programs (ICISP), and California State University Consortium for International Development (CSUCID).

There is an increasing trend of founding of American universities overseas and joint ventures with universities in other countries (Association of American International Colleges & Universities, 2011). These enterprises are promoting the American brand of education overseas and contributing massively to the continued internationalization of higher education. For example, Kaplan, which owns 57 colleges in the U.S., also owns the Dublin Business School, Ireland’s largest private undergraduate institution. The Apollo Group, which owns the University of Phoenix, also owns Western International University (WIU), which operates a branch campus called Modi Apollo International Institute in New Dehli in partnership with the KK Modi Group, an Indian industrial conglomerate. Furthermore, WIU has an agreement with the Canadian Institute of Business and Technology (CIBT) for CIBT to offer WIU programs in CIBTs three business schools in Beijing, China (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

Examples of the establishment of American universities in Europe, Asia, and
Africa include: Richmond, The American International University in London, England; American College Dublin, Ireland; The American University of Paris, France; Saint Louis University, Spain; Franklin University, Switzerland; Central European University, Hungary; John Cabot University, Italy; American University of Kosovo, Kosovo; American College of Thessaloniki and The American College of Greece, Greece; The American University in Bulgaria, Bulgaria; The American University of Armenia, Armenia; The American University of Beirut, Haigazian University, and Lebanese American University, Lebanon; American University of Central Asia, The Kyrgyz Republic; The American University of Afghanistan, Afghanistan; Forman Christian College, Pakistan; American University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates; The American University in Cairo, Egypt; Al Akhawayn University in Ifrane, Morocco; and American University of Nigeria, Nigeria (Association of American International Colleges & Universities, 2011). American colleges and universities also engage in these enterprises in North and South America, and Australia.

**Intentional Internationalization at Colleges and Universities in the U.S.**

The American Heritage College Dictionary (1993) defined “Intention” as, “A course of action that one intends to follow; an aim that guides action” (p. 707). Merriam-Webster (2011) defined “Intentional” as, “Done by intention or design.” These definitions support the concept of strategic intent, embedded in the process of internationalization. Internationalizing a college or university consists of an integrative and sustainable approach to incorporate international, intercultural, and global dimensions into institutional rationales (e.g., policies, activities, and quality assessments) in the areas of teaching, research, and service (Knight, 2008). Throughout this literature
review, intentionality surfaced as a necessary ingredient for accomplishing systemic rather than ad hoc implementation of internationalization, at the core of which is organizational strategic intent. However, the concept of intentionality was never developed in the research reviewed for this study, nor accounted for within the models and approaches to internationalization. This study, therefore, sought to explore the degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization at research universities by framing it through the theory of strategic intent.

**Strategic Intent Framing Intentional Internationalization**

Strategic intent, as a theoretical framework to guide organizational planning, surfaced in the late 1980s and early 1990s, albeit in the corporate arena. Hamel and Prahalad (1989) formulated the concept after analyzing the manner in which companies around the world were managing their competitive advantages. While many companies were seeking to discover the plans of their competitors (particularly those venturing into offshore manufacturing to capture global scale economies) in order to imitate strategy, Hamel and Prahalad posited that, because successful companies are strategically organic, approaches of this nature would not lead to competitive revitalization, but, rather, to playing catch-up to their visionary competitors. On the contrary, long-term strategic intent planning would allow companies to align efforts with challenging goals (Smith, 1994).

When comparing competitive strategy between Western and East Asian businesses, Hamel and Prahalad (1989) found that Western companies, for the most part, made plans on the basis of the strategic fit of their existing resources, which they acknowledged as being tactical. On the other hand, the planning approach of East Asian
companies was to leverage resources “to reach seemingly unattainable goals” (p. 131), which they called “strategic intent.” As a result of their research on the accomplishments of Honda, Canon, and Komatsu (all Japanese companies) in relatively short periods of time, Hamel and Prahalad defined strategic intent as, “The essence of winning; motivating people by communicating the value of the target; leaving room for individual and team contributions; sustaining enthusiasm by providing new operational definitions as circumstances change; and using intent consistently to guide resource allocation” (p. 132). In an environment inspired by strategic intent, every stakeholder commits to the vision and feels a personal responsibility toward eliminating barriers that would prevent the realization of the strategic intent (Smith, 1994).

By engaging the concept of strategic intent in their planning processes, companies are able to envision themselves in their leadership positions among competitors, and then engage organizational attention in focused and active planning processes to get there. Hamel and Prahalad (1989) used the U.S. Apollo program to land a man on the moon ahead of the Soviets to exemplify this strategy. At the core of strategic intent, therefore, are visionary leadership, innovation, shared responsibility and flexibility at all levels within the organization, and organizational competitiveness and enthusiasm (Hamel & Prahalad, 1989) to be the best in class. According to Hamel and Prahalad, “The goal of strategic intent is to fold the future back into the present” (p. 133).

As leadership is critical to moving an organization from the entrenched culture toward one of strategic intention (Smith, 1994), leadership intentionality becomes a principal, vital, and active feature in the strategic intent theory. In describing the role of leadership in strategic intent, Smith stated that it “transforms individual commitment to
collective reality” (p. 69). Smith defined three stages to cultural change via strategic intent. The first is the co-invention stage, in which the leadership vision is crafted into strategic intent and becomes a shared commitment among organizational leadership. The second stage is engagement, in which the entire organization becomes engaged in, and committed to, the process with a strategic intent. The last stage is practice. This is the stage in which rigor and discipline are injected into the process by aligning actions with the new values. It involves readjusting tasks, and developing change agents and champions for the new culture.

While being specific about the end result, another core characteristic of strategic intent is to be less prescriptive about the means to get there. An organization is not required to do everything at once to accomplish its strategic intent. Rather, plans are made based on the series of corporate challenges, each conceptualized as a milestone in the race toward accomplishing the strategic intent (Hamel & Prahalad, 1989). Within the strategic intent framework, Hamel and Prahalad viewed the establishment of corporate challenges as a way to “stage the acquisition of new competitive advantages” (p. 133).

Conducting further strategic intent research on the extremely successful Japanese information technologies and telecommunications enterprise, NEC Corporation, Prahalad and Hamel (1990) affirmed the importance of creating a strategic architecture based on an organization’s core competencies to be able to support strategic intent. In an organizational strategic planning mindset, core competencies are developed in the units of the company, and the strength of each unit equals the strength of the company. Therefore, each unit is valuable and its successes are shared with, and incorporated into, the efficiencies of other units, and celebrated by the entire corporation.
Ultimately, core competencies become corporate, as opposed to unit, resources. Additionally, investment in core competencies is not seen as needing to be, or expected to be, equitable among units; investment is based on strategy. According to Prahalad and Hamel (1990), “Many companies have unwittingly surrendered core competencies when they cut internal investment in what they mistakenly thought were just cost centers” (p. 7).

Developing core competencies is, therefore, at the root of strategic intent and involves continuous improvement of internal resources and functions in each unit to support organizational strategy. Prahalad and Hamel (1990) believed that an obsession with core competency building in the corporate environment would convert companies into global winners, as the optimized (core) products of each unit then contribute intentionally to the brand leadership of the company. According to Prahalad and Hamel, building competencies is not due to a lack of technical resources; rather, organizational leaders need to have the vision to set and build them, and commit the resources to enable their successful accomplishment and sustainability. Leadership objectives, therefore, would be for core competencies to become the foundational bases of a successful strategic intent architecture in organizational planning.

In summary, the theory of strategic intent most appropriately supports organizational intentionality in the process of successful campus internationalization by postulating a series of steps to accomplish intentionality (Figure 2.1). This strategy begins with the creation of a vision, and aligns with Smith’s (1994) first stage of cultural change via strategic intent, which is co-invention. According to Smith, organizational leadership plays a key role in setting the vision, supporting its accomplishment, and
sustaining its progress through tactical resource allocation. Smith stated, “Whatever the CEO and the top management team regard as possible becomes possible for the company” (p. 69). At this initial stage, the leaders take total responsibility for defining the future of the organization. They commit to a creative purpose based on what the organization will look like in the future, and not based on the organization’s current identity or its past (Smith). In other words, intentional leaders do not determine possibilities by thinking about what they currently see or have previously seen in the organization.

The next step in the process of intentionality is the establishment of core
competencies (i.e. activities and structure) that align with the vision. Smith’s (1994) second stage of strategic intent, engagement, is incorporated into this phase. At this point, the entire organization becomes committed to the vision, the strategic intent, at all levels of engagement. Hamel and Prahalad (1989) referred to this stage as “an obsession with winning at all levels of the organization” (p. 132). Smith further added that this step is achieved not by employees’ blind-faith acceptance of the credo of the leader, but because they have had “the opportunity to co-invent its implications for themselves, and to engage critically with the new strategic intent” (p. 74). Employees’ collaboration with organizational leaders is, therefore, key to the accomplishment of this step, in which the entire organization identifies with, and supports, the vision. Once there is commitment, the scope of the challenge is outlined, core competencies are established, activities are detailed, and structure is configured.

The final step in accomplishing organizational intentionality encompasses the creation of a culture of organizational flexibility, innovation, and enthusiasm that inspire all stakeholders to work toward the achievement of the vision. It also generates the development of change agents and champions for the new culture. These factors are represented in the third stage in Smith’s (1994) process of achieving strategic intent: the practice stage. According to Smith, continuous improvisation is critical to the creation of a pathway toward the vision. Flexibility is a key ingredient to the core competency areas, which seek to innovate through creativity and experimentation. As barriers are overcome and goals are met, stakeholders’ enthusiasm and drive to succeed increase, momentum accelerates, and change is mastered (Smith). In the end, the vision is accomplished by means of an intentional planning process that begins with the end in mind.
Indicators of Intentional Internationalization

Having made a commitment to systemically internationalize their campuses, university leadership is best served by having a clear understanding of what are considered to be standard indicators of intentional internationalization. These indicators would then serve as markers confirming the success of systemic internationalization, and, therefore, represent the core competencies to be developed within the strategic intent architecture of campus internationalization. Additionally, since systemic internationalization presupposes that the change is sustained, there is need to include in systemic internationalization a mechanism to assess its sustainability. This study proposed that these decisions would need to be bound together by intentional decision making and action.

In their research on the influence of organizational culture on an institution’s response to globalization, Burnett and Huisman (2010) concluded that an extensively enterprising campus spirit, or culture, is essential to internationalization. This finding coincides with the theory of strategic intent (Hamel & Prahalad, 1989) and with previous research indicating that institutions with entrepreneurial cultures would be able to internationalize their institutions with relative ease (Clark, 1998; Davies, 2001). By using Davies’ model regarding internationalization strategies, Burnett and Huisman also found that a high degree of systematization in response to globalization and an overall systematic approach to internationalization were vital to a successful process. In other words, a high level of sustainable systematization would represent systemic internationalization.

The indicators of systemic internationalization extracted from Burnett and
Huisman’s (2010) research included the following: the articulation of a clear mission and business plan in support of internationalization; a top/down down/up culture of commitment, particularly commitment and support of senior administration; institutionalized financial and administrative support; a systematic planning process; a strategic response to globalization that does not compromise the values of the institution; university community awareness of strategic priorities; faculty and staff accessibility and commitment to students; targeted marketing and specialist roles with strong direct links to the academic core; a structure for international management (e.g., an international office with experienced personnel), including the existence of direct leadership and effective product champions; personnel incentives, policies, and procedures; campus family spirit (e.g., faculty knowing students by their names); engagement in strategic alliances; engaging in offshore operations (e.g., branch campuses, franchise agreements, articulation programs, virtual programs) in key recruitment countries; developing learning techniques that incorporate the use of technology (e.g., videoconferencing); increased foreign language study; development of doctoral programs, international students, and student mobility; joint and double appointments for research; international dissemination of research results; postgraduate training programs for the international market; distance education programs; and, twinning programs.

**From random to intentional internationalization.** In their research on the influence of organizational culture on an institution’s response to globalization, Burnett and Huisman (2010), having conducted a comparative case study investigation of four universities, offered valuable insights regarding the process of an institution moving from random to intentional internationalization. Burnett and Huisman’s conclusions, based on
analysis of their data through the Davies (2001) model, suggested that institutions that are able to move from an ad hoc approach to a high degree of systematization will be in the ideal quadrant for systemic internationalization. However, to accomplish this, institutions would need to pursue activities in consonance with the indicators of intentional internationalization.

Moving from random to intentional internationalization requires institutions to engage in a strategic process that involves the development of a plan of action, achievement strategies, and assessment mechanisms. Moreover, since Felin and Foss (2004) have highlighted that the intentional intervention of individuals to impact organizational change has been left unexamined in research on organizational capabilities, the element of intentionality is definitely deserving of further study.

**Direction for Further Study on Intentional Internationalization**

Since internationalization at colleges and universities often occurs accidentally, Bruce (2009) emphasized the need for purposeful action on behalf of universities that want to build a vision of internationalization. Goodin (1996) suggested that a systemic internationalization process is the outcome of deliberate design, intentional intervention, and control. Burnett and Huisman’s (2010) investigation emphasized the importance of intentionality in accomplishing systematic internationalization. These investigations sustained the need for a purposeful and holistic organizational approach to campus internationalization.

Throughout this literature study, intentionality stood out glaringly as the vital ingredient needed for college and university administrators to successfully internationalize their campuses. Therefore, assessing the intentionality of institutions to
internationalize their campuses is perceived as a fundamental gap in the literature and looms as an element that would offer additional insights to college and university decision makers and planners in pursuit of a comprehensive program of internationalization. This study, therefore, endeavored to determine whether a campus’ successful internationalization can be significantly correlated to the organization’s intentionality in achieving that outcome. To accomplish this purpose, this study evaluated institutional strategy at public research universities based on Smith’s (1994) three stages to cultural change via strategic intent.

**Intentional Internationalization at Public Research Universities in the U.S.**

The globalization process has a transformational effect on the lives of individuals, on institutions, and on entire societies. It permeates culture, politics, economy, social relations; and, its effects on higher education are apparent in policy-making, governance, administration, academics, and identity (Vaira, 2004). As the nation’s most renowned higher education institutions throughout the world, research universities find themselves caught between the competitive pressures of the global economy and institutional imperatives. This circumstance urges organizational action in prioritizing, implementing, and sustaining an effective framework ensuring presence and prominence in the global marketplace without unraveling local, institutional, conflicts. Efforts at this level, therefore, require a systematic commitment, which this study proposes can only be sustained by means of an intentional approach to internationalization.

This study focused on internationalization at public research universities because they support and promote national interests, and as such, the pressures of globalization are more strongly exerted upon them. In addition, public expectations are higher for
them in terms of their capacity to sustain America’s global educational prominence. These institutions of higher learning are constantly being subjected to scrutiny regarding their advancement of national interests, and particularly evaluated regarding their ability to produce skilled labor and new knowledge (Vaira, 2004).

Of a record high 690,923 international students in the United States in 2009-2010 (3% increase over the previous year), the top 20 host institutions were Carnegie classified research universities (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, 2010). These 20 institutions enrolled 16% of all international students studying in colleges and universities in the United States, and among the 20 institutions, 14 were public universities (Institute of International Education, 2010b).

Also of significance to American research universities is that 78% of the 283 research universities in the United States reported this year that at least 1% of their undergraduate student population is comprised of international students (U.S. News & World Report, 2010). Moreover, 85% of the seventy-fifth percentile of these institutions are all “very high” or “high” classified research activity universities by the Carnegie Foundation (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, 2010) and their international undergraduate student enrollment ranged between 6% and 23%, with almost half of them in double figures (U.S. News & World Report, 2010).

As opposed to engaging in one or a few facets of international education (e.g., promoting study abroad, or designing innovative ways to support international students), as might be the case of liberal arts colleges or community colleges, research universities engage in efforts to expand and strengthen their international dimension in all facets of the organization, specifically teaching, research and service (Bruce, 2009).
Consequently, this common organizational context, which follows Horn, Hendel, and Fry’s (2007) multidimensional approach to the tripartite mission of the university, offers a framework for comparing research universities in their internationalizing efforts. Given this level of heterogeneity among research universities, this study, therefore, sought to examine the effect of institutional intentionality on the process of internationalization in these major facets of engagement at research universities.

**Chapter Summary**

Internationalization has surfaced in the realm of higher education as a major response to globalization and as an effective strategy in addressing modern-day accountabilities and sustaining institutional viability in the global marketplace. This study proposed, therefore, that planning outcomes, and their implementation and sustainability, could only be accomplished through intentional commitment on the part of institutional leadership and stakeholders. This literature review, then, proposed that the theory of strategic intent offers a solid foundation to frame intentionality in the process of campus internationalization.

Prior studies have described the elements involved in internationalization and have recommended models and approaches for optimization. These frameworks all point to the need for systematic, rather than ad hoc, strategy to build capacity. The systematic strategy is encouraging, particularly since the historical account of internationalization has demonstrated continuous improvement and efficiency in initiative and results.

Since research universities have overwhelmingly been the forerunners and major representatives of American higher education in processes of internationalization, the purpose of this study was to determine how organizational intentionality has impacted the
process of internationalization at these institutions. This objective was accomplished by examining internationalization planning, implementation, and sustainability indicators at these institutions, and by analyzing the effect of the theory of strategic intent in the processes of internationalization at these institutions. Ultimately, it is the expectation of the researcher that findings in this study would be transferable to other types of higher education institutions in the United States and offer insights relevant to improving their processes of internationalization.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

This chapter describes procedural considerations for addressing the research questions that guide this study. The section starts with an account of the major assumptions underpinning the study. Then, it reiterates the research questions, and outlines the research design, including the study population, participants and sample selection, instrumentation, data collection and analysis, and additional considerations that might be significant to outcomes.

This research sought to measure intentionality by applying the principles of the theory of strategic intent to the internationalization of higher education institutions. The researcher, who has over twenty years higher education scholar/practitioner experience, assumed that organizational intentionality plays a significant role in the successful accomplishment of institutional objectives, and that the theory of strategic intent is highly applicable to higher education institutional planning. The researcher also assumed that the survey and interview questionnaire will indeed measure the degree of intentional internationalization at the participating institutions and uncover best practices related to the process.

The focus of this study was on organizational intentionality as a strategy that steers organizational planning processes toward systemic accomplishment, as described by the theory of strategic intent. For this study, the process being impacted by intentionality is the process of internationalization. As such, this study sought to answer the overarching question: What is the degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization at the eight public research universities in the Southeast region of the
United States?

This question was addressed by the following sub-questions:

1. What is the strongest indicator of intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university?

2. What are best practices relative to intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university?

**Research Design**

The purpose of this study was to determine how the organizational strategy of intentionality has impacted successful internationalization at public research universities in the United States. The research perspective that steered this study was the mixed methods approach, which is a procedure that makes the most of both quantitative and qualitative research for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data (Creswell, 2009). This approach was most appropriate for this research because the quantitative and qualitative investigations complemented each other and allowed for a more complete analysis (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). In addition, their combined use resulted in a more comprehensive understanding of a research problem (Creswell). The rationale for engaging these two methods of investigation was because neither of them would be sufficient by itself to exhaustively explore and explain the complexities of organizational intentionality as a strategy for internationalizing colleges and universities.

Since the objective of the researcher was to obtain a greater depth of knowledge regarding the role of intentionality in campus internationalization, a phenomenon which had not been previously studied or investigated in higher education, the researcher sought to elaborate on quantitative results with qualitative investigation. As a result, the
researcher guided the study through a sequential explanatory design, consisting of two distinct phases (Creswell, 2009; Glatthorn & Joyner, 2005). The model corresponding to the mixed methods explanatory design used for this study is illustrated in Figure 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Data Collection (Descriptive Research)</td>
<td>Web-Based Survey</td>
<td>Numerical Data</td>
<td>Degree of contribution of Intentionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Data Collection (Case Study)</td>
<td>Interviews, Documents &amp; AV Review, Observations</td>
<td>Text Data</td>
<td>Highest Indicator &amp; Best Practices of Intentionality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.1 Model of Sequential Explanatory Mixed Methods Design**

Qualitative primary/quantitative first (quan-QUAL) research (Morgan, 1998) was employed in the examination of the overarching research question and the exploration of the sub-questions. The rationale for this approach was that, while the quantitative data and results would provide a general picture of the research problem, i.e. leadership intentionality in internationalizing a college or university, the qualitative data and its analysis would refine and explain the statistical results by exploring participants’ views more in depth. In this design, the priority was given to the qualitative investigation because it involved more extensive data collection, analysis, and explanation of the quantitative results by exploring four data sets. Ultimately, however, both the numerical and the text data, collected sequentially and analyzed thoroughly, were integrated during
the analysis of the entire study to offer a more comprehensive and better understanding of the research problem.

In the first phase, the quantitative, numerical data were collected by means of a web-based survey, and descriptive quantitative analysis was used to examine the degree of contribution of organizational intentionality in successful campus internationalization. Information resulting from data analyses in the first phase was then explored further in the second, qualitative phase. In this ensuing phase, structured interviews, documents, audio-visual materials, and researcher field observations were used to probe the strongest indicator and best practices in intentional campus internationalization by engaging the case study strategy. The reason for following up with qualitative research in the second phase was to better understand and explain the quantitative, statistical, results by exploring participants’ views and experiences more thoroughly (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2009).

The case study approach for the qualitative investigation was most appropriate because it provided an opportunity to study a complex phenomenon in its natural setting (Creswell, 2009), and produced an understanding of the problem based on multiple contextual factors (Miller, 2000). Its inductive value also resulted in an end product that was “richly descriptive” (Merriam, 2009, p. 39). In addition, this strategy enables a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon of study and adds heuristic value to the outcomes as the readers of this study expand their knowledge of intentional internationalization of higher education (Merriam).

Upon completion of the final investigation and qualitative data analysis, the researcher presented an interpretation of the entire analysis. The results of the two phases
were integrated during the discussion of the outcomes of the whole study. In summary, the mixed methods approach was most suitable for this study because the investigation used multiple sources of evidence to examine the contemporary phenomenon of higher education internationalization in its real-life operational context (Yin, 2009).

**Population and Sample**

The target population for this study was comprised of a senior international education officer at each of the eight public universities in the Southeast region of the United States (see Appendix A). Seven of the institutions participated in the quantitative investigation; one participant, SEU1 (Southeast region university number one), did not complete and return the survey despite several attempts by the researcher requesting participation. The criteria for selecting these institutions were that they were public research universities, at least one percent of their student enrollment was foreign students, and they were all located in a specified geographic region in the United States.

In the ensuing qualitative phase of the investigation, purposeful sampling (Creswell, 2009) was used to select the institution, from within the population, identified as having the highest degree of organizational strategic intent in its internationalization process, based on a score on the “Organizational Intentionality in Campus Internationalization Survey” (Appendix B). The rationale for selecting this sample was because it was considered information rich (Patton, 2002) for having demonstrated the highest level of intentionality in its internationalization efforts.

Since they had experienced the phenomenon of this study, representative sampling was used to select a minimum of four, and a maximum of eight, officers involved in international education from within the selected university to participate in
the case study. This range of number of participants was an appropriate sample size for this case study (Creswell, 2009). These officials included professionals in the areas of planning, institutional governance, internationalization governance, teaching, research, and service, and were identified once the case study institution had been selected. The rationale for deliberately selecting these informants was because they were the most capable of answering the research questions (Patton, 2002).

**Instrumentation**

In this investigation, data were collected from two sources, and two methods of data collection were utilized. First, the researcher used the “Organizational Intentionality in Campus Internationalization Survey” (see Appendix B), developed by the researcher based on the literature investigation, and reviewed by a panel of experts. The survey was tailored to investigate organizational intentionality and best practices in campus internationalization, and was applied to a senior international education officer at each of the eight public research universities identified as the research sample. The questions for this instrument were elaborated based on the factors identified in the theory of strategic intent as postulated and developed by researchers Hamel and Prahalad (1989), Prahalad and Hamel (1990), and Smith (1994).

After necessary modifications, the instrument had been pilot-tested by the Assistant Vice President of International Studies at Georgia Southern University (see Appendix E). Content validity and reliability were established through the circumstance of the person piloting the survey being “thoughtful, critical, and similar to the intended research participants” (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2009, p. 181). The objective of this survey was to answer the overarching research question regarding the degree to which
organizational intentionality led to their success in the process of internationalization, and to subsequently ascertain best practices in intentional internationalization at higher education institutions.

The survey comprised of two parts. Part one was designed to ascertain the professional characteristics (demographics) of the respondents. These include their current position; years of service in the position, in internationalization, to the university, and in higher education; and, their level of education. Part two was designed to gauge the degree of intentionality in internationalization at each of the participating universities, as reported by the corresponding respondent, a senior officer of international education at the university. Part two comprised of three sections, each established to measure one of the three areas of strategic intent. These were intentionality in creating a vision for internationalization, intentionality in organizational commitment to internationalization, and intentionality in the practice of internationalization. Responses to the survey followed a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from “least agree with” to “most agree with,” as represented by the numbers one through five, with the number one meaning “least agree with” and the number five meaning “most agree with.”

Secondly, from the seven institutions that participated in the survey, one university was selected for a case study; selection was based on this university having the highest degree of contribution of intentionality in its internationalization, as revealed by the survey results. To conduct the case study, the researcher, with the assistance of an expert panel, developed an interview questionnaire comprised of questions based on a thematic analysis of the literature investigation concerning indicators and best practices relative to intentional higher education internationalization (see Appendix F).
As with the survey, part one of the questionnaire was designed to ascertain the professional characteristics of the respondents. These also included their current position; years of service in the position, in internationalization, to the university, and in higher education; and, their level of education. According to Merriam (2009), the demographics of the interviewees are “relevant to the research study” (p. 97). These variables affect the direction or strength of participants’ responses (Baron & Kenny, 1986)

Part two of the questionnaire demonstrated alignment of the interview questions with the review of literature for this study. This was a structured interview with a specific set of predetermined questions (Creswell, 2009) that had been revised accordingly by the researcher and the panel of experts. The researcher made use of these interviews as a main information resource to answer the research sub-questions regarding the strongest indicator and best practices of intentionality relative to internationalization.

To further ensure construct validity of the study, the researcher utilized several sources of data collection (Creswell, 2009; Yin, 2009). The qualitative investigation, therefore, was comprised of a total of four data sets, namely: a structured interview, a review of documents, a study of audio-visual materials, and researcher observations.

**Data Collection**

Figure 3.2 offers a synopsis of the data collection procedures. The procedures for data collection began with obtaining permission from the Georgia Southern University Institutional Review Board to proceed with surveying and interviewing human subjects relative to this study. To procure entre to the subjects of this study, the researcher e-mailed colleagues working at these universities to request their assistance in connecting
him with a senior international education officer at each of the universities corresponding to the sample. For this study, the senior international education officers were considered “gatekeepers, individuals at the research site that provide access to the site and allow or permit the research to be done” (Creswell, 2009, p. 178).

![Figure 3.2 Synopsis of Data Collection Procedures](image)

Prior to initiating data collection, the researcher placed courtesy phone calls to the subjects to introduce the study, discussed its benefits to the institutions, and solicited collaboration by means of filling out the survey. The researcher also informed the official regarding the institution’s potential for selection for case study participation, and
solicited the institution’s willingness to collaborate. The researcher followed up each phone call with a courtesy e-mail (see Appendix G).

A web-based survey, administered through Survey Monkey™, was used to collect data corresponding to the first, quantitative, phase of the investigation. One of the advantages of web-based surveys was that responses could automatically be stored in a database and be expeditiously transformed into numerical data. Other advantages include savings related to time and cost, and the opportunity for easy access to the tool by the participants (Wright, 2005).

The survey was sent to all of the individuals identified as participants in the quantitative phase of the investigation. The survey was introduced by means of an informed consent form allowing the subjects the choice of agreeing to complete the survey or of declining to do so (see Appendix H). To decrease error in the response rate of the surveys, while at the same time seeking to obtain a relatively high response rate, a three-phase follow-up sequence was used (Dillman, 2000). Five days after the set date to respond to the survey, an e-mail reminder was sent to those subjects who had not responded (see Appendix J). Ten days later, a second e-mail reminder was sent (see Appendix K), and two weeks later, a final reminder was sent emphasizing the importance of the subject’s input in the study (see Appendix L).

Prior to initiating data collection for the qualitative phase of the investigation, the researcher sought the assistance of the senior international education officer at the institution selected for the case study in identifying a range of officers involved in international education at the institution. This representative sample included officials in the areas of institutional governance, institutional planning, internationalization
governance, internationalization planning, teaching, research, and service. The researcher also solicited the assistance of the “gatekeeper” in obtaining entre to these officials, and subsequently communicated with the officials via telephone and e-mail to introduce and explain the study, and request their participation.

To conduct the collection of the qualitative data, the researcher visited the campus for a total of two days. Prior to the site visit, the researcher requested from the senior international education officer the courtesy of having audio-visual materials and documents such as publications, agendas and notes from meetings, and planning documents relative to the internationalization of the institution available for the researcher’s review during the visit. The researcher also communicated with the interview participants via phone, and/or e-mail, to set up the interview schedule, and shared the informed consent form and the interview questions with the participants one week prior to the scheduled campus visit (see Appendix M).

At the beginning of the interview, the researcher reminded participants that the interview would be audio recorded, reiterated issues related to the confidentiality and security of the interview, and asked the participants to sign the consent form (see Appendix I). Participants were also notified that they could choose to stop the interview at any point in time if they were uncomfortable with any question, the process itself, or any other reason for which they felt compelled to discontinue their participation. Participants did not have to give a reason regarding why they wished to cease continuing with the interview.

The researcher, furthermore, explained to the participants his role and their role in the data collection process, and notified the participants that he would answer any
questions they posed prior to, or during, the interview. Following the recommendation of Bogdan and Biklen (2007), the researcher explained to each participant the importance of their involvement in the study, the benefits they might obtain from participating, and the process that would be used in the study to obtain the findings.

The researcher took all necessary precautions to ensure a successful interview process. This included bringing along a back-up tape recorder with additional batteries and a note pad to take handwritten notes, in the event of failure of the recording devices. Upon completion of each interview, the researcher checked to make sure the interview had been indeed recorded.

To ensure confidentiality of the survey and the interview questionnaire, each survey and each interview transcript was coded by a number representing the name and position of the subject or participant. To ensure confidentiality of the data, all contact information related to the subjects and participants in this study were stored separately from the data obtained by the researcher, to include: surveys, tabulations, audio recordings, interview transcriptions, and data analyses. To ensure security, all data obtained for purposes of this study were stored at the researcher’s home office in a locked filing cabinet, and the key to the cabinet is in the sole possession of the researcher.

In addition to the interviews, the researcher reviewed university documents and audio-visual materials, and conducted field observations to comprehensively investigate the strongest indicator and best practices relative to intentional internationalization at the case study university. Documents included hard copy and online publications, strategic plans, governance documents, minutes of meetings, official reports, media publications, and internationalization planning and assessment documents. Audio-visual materials
included photographs, art objects, and videos (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2009). To ensure reliability, the documents and audio-visual materials collected were indexed following coding protocols for managing qualitative data (Merriam), and were inventoried on a document analysis form (see Appendix J).

During the observations, the researcher explored the campus and the university’s website to ascertain prominent displays of intentional internationalization at this institution. Of particular interest, the researcher sought, through observation, to identify the strongest indicator and best practices relative to intentional internationalization at this university. To ensure reliability, the observations were inventoried on an observation form (see Appendix K).

**Data Analysis**

According to Marshall and Rossman (1999), data analysis is “the process of bringing order, structure, and interpretation to the mass of collected data” (p. 150). In the data analysis of this study, two types of data were processed. First, survey data obtained in the quantitative phase of the investigation were tabulated and analyzed by the researcher following descriptive statistical procedures (Sprinthall, 2007) to obtain the degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization at each of the seven public research universities identified as the research sample. The degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization at each institution was represented by a percentage.

To obtain the percentages from the survey, each of the five columns representing the possible answers on the Likert-type scale was assigned a percentage based on the following algorithm: 1=20%, 2=40%, 3=60%, 4=80%, and 5=100%. The answer to each question, therefore, was equivalent to its corresponding percent, and all ten answers in
each of the three areas of the survey were tabulated and averaged to show a percentage representing the outcome of each of area. Subsequently, the overall percentage of the survey was obtained by averaging the percentages of the outcomes of all three areas of the survey. Consequently, the institution with the highest percentage points was considered the university with the highest degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization.

In addition, by engaging discriminant function analysis, response frequencies were correlated to the demographic characteristics of the respondents to find whether officials differed in their responses (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2000). Frequencies analysis was also conducted for responses across the three areas and all the questions in the survey. This level of analysis satisfied Creswell’s (2009) requirement for the quantitative research to describe the variable.

Secondly, a thorough analysis was conducted of the four data sets collected in the qualitative investigation, and several strategies were used to determine the credibility of the information collected and to validate the findings. These strategies included: the process of triangulation, which was used to converge the different data sources; rich, thick descriptions were used to convey findings; and, an external audit was performed by asking a competent individual, not involved with this project, to conduct a thorough review of this study and report back to the researcher (Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 2009).

In conducting the qualitative data analysis, the researcher engaged the services of GMR Transcription Services to convert the interview audio recordings into text data. Subsequently, the interview transcriptions, along with the data collected from the documents, audio-visual materials, and the researcher’s observations were coded and
analyzed for themes with the help of a coding list developed from the literature

investigation framing this study. This coding list did not undergo any revisions as the
data analysis progressed.

The qualitative data analysis proceeded through an inductive process “working
back and forth between themes and the database until the research had established a
comprehensive set of themes” (Creswell, 2009, p. 175). Merriam (2009) referred to this
strategy as “the constant comparative method of data analysis” (p. 175). In the end, this
process allowed the researcher to interpret the data and give meaning to the analysis
(Patton, 2002). Findings have been presented in rich, thick narrative, and direct
quotations from the participants were used to elucidate interpretations (Creswell;
Merriam).

According to Creswell (2009), qualitative research looks for the development of
themes and how they are related. Therefore, the steps in this qualitative analysis included
a preliminary exploration of the data by reading through the interview transcripts and
reviewing the other data collected to make sense of all of the data. Then, the data were
coded by segmenting and labeling the text. Furthermore, additional codes were used to
organize the data into developing patterns, categories, and themes by aggregating similar
codes. Following, interrelated themes were connected across all data sources.
Ultimately, a narrative was constructed that discussed outcomes in the form of answers to
the research sub-questions related to the highest indicator and best practices relative to
intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university (Creswell;
Merriam, 2009).

The final data analysis procedure for this study was to comprehensively interpret
the role of intentionality in higher education internationalization by combining the outcomes of both the quantitative and the qualitative investigations and analyzing them in conjunction. This process is called “mixing” (Creswell, 2009, p. 207). To accomplish this engagement, the qualitative themes were compared with the descriptive quantitative data to produce an interpretation of the entire analysis (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2009).

The expectation of the researcher in mixing the databases was to compare and interpret (Merriam, 2009) how the indicators of intentionality, particularly the strongest indicator, and the best practices relative to intentionality in successful internationalization relate to the overall outcome of the survey of the case study institution. The researcher also compared the qualitative outcomes with the outcomes of the survey in three areas of strategic intent, namely: intentionality in creating a vision for internationalization, intentionality in organizational commitment to internationalization, and intentionality in the practice of internationalization.

**Reporting the Data**

The findings in this study are reported in the form of a discussion. Charts, graphs, and matrices were used to illustrate interpretations. The researcher organized outcomes into patterns, differences, categories, and basic description units to extract meaning and significance to the data analysis. The researcher compared and contrasted findings and also sought relationships and linkages among the descriptive dimensions (Patton, 1987).

The report begins with a presentation of the quantitative findings related to the survey outcomes. The researcher answered the overall research question pertaining to the degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization at seven of the eight public research universities in the Southeast region of the United States. Results from the
surveys are in the form of an overall percent for each institution, and a percent also represents each area of the survey. Each university was ranked to identify the institution with the highest overall percent on the survey, thus, the highest degree of intentionality in its internationalization. The outcomes of each university were discussed, and the results of each of the three areas of the survey were emphasized for each institution. The researcher also compared the outcomes of each area with the demographic characteristics of the respondent.

The qualitative findings were related to the interview outcomes, as well as outcomes of the document and audio-visual assessment, and researcher observations. The research answered the study sub-questions regarding the strongest indicator of intentionality and the best practices relative to intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university. The results of the interview analysis were compared with the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Since the purpose of this study was to determine how organizational intentionality has impacted successful internationalization at public research universities in the United States, in the analysis of the data, the researcher mixed quantitative and qualitative investigation outcomes to illustrate correlations. This research paid particular attention to potential variations in the outcomes based on the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Of particular interest to these characteristics, across all of the institutions, the researcher compared frequencies in the answers of the respondents with their demographics.

**Chapter Summary**

The questions posed in this research were answered by following a mixed-
methods investigative approach, guided through a sequential explanatory design. First, quantitative investigation was used to ascertain the degree of intentionality in internationalization at public research universities in the Southeast region of the United States. This was accomplished by administering a web-based survey to a senior international education officer at each university participating in the study. Descriptive statistical procedures were used to tabulate and analyze the survey, and produce the outcome of each institution in the form of a percent.

Secondly, the quantitative results were further explored through case study, qualitative, investigation to answer the research’s sub-questions regarding the strongest indicator and best practices relative to intentionality in successful internationalization at public research universities. The university identified as having the highest degree of intentionality in internationalization, based on the survey scores, was selected for the case study. The researcher interviewed eight officials involved in international education, reviewed documents and audio-visual materials, and conducted observations during a two-day visit to this institution. Results were obtained by following investigative protocols for coding and quantifying qualitative research.

In the final analysis, the purpose of this study of determining how organizational intentionality has impacted successful internationalization was accomplished by combining and analyzing the quantitative and qualitative investigative outcomes. Findings are presented in the form of a discussion and charts, graphs, and matrices were used to illustrate interpretations.
CHAPTER IV
REPORT OF DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine how organizational intentionality has impacted successful internationalization at public research universities in the United States. This study used a mixed methods sequential explanatory design to guide the investigation. First, the researcher conducted quantitative investigation to answer the overarching research question. Then, the researcher elaborated on the quantitative results by employing qualitative investigation to answer the research sub-questions.

In this chapter, the researcher presents the results of survey data, and four case study data sets comprised of interviews, document reviews, audio-visual reviews, and the researcher’s field observations. The researcher analyzed the survey data following descriptive statistical procedures, and conducted a thematic analysis of the data collected for the case study. The first section of this chapter describes key areas of the research methods of this investigation along with a description of the sample and participants. The final section presents the analysis of the data corresponding to the research questions and a summary of the findings of the investigation.

Research Questions

This study sought to answer the overarching question: What is the degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization at the eight public research universities in the Southeast region of the United States?

This question was addressed by the following sub-questions:

1. What is the strongest indicator of intentionality in successful
internationalization at a public research university?

2. What are best practices relative to intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university?

**Research Design**

In the first, quantitative, phase of the investigation, the researcher administered the “Organizational Intentionality in Campus Internationalization Survey” (see Appendix B) to the research subjects. This survey was designed to answer the overarching research question. Following the outcomes, based on an analysis of means and correlations of the survey responses, the researcher identified SEU3 (Southeast region university number three) as the institution with the highest degree of contribution of intentionality in its internationalization.

To respond to the research sub-questions, the researcher conducted a qualitative case study investigation at SEU3. In this phase of the study, the researcher interviewed officials involved in internationalization at SEU3, reviewed internationalization documents and audio-visual materials at this university, and conducted field observations. The first eight interview questions were designed to answer the research sub-question regarding the strongest indicator of intentional internationalization. The second 10 questions were designed to answer the research sub-question regarding best practices relative to intentionality in higher education internationalization. All interviewees were asked the same questions (see Appendix F).

The researcher documented and tabulated each interview question and response, the themes corresponding to indicators and best practices of intentional internationalization that emerged from the responses, and the frequency in which each
theme appeared. In the tabulation of results, the researcher placed interview responses in quotes, and annotated the corresponding internationalization officer, IO1 through IO8, from SEU3 to whom a particular response was attributed.

In conducting the document analysis, the researcher reviewed over fifty documents directly related to internationalization at SEU3. The researcher’s objective was to identify manifestations of internationalization within these documents and use them to substantiate interview outcomes, with the interviews being the main information resource for the qualitative study. The document review also served to triangulate interview outcomes and outcomes from the other data sources collected for this case study. Among the documents reviewed were planning documents such as strategic plans, which included planning meeting agendas, quality enhancement plan proposals and the institution’s 2010 Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), information on the membership of the planning teams, consultant reports, focus groups results, and institutional strategic plans from the past fifteen years.

Additionally, the researcher reviewed communications documents related to internationalization, such as: the president’s initiation of the most recent strategic planning process; minutes from planning committees and the university senate; faculty senate endorsement and approval of the global learning curricular framework; the president’s letter to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) related to the development of the 2010 QEP; recommendations from the QEP planning committee to the leadership team; the global learning for global citizenship integrated communications campaign; and communications related to the celebration of the International Education Week program.
The researcher also reviewed documents related to the institution’s profile and operational guidelines to identify their impact on campus internationalization. These documents included the college portrait of the university, organizational charts, statistical information, the university’s vision and mission, the undergraduate and graduate catalogs, documented expectations for student learning outcomes, and documents on internationalization offices’ goals and responsibilities.

Finally, the researcher reviewed documentation promoting internationalization programs and activities, which included calendars of internationalization events, international education services brochures, and invitations to internationalization receptions. Other types of documents reviewed were information on programs such as the Minority Health International Research Training Program, the Alternative Spring Break program, and the Tuesday Times Roundtables. The researcher also reviewed the following assessment tools: the global learning programs outcomes rubric, the global learning student affairs survey, the global learning faculty survey, the global learning faculty and staff workshop evaluation, and the study abroad experience assessment.

In conducting the audio-visual materials review, the researcher studied photographs and videos posted on the university’s website, as well as pictures on the documents reviewed during the document review process. The researcher selected materials for audio-visual review based on having identified expressions of campus internationalization in them. The researcher reviewed approximately fifty photographs and over fifty videos, and sought to identify indicators and best practices of internationalization within these materials and use them to substantiate interview outcomes. The audio-visual materials review also served to triangulate interview
outcomes and outcomes from the other data sources collected for this case study.

Among the elements of internationalization depicted in the photographs were flag displays of several countries in offices, greeting areas, a hall of flags, and in the ceiling of the Student Center Atrium. The photographs also depicted several artifacts, pictures, paintings, mosaics, and souvenirs from other countries prominently displayed in faculty and staff offices of university. Additionally, the photographs highlighted the prominence of posters in the hallways, on doors, and in offices promoting SEU3s Worlds Ahead re-branding initiative, and advertising international conferences, seminars, programs, activities, and services.

The videos reviewed by the researcher promoted SEU3s Worlds Ahead re-branding launch, and several recorded programs and student reactions to the Tuesday Times Roundtable discussions. The Tuesday Times Roundtable was a program that SEU3 implemented as part of its Worlds Ahead initiative for the campus community to participate for one hour every Tuesday mid-day in an open discussion of a selected New York Times article on global issues, or events.

To perform field observations, the researcher toured the SEU3 campus for two days, and took photographs of buildings, open areas, and several offices. In addition to observing the students in the hallways and grounds and having casual conversations with faculty and staff members at SEU3, the researcher toured the grounds, buildings, hallways, and offices of the university, and took notes of those observations and encounters. Through these field observations, the researcher sought to ascertain internationalization indicators and best practices and use them to substantiate interview outcomes. The field observations also served to triangulate interview outcomes and
outcomes from the other data sources collected for this case study.

During the field observations, the researcher listened in on students’ conversations in which issues related to campus internationalization were being discussed, or the students were communicating in a foreign language, which was quite common throughout SEU3. The researcher also observed the conspicuous use of several languages on message boards, advertisement posters, bulletin board announcements, building identifications, and monuments across the university.

A host of banners paved the walkways of SEU3 promoting several aspects of the Worlds Ahead initiative. In addition to the slogan, these banners had pictures of different faculty members and researchers of diverse ethnicities and nationalities, and a short written exposé of some aspect of local community, or global, significance of their work. On the grounds of the university, there were monuments honoring different nations and international causes. Trees from other countries had also been planted on the grounds of SEU3 over the years, and displays promoting global citizenship were hung over building entrances and exits.

**Description of Sample and Participants**

The subjects in the quantitative phase of this investigation were senior level international education officers at the eight public research universities in the Southeast region, SEU1 through SEU8, of the United States (see Appendix L). Each of these professionals was a campus leader in a major area of campus internationalization, and held a position of director, or higher. The researcher considered such areas as international education programs, international services and centers, international student and scholar services, global engagement, and study abroad to be major areas of campus
internationalization.

Among the seven subjects who responded to the survey, five held positions as directors, one was an executive director, and one was an assistant vice-president. The amount of time the subjects had been in their current positions ranged from three to twenty-two years, with the mean being 8.86 years. The total number of years served in higher education internationalization ranged from five to twenty-five years, the mean of which was 16.57 years. The total number of years these officials had served at the current university ranged from four to twenty-four years, with 13.57 years being the mean. On average, the subjects had served 21.14 years in higher education administration, with a range from twelve to thirty-four years. Among the subjects, four reported doctoral degrees and three reported master’s degrees as their highest degree earned (see Appendix L).

The participants in the qualitative investigation were eight officials who had significantly impacted campus internationalization and continued to be actively involved in international education at SEU3. These officials included professionals in the areas of planning, institutional governance, internationalization governance, teaching, research, and service. In this study, the names of the participants were substituted for the nomenclature IO (internationalization officer at Southeast region university number three) 1 through 8 (see Appendix M). The researcher assigned a code of IO1 to the first officer interviewed and the last one was assigned a code of IO8. Identifying responses by officer was done to make ready comparisons among the different officers concerning each question.

Two of the officers, IO2 and IO4, were involved in the area of strategic planning
for the university. Having served the university for eight years, IO2 was the Vice-Provost for Academic Planning and Accountability. The office overseen by this officer developed academic learning outcomes for the university, oversaw institutional and program accreditations, and conducted program reviews and assessments. The endeavors of this area facilitated the institution’s strategic planning process, which resulted in the development of the university’s 2010 Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), focusing on global learning; and, the 2010-2015 World’s Ahead Strategic Plan, establishing the institution’s internationalization priorities. IO2 underscored the effects of globalization in the areas of increased transportation, services such as healthcare, trade, commerce, and banking, on the geographical location of the university, propelling attention to globalization in the institution’s planning processes.

IO4 had been at SEU3 for seventeen of the thirty-two years he had served in higher education administration. As the Associate Vice-President for Planning and Institutional Research, IO4 monitored and advised the university’s administration on student and faculty engagements in internationalization activities, and served on the institution’s strategic planning global committee. This officer emphasized that the wide variety in the demographic and cultural diversity of the university’s human resources provided the institution with an adequate framework for successful internationalization engagements.

To gain insight from the governance of the university regarding campus internationalization, the researcher interviewed IO8, the president of SEU3. Including several years as Provost and Vice-President of Academic Affairs, IO8 had served this university for thirty-five years, and had founded the Latin American and Caribbean
Center (LACC) soon after arriving at SEU3 in the mid-1970s. Interviewees expressed that the LACC became the centerpiece of the university’s internationalization. IO8 stressed that SEU3 had been intentional about internationalization since its very founding in the early 1970s.

IO8 also underscored that the university has had multinational faculty from its inception and that it had always counted with global leaders throughout its history. Since becoming the President at SEU3 three years ago, IO8 has engineered the re-branding of the institution with the Worlds Ahead slogan and marketing campaign defining SEU3 as a university dedicated to preparing global citizens. This re-branding has operated in consonance with the university’s 2010 QEP focusing on global learning and its 2010-2015 World’s Ahead Strategic Plan. Moreover, IO8 created the position of Vice President of Engagement to reinforce and expand SEU3s overseas partnership opportunities.

To obtain insight into the governance of internationalization at SEU3, the researcher interviewed IO3, the Director of the Office of Global Learning Initiatives (OGLI). Data outcomes of this study revealed that the establishment of this operation was a direct outcome of the university’s engagement in developing the institution’s 2010 QEP. IO3, who had served the university in areas of international education for six years and who had had a seventeen-year portfolio in higher education internationalization, was asked to oversee the implementation of the QEP. This officer was the most explicit concerning the academic development and assessment of student global proficiencies. IO3 highlighted the intentionality of the university’s efforts to develop faculty competencies in global learning theory, pedagogy, and assessments. IO3 also expressed
that the OGLI had the necessary administrative autonomy on campus to operate as a much-needed hub to bring all the international education areas together to steer intentional internationalization progress at the university.

To obtain the faculty perspective on internationalization at SEU3, the researcher interviewed IO5, the Executive Director of the School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA). IO5 had served the university for thirty-six years and also held the position of Professor of Politics and International Relations and Law in SIPA. According to the data results of this study, SIPA was created in 2009 as the product of the global imperative of SEU3. The primary mission of this School was to integrate all the internationally-oriented disciplines of university, provide global education, and support study abroad opportunities. IO5 indicated that the intention of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences was to highlight a number of strengths within the arts and sciences, one of which was international. As a result, SIPA was created. IO5 emphasized that the faculty of the institution recognized the importance of internationalization in the daily life of the diverse community in which SEU3 is located, and therefore tailored the curriculum to include international course requirements.

IO6 was the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education, and had been involved in higher education internationalization for twenty-five years, most of which was served in the Department of State as a foreign service officer. IO6 supported international education at SEU3 from a research perspective by exploring and establishing international institutional linkages, which included researching opportunities for international work exposure with multi-national corporations through internships or inter-organizational agreements. IO6 discussed the importance of students engaging in
mentored research with faculty conducting international research to build global competence.

Two of the officers, IO1 and IO7, oversaw departments that were directly geared toward international education administrative services. IO1 had been leading the Office of International Student and Scholar Services for seventeen years and was also the institution’s participant in the quantitative phase of this investigation. The office overseen by this officer served in an advisement and advocacy capacity to all international students and scholars to ensure their smooth transition into the university and the community. IO1 was the only officer to mention the recent hiring of an international student recruiter and the need for international student recruitment to become a more targeted area of campus internationalization.

With seven years of higher education internationalization experience, IO7 was the Director of the Office of Education Abroad. This office was in charge of promoting education abroad opportunities and scholarship, and international education exchanges. IO7 discussed the need for students to be prepared to work in the local community, which was becoming increasingly more internationalized. Moreover, IO7 stressed the opportunity that the university had in capitalizing on its prevalence of faculty and staff who are from other countries to help boost student interest in developing international experiences and achieving global proficiency.

The amount of time the SEU3 officials had been in their current positions ranged from one to seventeen years, with the mean being 4.50 years. The total number of years they had served in higher education internationalization ranged from five to thirty-five years, the mean of which was 16.75 years. The total number of years the officials had
served at the current university ranged from four to thirty-five years, with 17.25 years being the mean. On average, the officials had served 22.75 years in higher education administration, with a range from ten to thirty-four years. Of the eight respondents, five reported doctoral degrees and three reported master’s degrees as their highest degree earned (see Appendix M).

**Findings**

The purpose of this study was to determine how organizational intentionality has impacted successful internationalization at public research universities in the United States as measured through the lens of the strategic intent theory. After sending the “Organizational Intentionality in Campus Internationalization Survey” (see Appendix B) to eight senior international education officers at the public research universities in the Southeast region of the United States, and receiving responses from seven of the subjects, the researcher analyzed the responses and answered the overarching research question. *Overarching Research Question: What is the degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization at the eight public research universities in the Southeast region of the United States?*

The researcher averaged responses in each of the three areas of the survey to obtain a mean score for each area. Each of these areas represented one of the three stages of the theory of strategic intent. The stages are: co-invention, which is the creation of a vision; engagement, which represents organizational commitment; and, practice, in which the strategic intent is successfully demonstrated. Subsequent to averaging the responses, the overall percentage of the responses was obtained by averaging the mean scores of all three areas. As a result, and following the research design for this study, survey
outcomes revealed the degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization at each of the institutions, which was the mean percentage score of the three areas of strategic intent. In the outcomes, the degrees of intentionality ranged from 36%, corresponding to SEU2, to 81%, corresponding to SEU3 (Table 4.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three Areas of Strategic Intent in Campus Internationalization</th>
<th>SEU 2</th>
<th>SEU 3</th>
<th>SEU 4</th>
<th>SEU 5</th>
<th>SEU 6</th>
<th>SEU 7</th>
<th>SEU 8</th>
<th>Average of each Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Intentionality in Creating a Vision for Internationalization</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Intentionality in Organizational Commitment to Internationalization</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Intentionality in the Practice of Internationalization</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Means (Degree of Contribution of Intentionality in Campus Internationalization) | 36% | 81% | 39% | 80% | 73% | 77% | 66% | 64% |

Table 4.1 Overall Results of the “Organizational Intentionality in Campus Internationalization Survey” for all Three Areas of Strategic Intent

To further investigate the validity of survey outcomes, the researcher computed a Pearson product–moment correlation coefficient (see Appendix N) to assess the significance of relationships among variables. First, the researcher correlated the demographic variables corresponding to the research subjects. Findings revealed a
significantly positive relationship ($r=0.771, p<0.01$) between the total number of years respondents had served in higher education administration ($\mu=21.14$) and the number of years they were in their current position ($\mu=8.86$) (see Appendix N). According to this finding, the longer a respondent had worked in higher education administration, the longer they had remained in their current position.

Other findings associated with the demographics of the subjects were that the total number of years the respondents served at their universities ($\mu=13.57$) held a significantly positive relationship ($r=0.876, p<0.01$) with their responses regarding intentionality in the creation of a vision for internationalization at their campuses. There was also a significantly positive correlation ($r=0.801, p<0.05$) between the total number of years the respondents had served at their universities ($\mu=13.57$) with their responses regarding the commitment of the organization in internationalizing the campus. Additionally, the analysis produced a significantly positive relationship ($r=0.801, p<0.05$) when comparing the total number of years the respondents had served at their universities ($\mu=13.57$) with the composite outcome regarding the degree of contribution of intentionality in campus internationalization.

Secondly, the researcher performed frequencies analyses across the three stages of strategic intent in campus internationalization by measuring responses in the three areas, and all questions, of the survey. The researcher correlated the outcomes in these three areas of strategic intent with each other and with the overall degree of contribution of intentionality in campus internationalization.

Findings revealed the emergence of several relationships. A significantly positive relationship ($r=0.962, p<0.01$) emerged between intentionality in the creation of a vision
for internationalization and intentionality in organizational commitment to internationalization. A significantly positive relationship ($r=0.800$, $p<0.05$) also resulted between intentionality in the creation of a vision for internationalization and intentionality in the practice of internationalization. In addition, a significantly positive relationship ($r=0.885$, $p<0.01$) appeared between intentionality in organizational commitment to internationalization and intentionality in the practice of internationalization (see Appendix N).

The results of the correlations showed that the more one stage of strategic intent increased, the more each of the other stages and the overall strategic intent increased. Therefore, as intentionality in internationalization increased in each of the stages of strategic intent, the more intentionality contributed to internationalization at the institutions. Equally, the more intentionality contributed to campus internationalization, the more each of the stages of strategic intent had increased.

Subsequent to the quantitative investigation, the qualitative investigation supported the purpose of this study by seeking to answer the research sub-questions regarding the strongest indicator and best practices relative to intentionality in higher education internationalization. The researcher answered these questions by conducting a case study at SEU3, the institution that resulted with the highest degree of contribution of intentionality in campus internationalization according to the quantitative study.

*Research Sub-Question 1: What is the strongest indicator of intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university?*

The researcher conducted a thematic analysis of participants’ responses to the first eight questions of the interview questionnaire (Appendix F) to investigate emerging
themes corresponding to indictors of intentional internationalization at SEU3. Then, the researcher performed a frequency analysis for these responses to identify the indicator with the highest percentage of occurrence among all of the emerging indicators. In the outcome, four indicators accounted for 55% of all the indicators of intentional internationalization emerging from the qualitative analysis. These top four indicators were planning, curriculum, globalization response, and commitment (Figure 4.1).

Among these four indicators, with a 19% frequency, planning was the strongest indicator of intentionality in successful internationalization at SEU3. Interview participants made numerous references to this indicator, and the document and audio-visual review, and field observations overwhelmingly supported the presence of the planning indicator at SEU3.

![Figure 4.1 Indicators of Intentionality in Successful Internationalization at SEU3 Based on Interviews Responses](image)

*Figure 4.1* Indicators of Intentionality in Successful Internationalization at SEU3 Based on Interviews Responses
Research Sub-Question 2: What are best practices relative to intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university?

The researcher conducted a thematic analysis of participants’ responses to the last ten questions of the interview questionnaire (Appendix F) to investigate emerging themes corresponding to best practices of intentional internationalization at SEU3. Then, the researcher performed a frequency analysis for these responses to identify the best practice with the highest percentage of occurrence among all of the emerging best practices of intentional internationalization in each the three stages of strategic intent: vision creation, organizational commitment, and practice.

In the first stage of strategic intent, the creation of a vision, the theme that emerged at SEU3 as the most salient best practice of intentional internationalization was the commitment of the leadership of the university to internationalization (Figure 4.2).

![Figure 4.2 Best Practices of Intentionality in the Creation of a Vision for Successful Internationalization at SEU3 Based on Interviews Responses](image)
Interview participants prominently highlighted that the leadership was purposeful in ensuring that the vision for campus internationalization was clearly articulated in the institution’s strategic planning and re-branding efforts. This commitment was most notable in the institution’s development of the 2010 QEP, as the product of SEU3’s internationalization vision and as the operational guide to achieve intentional campus internationalization. Resource allocation and vision in planning also emerged as prominent best practices in this stage of strategic intent (Figure 4.2).

In the second stage of strategic intent, organizational commitment, the most salient emerging theme regarding best practices of intentional internationalization at SEU3 was structure establishment (Figure 4.3). The thematic analysis revealed that SEU3 had instituted several competent structures to implement the campus
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*Figure 4.3 Best Practices of Intentionality in Organizational Commitment for Successful Internationalization at SEU3 Based on Interviews Responses*
internationalization vision. In addition, one of the most unique features of this theme found in the analysis was that the human resources at SEU3 were already heavily internationalized, as employees were actively involved in the process of internationalization.

The structure establishment theme appeared prominently throughout the interviews as respondents conveyed a strong belief in the comprehensiveness of the QEP in identifying the university’s internationalization expectations, and in the resulting decisions of the administration that created SIPA and the OGLI. Identifying, implementing, and supporting the establishment of structure is a major component of the theory of strategic intent, which, in the case of SEU3, respondents indicated it enabled the implementation of a strategic architecture for internationalization by developing critical units. Other prominent best practices in this stage were employee engagement and competencies establishment (Figure 4.3).

In the third stage of strategic intent, intentionality in the practice of internationalization, the most salient emerging theme at SEU3 was creativity and experimentation (Figure 4.4). The most prominent aspect in the emergence of this theme was the unique manner in which internationalization operated at SEU3. The institution was able to capitalize on its geographic proximity with Latin-American and the Caribbean, its location in one of the most internationalized regions of the country, its internationalized human resources, and the demographic diversity of its students, to promote and institutionalize its internationalization initiative.

Several interview participants were very prompt in pointing out that the driving force behind internationalization at SEU3 was its geographic location. This new phase of
Figure 4.4 Best Practices of Intentionality in the Practice of Successful Internationalization at SEU3 Based on Interviews Responses

Internationalization experimentation at SEU3 began with the process of developing the 2010 QEP. In the outcome, the institution proposed creative ways to accomplish more in-depth and intentional campus internationalization. The review of documents revealed SEU3 decided to first implement a policy of global pre-requisites for undergraduate students. The QEP also included co-curricular global learning experiences in the form of the Alternative Spring Break program, the International Education Week event, and Tuesday Times Roundtable discussions, among other activities and events. These new and creative programs were geared to meet students’ needs for multicultural competencies and global citizenship. Other best practices that emerged in this stage were a systematic approach to internationalization, and the development of internationalization change agents (Figure 4.4).
Response to Research Questions

The research sub-questions sought to identify the strongest indicator and best practices of intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university. These questions were answered by conducting a qualitative case study investigation at the university that resulted with the highest degree of contribution of intentionality in its campus internationalization based on results of the quantitative study. This university was SEU3 (Figure 4.5).

To realize the case study, the researcher interviewed eight officials, IO1 through IO8, involved in internationalization at SEU3 (see Appendix M), reviewed documents and audio-visual materials pertaining to internationalization at SEU3, and conducted field observations at the university. The researcher designated the interviews as the main source of information in the qualitative investigation.

![Figure 4.5 Degree of Contribution of Intentionality in Internationalization at U.S. Southeast Region Universities](image)

*Figure 4.5 Degree of Contribution of Intentionality in Internationalization at U.S. Southeast Region Universities*
Indicators of intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university

The first research sub-question of this study sought to answer the question: What is the strongest indicator of intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university? In the thematic analysis of the interviews, each official cited planning as the key indicator of the university’s intentionality in internationalizing the campus. The literature investigation of this study identified this indicator as a strategic and systematic planning approach to campus internationalization, and aligned it with the creation of a vision for internationalization stage of the theory of strategic intent. This indicator emerged as the strongest indicator of intentional internationalization at SEU3 primarily due to its impact on the development of the 2010 QEP, the resulting incorporation of global learning requirements into the curriculum, the creation of the OGLI, and the development of the 2010-2015 Strategic Plan and assessment plans.

According to IO2, these engagements demonstrated “purposeful support from the institution’s leadership.” IO3 affirmed that internationalization was “being looked at in a more coordinated fashion, particularly the curriculum, assessments, and student learning outcomes.” IO4 believed that the meaningful planning accomplishments pertaining to the internationalization of SEU3 was making internationalization the theme of the QEP, incorporating it as a pillar of the 2010-2015 Strategic Plan, and creating SIPA. IO4 sustained that planning was one of the two most important indicators of internationalization of higher education. IO2 and IO7 held the same positions.

Furthermore, the participants indicated that with a five-year internationalization assessment plan in place, SEU3 was now able to assess global course completions, global
learning outcomes, the number of students engaged in international education programs and activities, the number of students taking foreign languages, the number of faculty engaged in international education and research, and university agreements with overseas entities. IO4 believed that cohesion had been “reignited by the QEP,” and IO7 underscored that having embarked on a comprehensive planning process, the institution now had “a vision for where it is heading.” These officials gave serious, ample, and significant credit to the deliberateness of the institution’s planning efforts in internationalizing SEU3.

The existence and availability of numerous planning documents corroborated that planning was highly indicative of successful internationalization at SEU3. In addition to the documents related to the strategic outcomes of the planning process, the existence of proposals, meeting agendas and minutes, focus groups results, letters, and documents on committee and team memberships allowed the researcher to navigate the comprehensiveness of the planning process. A strategic and systematic planning approach appeared as an internationalization indicator theme in approximately 96% of all the documents reviewed by the researcher, and, with almost a 50% frequency rate, it resulted as the highest indicator in the document analysis for this case study.

Internationalization of the curriculum and the educational experience was intricately associated with strategic and systematic planning at SEU3. This second most prevalent indicator represented 14% of the indicator themes in the interview data set (Figure 4.1). Major curricular changes were the outcomes of planning for internationalization. IO3 elaborated that every student affairs department chose one of the global student learning outcomes established by the university and focuses on that
outcome in its semester planning efforts. These global learning outcomes were global perspective, global engagement, and global awareness. IO4 pointed out that, in addition to the creation of SIPA, making internationalization the theme of the QEP and a pillar of the 2010-2015 strategic plan established curriculum as a strong indicator of intentional internationalization at SEU3.

IO4 moreover referred to the creation of certificate programs that focus on internationalization, such as Latin-American and Caribbean Studies, African-American Diaspora Studies, and Asian Studies strongly substantiated the university’s curricular efforts toward intentional internationalization. According to IO5, “there is an international dimension to every school and college in the university.” Furthermore, IO8 emphasized that the university needed to remain focused on the basics of teaching culture and foreign languages, and that the internationalization of the curriculum will continue to increase as SEU3 would be “going after federal grants to fund language studies.” In addressing what the future of internationalization would look like for SEU3, IO2 affirmed that all “students will be graduating from a globalized curriculum through all disciplines, and having internationalization experiences on campus or abroad.”

Appearing in approximately 60% of the documents, the thematic analysis of the researcher’s document reviews supported internationalization of the curriculum as the second highest indicator of intentional internationalization at SEU3. In the documents, this indicator was generally associated with the strategic and systematic planning approach to internationalization of the SEU3 leadership, and since major curricular changes were the outcome of planning for internationalization, this theme had a high affinity with the planning indicator. This indicator involved increased English as a
Second Language teaching, foreign language and area studies training, extracurricular activities such as intercultural events, acquisition of global skills and competency, and intercultural sensitivity to live in a globalized world.

In the researcher’s field observations, discussions about planning regularly signaled the addition of global learning prerequisites to the undergraduate curriculum and to the law school and medical school curricula, the development and increase of overseas internships, and co-curricular global learning experiences. Respondents explained that co-curricular activities included alternative spring breaks where students took up global causes, such as the restoration of a national park in Costa Rica and a mentorship program at an elementary school in Nicaragua.

Another prominent co-curricular engagement interviewees and field-observed officials pointed out was the International Education Week (IEW), which comprised of activities such as international workshops and events, speeches on globalization, art exhibitions and a film festival, information sessions on study abroad and overseas internships, video conferences with the Department of State, and visits by local consulates. According to the officials, these activities were jointly planned by the global learning faculty and student affairs officials at SEU3, and were designed to enrich global learning. Respondents also noted that students received extra credit by participating in the Tuesday Times Roundtables.

Of added value to SEU3s internationalization planning was the institution’s embrace of the strategic response to globalization indicator. This indicator represented the strategic manner in which the institution responded to the effects of globalization, and was highly associated with strategic and systematic planning (Figure 4.1). Interview
participants believed that the geographic location of SEU3 and the demographics of the region were extremely favorable to the university in terms of campus internationalization, and that the university has purposefully incorporate globalization components from its local community, Latin-America, and the Caribbean into its institutional planning activities. IO4 expressed that the demographic richness of having such diverse immigrant communities in the county in which the university was located, and in the surrounding counties, offered “a wealth of very interesting research in terms of transcultural adjustment.”

IO5 pointed out that SEU3 was at crossroads with the Caribbean, and referred to this region as “one of the most globalized areas in the world.” IO8 underlined that “the local economy was intimately embedded in the global economy,” and IO2 expressed that SEU3 was “preparing students to serve a globalized U.S.A. internally.” IO4 believed that SEU3 was inherently globalized since 80% of its student population was minority, and many of the students were born in other countries. IO4 also affirmed that these students had a very “migrational philosophy when it comes to citizenship; they are whatever they are plus American.”

IO4 furthermore highlighted SEU3s global expansions with programs in Jamaica, China, and India, and expressed the need for more focus on increasing educational partnerships with Brazil and Russia. IO8 underscored the need for SEU3 to engage in more dual degrees with other countries, and for SEU3 students to participate more in study abroad engagements so that they would have an opportunity to “understand how similar issues are addressed in foreign contexts.”

While the document reviews analysis strongly supported the association of
internationalization of the curriculum with strategic and systematic planning at SEU3, analyses of the audio-visual materials and researcher observations highly substantiated global response as having the strongest affiliation with the strategic and systematic planning indicator. Global response, therefore, resulted with the highest frequency rate amongst all the other elements in both the audio-visual and researcher observations data sets analyses. This was mostly because of the ample amount of videos existent on SEU3s website heavily favoring the Worlds Ahead branding initiative and the Tuesday Times Roundtable discussions, which the researcher evaluated as a significant means employed by the university to strategically respond to globalization.

In the thematic analysis of the interviews, commitment surfaced as the fourth most salient indicator of intentional internationalization. It stood for a top/down down/up culture of dedication, particularly by the senior administration of the university, to support and fund campus internationalization. While IO8 identified faculty hiring as highest indicator of intentional internationalization, IO2 and IO5 chose commitment, explicitly in the form of investment in the faculty of the institution, as their highest indicator of intentional internationalization. Additionally, IO4 and IO6 both decided on commitment in the form of executive support as their strongest indicator of intentionality in successful internationalization at SEU3.

For example, in answering question number one regarding the reasons why SEU3 had been highly intention in its internationalization efforts, IO6 stated, “It comes from the president. He has a vision and understands the importance of preparing students for the future.” In answering question number two regarding the reason why internationalization was important to SEU3, IO5 pointed out that “The LACC, which became the centerpiece
of the university’s internationalization was founded by the current president in the 1970s.”

In answering question number three concerning the indicators of intentional internationalization at SEU3, IO5 highlighted that the university had brought in a competent internationalization consultant. In the answers to question number four in which the participants were asked to narrow their indicators down to the two strongest, IO2 indicated that the participation of the leadership of the institution in the planning processes was so strong that it engendered faculty buy-in. IO5 reiterated the impact of leadership on faculty buy-in, and IO8 confirmed the importance of hiring competent faculty. IO6 also underscored the steady focus of the leadership, particularly the president, and the availability of resources to hire faculty with internationalization experience.

The most prominent expression of commitment as a strong indicator of internationalization surfaced in the answers to question number five, in which six of the eight respondents stated that senior administrative commitment was the strongest indicator of intentional internationalization at SEU3. In answering question number six related to interviewees’ beliefs regarding whether there were other indicators of intentional internationalization that the university had yet to embrace, IO6 stated the importance of “having the right person in a senior level position that could bring all the internationalization areas together.” In addressing answers to question number eight regarding interviewees’ thoughts on what the future would look like for internationalization at SEU3, IO5 declared, “The University will expand further, particularly because it has a passionate president.”
Best Practices of intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university

The second research sub-question of this study sought to answer the question: What are best practices relative to intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university? This question was answered by the outcome of the thematic analysis of the second ten questions of the second part of the interview questionnaire (see Appendix F), the documents and audio-visual reviews, and the researcher’s field observation, which resulted in the identification of best practices relative to internationalization at SEU3. Best practices were assessed based on the frequency of their outcomes in the thematic analysis. The frequency of outcomes was determined by a percent score in each of the three stages of strategic intent.

Outcomes of this study found that the most salient best practice related to the first stage of strategic intent, intentionality in creating a vision for internationalization, was the leadership commitment of the university (Figure 4.2). The most salient best practice related to the second stage of strategic intent, intentionality in organizational commitment to internationalization (Figure 4.3), was the establishment of internationalization structure at the university. Finally, the results of this study found that the most salient best practice in the third stage of strategic intent, intentionality in the practice of internationalization, was a systematic approach to internationalization through creativity and experimentation (Figure 4.4).

**Intentionality in the creation of a vision for internationalization.** In the first stage of strategic intent, creation of a vision, interview participants rated the commitment of the leadership of the university as the most prominent best practice of visionary
leadership and innovation in campus internationalization. Resource allocation and vision in planning were also highly rated by respondents as best practice in this stage. These three themes of intentionality in this co-invention stage of strategic intent combined for almost two-thirds of SEU3’s creation of a vision for internationalization (Figure 4.2).

In six of the eight responses to the question regarding what is the driving force behind intentionality at SEU3, the answer was leadership commitment, and, of these six answers, three of them directly signaled the president as the driving force. According to IO4, the president “reignited the value of the institution due to its geography, its community, and the kinds of students it serves.” IO5 affirmed that “the leadership plays a significant role in turning things around.” These answers aligned with internationalization indicators’ outcomes in this study showing that senior leadership commitment was vital to the intentional internationalization of SEU3.

Throughout the responses corresponding to the analysis of this phase of strategic intent, SEU3’s leadership commitment was prominently highlighted. IO4 illustrated this level of commitment by informing, for example, that the university contracted consultants who were specialists in internationalizing curricula to assist in the QEP initiative. According to IO4, the consultants “put together a very thorough research project looking at internationalization efforts across the country, pulling out best practices, and suggesting several options.”

IO5 reiterated, “The president’s focus on engagement reinforces the international.” IO5 also believed that the president’s establishment of a vision for internationalization, appointing strong vice–presidents, and receiving strong support from the provost contributed most to the intentional internationalization of SEU3. IO8
underscored that hiring the right faculty and supporting them was the best practice that contributed the most. IO2 expressed that it was the authenticity of the president, who was supportive, including providing financial support, and actively involved in internationalizing the campus that sustained such a high level of intentionality in internationalization.

Several other respondents reiterated the impact of leadership on sustainability. IO6 indicated that internationalization intentionality was sustained by “the power of the leaders to make internationalization happen at the institution.” IO2 affirmed that internationalization needed to become the “the standard operating procedure, and culture, of the university, sustained by leadership, resources, and communications.” IO6 concluded, “The commitment of the leaders already exists.” These responses clearly established leadership commitment as a major best practice of intentional internationalization at SEU3.

Regarding the value of the best practice of resource allocation to the leadership commitment best practice, interview participants stressed that resource allocation was a critical ingredient in high commitment. IO1 expressed the need to continue funding internationalization, particularly as related to engendering systemic internationalization. IO7 affirmed the need for expansion of resources and proactive thinking to keep sustaining a high level of intentionality in internationalization. According to IO8, “Having resources available is very important, and the leadership has to keep a bully pulpit and emphasize it so the people realize it is crucial.” IO8 further detailed the need for resources to reward internationalization in such ways as travel time and dollars for faculty and staff to attend conferences.
Based on the thematic analyses of the documents and audio-visual materials, the resource allocation element appeared approximately in 50% of the materials reviewed. The 2010 QEP document review revealed that SEU3 amply dedicated resources to their internationalization planning processes and to the implementation of the 2010-2015 Strategic Plan for the institution. For example, in addition to contracting consultants to assist in the development of the QEP, one major outcome of the QEP was the creation of the OGLI with a seven-year, fiscal year 2008-2009 through fiscal year 2014-2015, allocation of $4.1 million.

The researcher’s reviews of the documents corresponding to internationalization programs revealed that SEU3 also implemented the Alternative Spring Break program, the International Education Week event, the Tuesday Times Roundtable discussions, and the global learning curricular framework. According to the reviews, SEU3 also engaged in the Worlds Ahead institutional re-branding initiative, appointed a new Vice-President for Engagement, employed several surveys to assess co-curricular collaborations, and conducted numerous workshops and events related to campus internationalization.

In the thematic analysis of the researcher’s field observations, the element of resource allocation was also overwhelmingly present in approximately 80% of the field observations. For example, SEU3 engaged in campus-wide promotions of its Worlds Ahead re-branding; and, there were considerable monetary investments in promoting internationalization by institutionalizing halls of flags, establishing monuments honoring international causes, and promoting study abroad and international student services.

Vision in planning also emerged as a critical theme in support of the best practice of leadership commitment in the strategic intent stage of co-invention. Regarding this
best practice, interview participants consistently referenced the 2010 QEP as the product of SEU3's internationalization vision and as the operational guide activated by the institution’s leadership to achieve intentional campus internationalization. According to IO7, the QEP is the driving force behind internationalization at SEU3. Seven of the eight respondents indicated that SEU3's global learning initiative, as expressed in the QEP, represented the institution’s model to internationalize the campus.

Additionally, IO3 underscored that one element relative to intentional internationalization that contributed more than others at SEU3 was “having a strategic plan to guide the university in its internationalization efforts.” Furthermore, IO4 stated that the university prioritized its internationalization activities and engagements against the strategic plan and measured against short and long term goals. IO7 expressed that the institution’s strategic plan had a strong intentional internationalization component which caused it to be supported by the administration, and IO4 indicated that the strategic plan served to bring every decision back to intentionality.

Outcomes of the thematic review of documents supported vision in planning as a meaningful component of intentional internationalization at SEU3. This theme appeared in approximately 20% of the documents reviewed. It was prominently expressed in the president’s letter to SACS which accompanied the QEP, it was threaded throughout the QEP, and it guided the development of the institution’s strategic plans. The vision in planning best practice was also prevalent in approximately 60% of the analysis of the audio-visual materials data set, particularly in the Worlds Ahead re-branding videos in which the president promoted the initiative and established a framework for its accomplishment.
In the researcher’s field observations, the presence of vision in planning was very prevalent. The researcher observed this theme particularly in the purposefulness of the use of several languages as identifiers of buildings and on monuments across campus. For example, four of the major buildings were each called a name in a different language, based on the order in which they were constructed: building one was called “Primera Casa” in Spanish, building two was called “Deuxième Maison” in French, building three was called “Owa Ehan” in Swahilli, and building four was called “Viertes Haus” in German. The peace monument on the campus grounds also had the phrase “Peace to All Mankind” written on it in several different languages. Additionally, vision in planning was prominently noticeable by the numerous banners and advertisements displayed throughout the campus, inside and outside of the buildings, advertising and promoting SEU3s Worlds Ahead re-branding initiative.

**Intentionality in organizational commitment to internationalization.** In the second stage of strategic intent, organizational commitment to internationalization, interview participants rated structure establishment as the most prominent best practice in internationalizing the campus. Employee engagement and competencies establishment were the other two highest rated best practices in this second stage. These three best practices of intentionality in the engagement stage of strategic combined for almost half of SEU3s organizational commitment to internationalization (Figure 4.3).

IO4 indicated that one of the major expectations of creating the OGLI was to “provide bridges and support mechanisms” to make the university’s internationalization process successful. IO1 did not see this happening as yet, however, and emphasized the need for internationalization to be more organized at the institution by bringing the
internationalization areas together “in some meaningful way.” IO6 espoused the importance of creating an institutional framework to develop internationalization more comprehensively.

IO6 believed that one of the best practices of intentional internationalization of a university was to invest in its human capital and choose the best person to oversee the entire process. IO3 expressed that one of the practices relative to intentionality that had contributed to successful internationalization at SEU3 was the creation of the OGLI and having it serve as “the hub for internationalization” with a strategic plan in place, in the form of the QEP, to guide SEU3 in its internationalization efforts. IO3 acknowledged, however, that one improvement that could be made relative to best practices in intentional internationalization would be for SEU3s administration to create a senior level position, such as a Vice Provost for International Affairs, under which all the internationalization areas could be effectively coordinated. Several other respondents expressed the same need.

For example, IO6 supported that it would be important to have “one structure that brings all the internationalization efforts together, with a leader who is creative, open, flexible, and capable of making things happen.” IO5 noted that there needed to be flexibility in the structure so that “it doesn’t calcify.” According to IO7, a major improvement in SEU3s intentional internationalization would be to have an area that coordinated internationalization throughout the university and operated as a resource for all internationalization efforts, including serving as a data-warehouse for internalization information.

The best practice of structure establishment was firmly supported in the document
analysis. One-third of the documents reviewed by the researcher discussed the various administrative internationalization structures at SEU3, including the various programs and activities supported by these structures. For example, the LACC, which offered a number of degree programs and certificates in different areas of studies related to the hemisphere, became part of SIPA. SIPA itself offered training and research to students with the objective of developing internationalization proficiency. According to IO5, SIPA enrolled between eight and ten thousand students, which represented approximately one-fifth of the SEU3s total student enrollment. Additionally, the OGLI promoted global learning initiatives, conferences, events and activities, amongst which were the Tuesday Times Roundtable discussions.

In the researcher’s review of audio-visual materials and field observations, structure establishment was prominently represented, particularly in the thematic analysis of the videos related to the president’s Worlds Ahead initiative and the Tuesday Times Roundtables.

In addition to the creation of new internationalization administrative structures, results of the interviews analysis highlighted the establishment of several other core competencies, such as the globalization of the curriculum, financial support, professional development, communications, promotions and advertisement, and stakeholders’ commitment and collaborations. Other internationalization operations at SEU supported student engagement in several aspects of international education, including study abroad, awareness activities, and various academic programs, information, and research endeavors.

Additionally, the theme of employee engagement surfaced as the second most
prevalent best practice of organizational commitment to intentional internationalization at SEU3 (Figure 4.3). The literature investigation of this study identified this theme in the theory of strategic intent as employees at all levels of the organization having an opportunity to become critically engaged in the internationalization vision of the university. One of the most unique features that surfaced in this data analysis was that the human resources at SEU3 were already heavily internationalized, and employees seemed to be actively involved in the process of internationalization.

According to IO5, “The institution has to listen to all of its constituents.” IO5 believed that, in addition to the QEP, the driving force behind internationalization at SEU3 was the community, the faculty, and the staff. IO3 affirmed that while top/down leadership was important in establishing the vision, buy-in from the bottom up was also critical to intentional internationalization.

IO3 indicated, for example, that integrating the academic units into the process of internationalization was hugely successful, and that support trickled down from the president to the deans, subsequently to the chairs, and then to the different areas. IO8 underlined that the driving force behind SEU3’s successful internationalization was the faculty who institutionalized it, and its success was possible because the concept was student-centered, for which reason students were easily engaged since it met their needs.

Referencing the critical engagement of employees, IO3 stated, “Many of the employees are internationalists, who have studied in Latin-America and the Caribbean; they have studied health, social, cultural, disaster, and anthropological issues.” IO2 reported, for example, that the division of student affairs, particularly the student government association and the office of judicial affairs, embraced the 2010 QEP by
supporting various co-curricular activities.

The document reviews revealed that SEU3’s more than 8,200 faculty and staff represented approximately one hundred and thirty-eight countries. Addressing whether there were some best practices relative to intentional internationalization that contributed more than others at SEU3, IO3 affirmed that “there was a general feeling that the university had some international expertise to begin with.” The researcher interpreted that IO3 was alluding to the inherent internationalization experiences of the faculty and staff based on the fact that they were originally from other countries, or, in one way or another, had meaningful associations with foreign cultures.

During the observations of SEU3’s demographic framework, the researcher observed, for example, the prominence of flags displays representing various countries, and international artifacts, tokens, mosaics, souvenirs, paintings, pictures, and posters on top of the desks and hanging from the walls of the offices he visited. In answering the question regarding what the university must do to sustain a high level of intentionality in internationalization, IO8 made it clear that internationalization at SEU3 “must be recognized and celebrated, and not taken for granted.”

Another best practice of organizational commitment to internationalization that resulted in the thematic analysis of the qualitative investigation in this study was competencies establishment (Figure 4.3). Based on the theory of strategic intent, this best practice represents the establishment of the core competencies required for internationalizing a university, including communicating to employees at all levels of the organization all policies and operational procedures.

According to IO1, SEU3 prioritized internationalization by “documenting these
priorities in the institution’s strategic plan and in the current QEP.” IO7 indicated that instituting the global learning course requirements were a big priority, which propelled the involvement of various offices on campus with the internationalization plan. Moreover, IO7 felt that engaging students internationally, such as in study abroad, internships abroad, work abroad, and service learning abroad as in the case of the Alternative Spring Break program contributed more than any other core competency to the intentional internationalization of SEU3.

In highlighting the administration’s support as a core competency, IO2 stated that, in addition to the globalization of the curriculum, a best practice of intentional internationalization at SEU3 was “offering financial support and release time to faculty to re-write the curriculum and be involved in internationalization.” IO4 discussed that “intentionality in choosing the right courses, integrating faculty, giving stipends to faculty to work on the courses, and having workshops for faculty” were best practices that contributed to successful internationalization at SEU3. IO8 believed that the core competency that contributed the most was hiring the right faculty and supporting them. According to IO8, it was essential to make sure that the faculty were “getting out, doing their research, and are able to have excellent communications with their peers around the world.”

In response to the question regarding what the university needed to do to continue sustaining a high level of intentional internationalization, IO8 expressed that internationalization had to be rewarded with travel time, travel dollars, and attendance to conferences. IO2s response was that it needed to become the “standard operating procedure of the university, sustained by leadership, resources, and communications.”
Regarding communications, promotions, and advertisement, IO7 believed in the need to expand the resources and becoming intentional about how to integrate the foreign students enrolled at SEU3 into the campus community. IO7 also believed in the importance of showcasing the outcomes of SEU3s internationalization efforts. IO2 underlined that some of the best practices that contributed to successful intentional internationalization at SEU3 could be attributed to the leadership of the institution “communicating and reinforcing the Worlds Ahead strategic initiative to the entire university.”

In terms of stakeholders’ collaborations and commitment, IO4 believed this was an area of strength in the development and execution of the 2010 QEP. Respondents amply discussed the various co-curricular activities in which several offices were jointly engaged, such as the Alternative Spring Break program, International Education Week, and the Tuesday Times Roundtables.

The competencies establishment theme was supported by the document analysis conducted by the researcher for this case study, particularly in the review of the QEP. This document corroborated the responses of the interviewees related to this theme regarding the establishment of a clear strategy and architecture to intentionally internationalize SEU3. Several other documents, such as the institution’s strategic plans, the Office of the Provost Organizational Chart, the Global Learning Curricular Framework, the university’s undergraduate catalog, and other documents related to the various curricular and co-curricular programs, activities, and assessments also elucidated the establishment of core intentional internationalization competencies.

The audio-visual analysis and the researcher’s field observations confirmed the
operationalization of the core competencies identified in the interviews and document analyses. In both the audio-visual reviews and the field observations, the researcher experienced the administration’s investment in real estate and activities. For example, SIPA was located in a new state of the art building with modernized office and teaching facilities; the Worlds Ahead re-branding initiative was prominent throughout the campus with posters and advertisements; and, areas such as the OGLI, student affairs, and various other departments were noticeably and actively working together in producing and advertising the Tuesday Times Roundtable discussions.

**Intentionality in the practice of internationalization.** In the third stage of strategic intent, intentionality in the practice of internationalization, interview participants rated creativity and experimentation as the most prominent best practice in this stage of the strategic intent of internationalizing the SEU3 campus. Systematic approach and change agents emerged as the other two highest best practices in this final stage of strategic intent analysis. These three best practices of intentionality in the practice stage of strategic intent combined for two-thirds of SEU3s practice of internationalization (Figure 4.4).

The theme of creativity and experimentation represented the accomplishment of innovation during the process of internationalization. With a 30% frequency rate, this theme rated highest among all the themes corresponding to best practices in intentional internationalization resulting from the SEU3 interviews data set. The most salient aspect in the emergence of this theme is the unique manner in which internationalization operated at SEU3. The institution was able to effectively capitalize on its geographic proximity with Latin-American and the Caribbean, its location in one of the most
internationalized regions of the country, its internationalized human resources, and the demographic diversity of its students.

According to IO4, as the university embarked upon developing its 2010 QEP, the president reignited the value of the institution due to its “geography, community, and the kinds of students it serves.” IO5 indicated that the establishment of the Latin American and Caribbean Center in the 1970s had set the stage for how creative and experimental SEU3 could be in developing internationalization.

Analysis of the case study data sets revealed that the current new phase of internationalization experimentation at SEU3 began with the process of developing the 2010 QEP. According to IO5, the QEP led the innovation. The review of documents revealed SEU3 decide to first implement a policy of global pre-requisites for undergraduate students. The QEP also included co-curricular global learning experiences in the form of the Alternative Spring Break program, the International Education week event, and Tuesday Times Roundtable discussions. These new and creative programs were geared to meet students’ needs for global competencies enabling global citizenship.

According to IO5, “There is a huge push for an engaged university that has an international dimension.” For this reason, SEU3s medical school and law school also incorporated global learning into their curricula. According to IO6, part of SEU3s experimentation was to increase the engagement of foreign students enrolled at the university so that they could acquire a sense of identity with SEU and become strong advocates for the institution when they returned home. IO2 underscored that SEU3 also supported and demonstrated sensitivity to global needs, such as those resulting from the 2010 Haiti Earthquake and the 2011 Japan Tsunami, and brought in guest speakers, such
as Fareed Zakaria, to discuss global issues.”

Since financial and family constraints limited the opportunities for students to participate in extensive study abroad, even for one-semester engagements, IO7 proposed exploring “bringing the world to the students.” Additionally, IO2 recommended that students who were unable to participate in study abroad might consider participating in the shorter Alternative Spring Break program. IO8 expressed the importance of “structuring the curriculum around student needs rather than around faculty needs.”

In addition, according to IO8, having students receive global exposure as early as in their freshman experience, or participating in study abroad or receiving substantive cross-cultural experiences before becoming juniors was an experiment worth exploring. IO8 further expressed that “there isn’t a single set of practices adhered to.” IO6 articulated that it was important to SEU3 not to have restrictions, but to allow for creativity. Referring to the best practices relative to intentional internationalization that contributed to successful internationalization at SEU3, IO6 further stated, “The important thing is that the project is beneficial to the students, is cost-effective, and will produce tangible results.”

Moreover, the responses of the interview participants, the documents and audio-visual reviews, and the researcher’s field observations corroborated the prominence of the creativity and experimentation theme in SEU3s practice of intentional internationalization. The document review revealed that SEU3 believed that, for the campus community, “geography is destiny,” therefore, it embraced its diversity and geography as “resources for student learning.” In conversations with university officials during the field observations, the officials informed the researcher that, once the
institution has had a chance to assess the effectiveness of global pre-requisites model in undergraduate education, it would move to add global pre-requisites to the graduate curriculum. At a 100% frequency rate, the outcomes of the researcher’s reviews of approximately fifty photographs and over fifty videos revealed prominent support for the theme of creativity and experimentation in the practice of intentional internationalization at SEU3.

Additionally, taking a systematic approach to internationalization surfaced the second most prominent theme related to the practice of internationalization at SEU3 (Figure 4.4). During the interviews, IO4 referred to the development of the 2010 QEP as a “collaborative process to streamline internationalization of the curriculum under the OGLI. IO1 believed that SEU3 brought all of the internationalization areas together “in a meaningful way.”

In detailing the process of internationalization, IO5 stated that the approach was to “articulate a vision, speak to the chairs, discuss with individual departments, have the departments discuss among themselves, vote on it, and have the OGLI keep the ball rolling.” IO5 also added that the presence of area studies-related centers, institutes, and other internationalization programs reinforced the QEP. IO6 saw the SEU3 approach as a best practice in intentional internationalization at a university, which was to “create an institutional framework and let it develop.” IO1 stated that this approach formalized internationalization at SEU3, and was responsible for it being sustained at such a high level of intentionality.

IO5 listed the sequential manner in which internationalization was accomplished, which was first to develop the action plan in the form of the QEP, then create
administrative structures such as SIPA and the OGLI, then add the international
dimension to the medical school and law school curricula, and finally nominate a vice-
president of engagement to embrace and promote the accomplishments. IO5 believed
that this approach would keep spreading internationalization throughout the university.
IO7 summed it up by saying that incorporating the global learning courses was the
biggest priority, after that, other offices began getting engaged in the overall
internationalization plan, which is supported by the university’s administration.

During the analysis of the interviews and, in particular, the analysis of documents,
the researcher found this theme to be easily traceable throughout these data sources. For
example, not only did the 2010 QEP explain the timeline and events of its development,
but it also publicized a timeline of major items to be accomplished up until the end of the
period of funding established for the OGLI, meaning fiscal year 2014-2015. All of the
participants in the development of the QEP and in the implementation of
internationalization at SEU3, and the roles and extent of their participation were clearly
defined in the documents the researcher analyzed.

Furthermore, during the researcher’s field observations, in conversations with
SEU3 officials, everyone pointed to the coordinated manner in which the QEP process
was conducted. Finally, based on the outcomes of the audio-visual materials and the
researcher’s field observations, the systematic approach theme was evidenced 100% of
the items analyzed.

Finally, with regard to the practice of internationalization, results of the data
analysis of the interviews data set additionally revealed that 14% of the best practices in
intentional internationalization at SEU3 involved the development of change agents
In answering the question concerning what was the driving force behind internationalization at SEU3, interview respondents specifically identified the President, the Provost, the Executive Director of SIPA, the Vice-Provost for Academic Planning and Accountability, and the faculty. In the outcomes of the analysis of the data sets of this case study, the leadership of the university surfaced as having a strong commitment in the practice of internationalization at SEU. Among these leaders, the internationalization leaders were highlighted, particularly the Director of the OGLI, who was identified consistently in the data analysis as the individual that had operationalized internationalization at SEU3. The document reviews analysis revealed that the person appointed as Director of the OGLI was strategically selected for the position having demonstrated significant competence in the process of internationalization at SEU3.

The president was mentioned several times throughout the interview and during the researcher’s field observations in respondents’ remarks about influencers of intentional, sustained, and successful internationalization. According to IO5, “The president’s focus on engagement reinforces the international.” The researcher’s analysis of the audio-visual materials data set supported this comment. In the Worlds Ahead promotional and advertisement videos, the president was portrayed as playing a prominent leadership, strategic planning, and support role in reengineering SEU3s internationalization. IO2 highlighted that internationalization was sustained at SEU3 due to the authenticity of the president regarding its importance, and his active and supportive involvement in the process.

The researcher’s field observations also profiled the Director of International
Student and Scholars Services, the Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs for Research, the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education, The Director of the Office of Study Abroad, and the various faculty and staff who led, were involved in, and promoted and advertised internationalization at the university as change agents in this new strategic planning phase of intentional internationalization at SEU3.

**Degree of Contribution of Intentionality in Internationalization at Eight Public Research Universities in the Southeast Region of the U.S.**

This study sought to answer the overarching question: What is the degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization at the eight public research universities in the Southeast region of the United States? This question was answered by the outcomes of the quantitative investigation. The researcher tabulated an analyzed the responses from the seven responding institutions by using descriptive statistical procedures.

Responses to the demographic questions of the survey were positively related with several outcome variables (see Appendix N). This correlation analysis showed that the more years of service a respondent had at their institution, the higher they rated intentionality in the creation of a vision for internationalization, intentionality in organizational commitment to internationalization, and the degree of contribution of intentionality in campus internationalization.

Survey outcomes revealed the degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization at each university in each of the areas of strategic intent: co-invention, engagement, and practice. The mean results from each area of strategic intent at a university represented the degree of contribution of intentionality in
internationalization at that institution. The degree of contribution of intentionality in each stage of strategic intent was computed in the form of a percent, which was the average score of the answers to the questions in each of the three areas. The degree of contribution of intentionality at the institution was a composite percent representing the means of each of the areas of strategic intent at that institution (Table 4.1). A higher percent meant a higher degree of contribution in intentionality in internationalization; a lower percent meant a lower degree of contribution.

The results of the quantitative analysis showed the degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization at each of the seven public research universities in the Southeast region of the United States (Figure 4.5) and answered the research overarching question. To validate outcomes by determining how significant the relationship was among the variables, the researcher computed a Pearson product–moment correlation coefficient (see Appendix N). The results of the correlations showed that the more the institution’s leadership was intentional in creating a vision for internationalization, in committing the entire campus to internationalization, and in practicing internationalization, the higher was the overall intentionality of the organization in accomplishing campus internationalization. Conversely, higher overall intentionality also meant higher intentionality in each strategic intent stage.

**Chapter Summary**

This Chapter reported the statistical results of data collected in the quantitative and qualitative investigations of this study.

The findings of the quantitative investigation showed the degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization at seven public research universities in the
Southeast region of the United States, and identified SEU3 as the one with the highest degree of contribution of intentionality in its campus internationalization process. The findings of the case study investigation of SEU3 identified a strategic and systematic planning approach to campus internationalization as the highest indicator relative to intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university, and revealed nine best practices vis-à-vis intentional internationalization.

The first three best practices, leadership commitment, resource allocation, and vision in planning were associated with the co-invention stage of the theory strategic intent. The next three best practices, structure establishment, employee engagement, and competencies establishment were aligned with the engagement stage of the theory strategic intent. The final three best practices, creativity and experimentation, systematic approach, and change agents were associated with the practice stage of the theory strategic intent.

The next chapter will discuss these results and their implications for the intentional internationalization of higher education, and offer recommendations for future studies.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of Study

This mixed methods study was designed to determine how organizational intentionality has impacted successful internationalization at public research universities in the United States. For this study, successful internationalization was based on international student enrollment, and was defined as a research university at which at least 1% of its student enrollment in the academic years 2009/2010 or 2010/2011 was comprised of international students. This criterion was aligned with the U.S. News & World Report’s survey results, which indicated that 78% of the research universities in the United States reported that at least 1% of their undergraduate student population was comprised of international students (U.S. News & World Report, 2010). Each of the institutions participating in this study met the definition of successful internationalization.

The purpose of this study was accomplished by examining internationalization at seven public research higher education institutions in the Southeast region of the United States (see Appendix A) through a variety of planning, implementation, and sustainability indicators, which were uncovered in this literature investigation. Additionally, the researcher analyzed the effectiveness of the use of the theory of strategic intent in the processes of internationalization at these institutions.

In the first part of this investigation, a quantitative study was employed to answer the overarching research question concerning the degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization at the participating institutions. The subjects for the study were a senior internationalization officer at each of the seven institutions. Each subject
answered the “Organizational Intentionality in Campus Internationalization Survey” (see Appendix B) instrument online. By using the SPSS computer programming software, the researcher analyzed responses to find the degree of contribution of intentionality in campus internationalization at each of the institutions (Table 4.1). Subsequently, the researcher computed a Pearson product–moment correlation coefficient (see Appendix N) to find whether officials differed in their responses and to determine how significant the relationship was among the variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2000).

The second phase of the investigation comprised of a qualitative case study designed to answer the research sub-questions established to ascertain the strongest indicator and best practices of intentional internationalization at the institution identified in the quantitative study as having the highest degree of intentionality in its campus internationalization. During the case study, the researcher interviewed eight officials involved in different aspects of campus internationalization, such as planning, institutional governance, internationalization governance, teaching, research, and service. In addition, the researcher conducted document and audio-visual reviews, and field observations to triangulate interview outcomes.

By answering the three research questions, this study elucidated the role of organizational intentionality in the process of internationalization in higher education. Of particular interest to this study was the influence of intentionality on the development and operationalization of an organizational plan to strategically respond to the impact of globalization on the institution. The following sections are descriptions of the results of this investigation. They begin with an analysis and discussion of the research findings, and end with the researcher’s conclusions and insights regarding the practice of
Analysis of Research Findings

In the outcomes of the thematic analysis of the interviews, on average, four themes surfaced from the responses to each interview question. There were five hundred and forty-two references to themes identified as indicators and best practices related to the intentional internationalization of higher education. The analysis of these themes allowed for several findings to be made in this study regarding intentionality in the internationalization of higher education by answering the research questions.

Overarching Research Question: What is the degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization at the eight public research universities in the Southeast region of the United States?

Outcomes of the quantitative investigation showed the degree of contribution of intentionality at each of the seven institutions studied (Figure 4.5). Findings were represented in the form of a percent. SEU3 scored the highest percent, and was, therefore, identified as the institution with the highest degree of contribution of intentionality in its internationalization its process. As the outcomes indicated, there are varying degrees of contribution of intentionality in the internationalization of higher education. Therefore, an institution’s percent score in this investigation is not equated to the institution’s success in internationalization. Rather, it reveals the degree to which intentionality contributed to the participating universities’ internationalization efforts.

Outcomes also uncovered the degree of contribution of intentionality in each of the three stages of strategic intent (Table 4.1). Additionally, the results of the correlations of the variables studied revealed that, while each stage of strategic intent
positively impacted the others, intentionality in all three stages likewise positively impacted SEU3s overall intentionality in achieving campus internationalization.

Conversely, the more intentionality contributed to campus internationalization at SEU3, the more each of the stages of strategic intent increased. These data suggest that the achievement of strategic intent in campus internationalization is directly related to the accomplishment of intentionality in all the three stages of strategic intent: the creation of a vision, organizational commitment, and the practice of internationalization.

An issue of relevance to the degree of contribution of intentionality in internationalization that surfaced during the data analysis of this investigation was the relatively high score outcome of SEU3 in the strategic intent area of intentionality in organizational commitment to internationalization (Table 4.1). There was a gap of 29 percentage points between SEU3s score of 84% and the average score of the other institutions, which was 55%. This was the largest gap between the highest scoring institution and the average of the others in any of the three stages of strategic intent. The researcher assumes that the reason for such a wide difference in organizational commitment between SEU3 and the other institutions was the recent increased and purposeful focus of the institution on campus internationalization, which resulted in the development and implementation of the 2010 QEP emphasizing internationalization.

Of added interest to this research regarding the quantitative outcomes was that SEU3s 74% score in intentionality in the practice of internationalization was not as high as its score in the two other areas of strategic intent. The researcher infers that the reason for this lower score is that the institution has been placing more emphasis on the first two stages of strategic intent during its most recent focus on intentionality in its
internationalization process. However, while this was the lowest of the three SEU3 scores, it was still higher than each of the average scores for all institutions in all three areas of strategic intent.

Regarding the analysis of the demographics of the subjects in the quantitative investigation, outcomes indicated that the longer respondents had worked in higher education administration, the longer they had remained in their current positions, which were all in some aspect of international education. In addition, the longer respondents had worked at their current university, the longer they had remained in their current positions.

Furthermore, the results demonstrated significantly positive relationships between the total number of years the respondents had served their universities and their responses regarding intentionality in their institution’s creation of a vision for internationalization, commitment to internationalization, and to the overall degree of contribution of intentionality to their campus’ internationalization. Noticeably, no significant correlations emerged between this demographic variable and the practice of internationalization, even though this area recorded the highest average score among the mean scores of the three areas of strategic intent (Table 4.1).

The correlations with statistical significance, however, suggest that international education officials who have been in their positions longer have stayed at their universities longer, and have had an opportunity to observe how intentionality has evolved and increased over time, or have had the chance to compare a distant former change management neutral stage of internationalization with the breakthrough results of strategic intent (Figure 2.1).
Research Sub-Question 1: What is the strongest indicator of intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university?

The planning indicator was found to be the most prominent indicator impacting the institution’s high intentionality in its efforts to internationalize, and was by far the most important indicator associated with efforts to assess the university’s success in internationalization (Figure 4.1). Moreover, interview participants believed that this indicator was the most essential when discussing the future of internationalization at SEU3. Each official cited planning, particularly as it related to the development of the 2010 QEP, the resulting incorporation of global learning requirement into the curriculum, the creation of SIPA and the OGLI, and the development of the 2010-2015 Strategic Plan and assessment plans, as a key propeller of the university’s intentionality in internationalization.

According to the perceptions of the interview participants, the purposefulness with which the institution made internationalization the focus of the institution’s 2010 QEP, committed resources to instituting the determinations of the QEP, and threaded internationalization into the 2010-2015 Strategic Plan had established planning as the most important indicator of intentionality in internationalization at SEU3. These perceptions were amply supported by the amount of planning documents available and the high level at which planning was evident in the document reviews conducted by the researcher.

Notwithstanding, while planning was important to SEU3 in its internationalization efforts, it was still seen by officials as the indicator that most needed to be embraced by the university to achieve continued and sustained internationalization success. Interview
participants expressed, for example, that SEU3 should plan for multicultural living/learning communities, more undergraduate research in globalization projects, mentoring programs that allow faculty to connect students on international issues, dual degree programs with other countries, and more educational involvement in Brazil and Russia. The officials were particularly intent on the importance of making long-term study abroad more feasible for students, and in establishing an organizational model that would bring all the internationalization operations under the umbrella of one area.

Additionally, internationalization of the curriculum and the educational experience emerged as a high indicator of intentional internationalization and was seen by interview participants as having a vital association with the planning theme at SEU3 (Figure 4.1). Participants’ discussions about the strategic and systematic planning approach regularly signaled the addition of global learning prerequisites to the undergraduate curriculum, and to the law school and medical school curricula. These discussions also highlighted the development and increase of overseas internships, and co-curricular global learning experiences. Respondents explained that co-curricular activities included alternative spring breaks where students took up global causes, such as the restoration of a national park in Costa Rica and a mentorship program at an elementary school in Nicaragua.

In addition to planning and curriculum, strategic response to globalization surfaced in the thematic analysis of the interviews as an important indicator of intentional internationalization at SEU3, and emerged in high association with strategic planning. For example, interview participants believed that the leadership of the institution has been highly intentional in capitalizing on the institution’s diverse stakeholder population,
its location in one of the most multicultural regions in the country, and its geographic
proximity to Latin America and the Caribbean. They believed that these characteristics
have been vital to the institution being able to successfully plan and advance its
internationalization program.

According to IO4, as the university embarked upon developing its QEP, the
president reignited the value of the institution due to its “geography, community, and the
kinds of students it serves.” The researcher interpreted this statement as a reference to
the institution’s embrace of its internationalized demographics. For example, SEU3
implemented the Minority Health International Training Program for undergraduate and
graduate nursing students and faculty to collaborate with foreign nursing faculty at
selected universities in Italy, Germany, Thailand, England, and several countries in Latin-
America in researching disparities care of chronic illness patients and families.

SEU3’s senior administration’s commitment emerged as another salient theme
corresponding to indicators of intentional higher education internationalization, and was
also highly associated with the planning indicator. Several interview participants
highlighted, for example, that for internationalization to be sustained at SEU3, there was
need for the senior administration to ensure organizational commitment, particularly by
allocating resources to attract, retain, and engender buy-in from faculty competent in the
delivery of international education.

What was moreover significant about a culture of commitment as an indicator of
internationalization intentionality at SEU3 was that six out of the eight interview
participants selected it as the strongest indicator when directly asked the question: “In
your estimation, what is the strongest indicator of intentionality in successful
internationalization? The two other participants chose planning. However, inasmuch as the participants felt so strongly about senior administration commitment, it was planning that surfaced to the top as the strongest indicator of intentional internationalization based on the thematic analysis of the entire interview data set. Nevertheless, the commitment indicator resurfaced as the most prevalent best practice in the creation of a vision for internationalization stage of strategic intent in the form of leadership commitment. What this finding suggests is that commitment had a major impact on SEU3s internationalization efforts, both as a prominent indicator and as a salient best practice of intentional internationalization.

*Research Sub-Question 2: What are best practices relative to intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university?*

With regard to best practices of intentional internationalization, this literature review identified the existence of thirty best practices through research of the theory of strategic intent. According to this theory, ten best practices existed in each of the three stages of strategic intent (Hamel & Prahalad, 1989; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990; Smith, 1994). In assessing best practices relative to intentional internationalization at SEU3, the outcomes of the thematic analysis of the interviews, supported by document and audio-visual reviews, and the researcher’s observations, revealed three best practices with an almost 50% or more frequency of occurrence in each of the stages of strategic intent (Figures 4.2, 4.3, & 4.4).

In the analysis of best practices in the first stage of strategic intent, intentionality in the creation of a vision for internationalization, leadership commitment emerged as the most prevalent with a 28% frequency rate, resource allocation was 22%, and vision in
planning accounted for a 14% rate (Figure 4.2). Based on the thematic analysis corresponding to vision creation, the leadership commitment theme was conspicuously associated with the tactical allocation of resources and the vision in planning best practices.

Respondents stressed that the resource allocation best practice was a critical ingredient to the high level of internationalization commitment of the institution’s leadership. For example, the OGLI was established to implement SEUs QEP and was granted a seven-year $4.1 million budget. Additionally, the university’s leadership allocated $30,000 to an integrated communications campaign promoting the global learning for global citizenship initiative. Interview participants acknowledged that SEU3s vision in planning for internationalization was clearly established in the institution’s 2010 QEP, which became the single most important driving force for internationalizing the university.

Additionally, the commitment of the leadership was prominently expressed in the institution’s re-branding efforts through the Worlds Ahead initiative, and in the various vivid representations of a globalized SEU3 in the form of such globally-themed items as monuments, banners, posters, and flags prominently displayed throughout the campus. The researcher interpreted these expressions as clear articulations of the institutions leadership commitment to campus internationalization.

In assessing best practices of intentional internationalization in the second stage of strategic intent, organizational commitment, structure establishment emerged with a 22% rate of occurrence, employee engagement was 16%, and competencies establishment featured 11% (Figure 4.3). Interview respondents not only believed that
having strong administrative structures to support internationalization was vital to its success, but also coincided on the need for a single high level administrative structure to oversee, and be accountable for, all aspects of internationalization at SEU3.

In addition to the Office of International Scholars and Students Services, the Office of Education Abroad, the LACC, the International Research Hurricane Center, the International Forensic Research Institute, the Applied Research Center, the Center for Leadership, the Minority Health International Training Program, and the Partnerships for International Research and Education Program, respondents reported that SEU3 had created SIPA and the OGLI as major outcomes of the QEP process. Given the scope of the structure established by SEU3, inclusive of strategic planning and the physical infrastructure, the researcher surmises that structure establishment was a very comprehensive undertaking at SEU3. The researcher noted, for example, that the planning structure, inclusive of the 2010 QEP and the 2010-2015 Strategic Plan, established the core competencies relative to internationalization at the institution, and strategically committed the entire university to an intentional process of internationalization.

Regarding employee engagement as a best practice of intentional internationalization, the researcher ascertained that the entire campus community had been given the opportunity to become critically engaged in SEU3s internationalization vision through several levels of involvement, inclusive of planning, management, support, promotion, and branding. Internationalization, therefore, seemed to be woven into the cultural fabric of SEU3. Interests in the celebration of diversity and attention to global issues seemed to be a natural reaction and way of life of everyone on campus. The
document reviews, for example, revealed that SEU3’s more than 8,200 faculty and staff represented approximately one hundred and thirty-eight countries. Additionally, the researcher noticed the prominence of flags displays representing various countries, and international artifacts, tokens, mosaics, souvenirs, paintings, pictures, and posters on top of the desks and hanging from the walls of the offices he visited.

In terms of the best practice of establishing core competencies, this literature investigation revealed that identifying, implementing, and supporting core competencies is a major component of the theory of strategic intent. Findings of this study suggest that the establishment of core competencies at SEU3 enabled the institution to create a strategic architecture for internationalization by developing critical units. This theme resulted as the third highest best practice in this stage of strategic intent in the interview analysis, and held a 63% association with structure establishment, which was the highest theme in this second stage of the strategic intent of internationalizing SEU3. This meant that every time structure establishment was mentioned by the respondents, there was a 63% chance that competencies establishment would also be mentioned.

Core competencies establishment appeared prominently throughout the interviews as respondents conveyed a strong belief in the comprehensiveness of the 2010 QEP in clearly identifying the university’s internationalization expectations, and in the resulting decisions of the administration that created SIPA and the OGLI. In addition to the creation of new internationalization administrative structures, interviewees highlighted the establishment of several other core competencies, such as the globalization of the curriculum, financial support, professional development, communications, promotions and advertisement, and stakeholders’ commitment and collaborations.
The analysis of the data sets revealed that the best practice of competencies establishment at SEU3 also involved implementing the global course requirements, promoting student study abroad and global engagement, supporting faculty with financial resources and release time to become globally engaged, hiring faculty with competence on global issues, promoting the global re-branding initiative to all stakeholders, and creating administrative and physical structures to operationalize internationalization at SEU3.

In the assessment of best practices in the final stage of strategic intent, intentionality in the practice of internationalization, creativity and experimentation emerged with a 31% frequency rate, a systematic approach to internationalization was 21%, and the development of change agents had a frequency rate of 14% (Figure 4.4) at SEU3.

In terms of creativity and experimentation, data results revealed the creative ways in which SEU3 was able to converge the distinctive identities and needs of the various demographics it served--a wide range of cultures, races, ethnicities, and expectations--in developing programs and activities to deliver the education imperative. For example, given the financial and family constraints limiting opportunities for SEU3s students to participate in extensive study abroad, interview respondents proposed exploring creative and experimental avenues for students to experience study abroad while still physically located in their hometown, such as video conferencing.

Additionally, in response to the best practices that contributed most to intentional internationalization at SEU3, IO6 stated, “The important thing is that the project is beneficial to the students, is cost-effective, and will produce tangible results.” The
researcher interpreted this statement to represent a strong commitment on behalf of SEU3 in finding every possible means to engage its students in the acquisition of the cognitive skills that would allow them to compete at the highest level in the global marketplace.

Results from the emergence of a systematic approach to internationalization as a best practice of intentionality in the practice of internationalization suggest that SEU3s approach to campus internationalization was purposeful and collaborative. A prominent example demonstrating this kind of approach was the organization’s willingness to engage the entire campus community by allowing stakeholders to submit proposals on what ought to be the focus of the 2010 QEP. The analysis further revealed that once the theme of the QEP was established, the planning process ensued with the full support and engagement of the leadership of the institution. Additionally, roles were clearly defined, timelines for accomplishments were established, and resources were allocated to meet expectations.

Findings in this study also suggest that SEU3s planning efforts resulted in the institution implementing competent administrative structures to manage, assess, and monitor all of its internationalization engagements and activities. The researcher interprets these achievements as the result of the university having been able to move from seemingly ad hoc internationalization to a more systemic approach (Figure 2.1), which was, moreover, evident in the institution’s high strategic intent ratings (Table 4.1).

Notwithstanding, interview participants highlighted the need for one administrative structure to oversee and be accountable in a comprehensive manner for the various international education areas of the institution, which currently report to different areas. This finding suggests that the different internationalization areas acknowledge the
need to optimize the systematization of internationalization at the institution, and are ready to further collaborate with each other.

Regarding the emergence of the theme of change agents as a prominent best practice in the practice stage of intentional internationalization at SEU3, the outcomes of the interviews and the researcher’s conversations with university officials during the field observations identified all the interview participants as internationalization change agents. Results confirmed that these officials were actively involved in intentionally leading, supporting, and sustaining the new strategic plan for internationalization at SEU3, as outlined in the QEP.

While the outcomes of the qualitative data sets suggest that the institution’s leadership and its internationalization leadership became major change agents of intentional internationalization at SEU3, the results also identified several other officials who had been developed as change agents, particularly the faculty members who submitted proposals for the QEP focusing on the internationalization of the university. These faculty members highlighted the need for intentional internationalization at SEU3, and from among them, one proposal was selected to frame the QEP.

One very interesting researcher observation was that, on several occasions, while talking with a given official, that official would refer the researcher to another official from whom to obtain additional information, or more expert opinion or experience, on the SEU3 internationalization process. Coincidentally, often times, the official to whom the researcher were referred would be one of the interview participants, of whom the referring official would have had no prior knowledge that the researcher had made plans to interview. Of interest to this analysis was that the names of all of the interview
participants were often mentioned as internationalization change agents at SEU3.

In the final data analysis of the best practices of intentional internationalization at SEU3, among the twenty-eight best practices emerging from the data sets, creativity and experimentation, leadership commitment, resource allocation, structure establishment, a systematic approach to internationalization, and employee engagement featured as the most salient best practices of intentional internationalization at SEU3. Coincidentally, these top six best practices were evenly distributed among the three areas of strategic intent.

**Discussion of Research Findings**

This discussion is based upon the findings in Chapter 4 of this study, and the review of literature corresponding to the internationalization of higher education, including the strategic intent theory relative to intentionality. While the findings of this study indicated that successful internationalization at different public research universities may have different degrees of contribution of intentionality (Table 4.1), no significant correlations emerged between the degrees of contribution of intentionality in campus internationalization at public research universities and the percentage of international students enrolled at these institutions.

For example, while SEU6 had the highest percentage of international students among its total student enrollment (see Appendix A), the institution ranked fourth among the seven institutions investigated in terms of the degree of contribution of intentionality in successful campus internationalization (Table 4.1). The institution that ranked second lowest among the participants in terms of the percentage of foreign students enrolled, SEU5 (see Appendix A), had the second highest percentage score in terms of the degree
of contribution of intentionality in its internationalization success (Table 4.1).

Furthermore, the institution that ranked as the most intentional in its internationalization, SEU3 (Table 4.1), was second among the participants relative to the number of international students it had enrolled (see Appendix A). These outcomes suggest that, while intentionality contributed to successful higher education internationalization in varying degrees, no direct correlation was established between the level of successful internationalization at the institutions participating in this study and the degree of contribution of intentionality in their internationalization.

Among the indicators of intentional internationalization uncovered in the literature review, international student recruitment featured as one of the most prominent (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Burnett & Huisman, 2010; Stromquist, 2007). Cudmore (2006), for example, signaled foreign student recruitment as one of the most significant signs of internationalization. However, in the data analysis corresponding to this study, this indicator did not emerge as a relevant theme. The only mention of this indicator was a comment from IO1 informing that SEU3 had hired an international admissions recruiter and that SEU3 needed to have a more targeted approach toward international student recruitment. However, there was no additional follow-up, as IO1 did not have any further information regarding the circumstances surrounding the hiring. As a result, among the six rationales of emerging importance driving internationalization at the institutional level postulated by Knight (2008), the income generation rational was the only one not evidenced in this study (Table 2.1).

In considering the reason why international student recruitment did not feature in the findings of this study, the researcher surmises that the highly multicultural
environment of SEU3, and the high representation of foreign-born students on campus probably deemphasized the need for the institution to engage in this effort. However, with the financial benefits of foreign student enrollment in the U.S. being an $18.8 billion industry (NAFSA: Association of International Educators, 2011b), and with SEU3 having a highly multicultural campus featuring a high degree of contribution of intentionality in its internationalization efforts, the researcher infers that intentional international student recruitment looms as a great revenue maximization opportunity for the institution.

In the quantitative investigation, outcomes showing a significantly positive relationship between participants’ years of service at their universities and their responses relative to the impact of strategic intent in internationalizing their institutions suggest that these officials see themselves as stakeholders in the process of internationalization at their institutions. These outcomes align with Smith’s (1994) assertion that every stakeholder commits to the vision and positively promotes the realization of the strategic intent, to the point of transforming individual commitment to collective reality.

Findings in this research revealed that planning was the strongest indicator of intentional internationalization at SEU3. This result aligns with the postulations of several researchers emphasizing planning as an essential engagement in institutional response to globalization (Bruce, 2009; Burnett & Huisman, 2010; Childress, 2009; de Wit, 2002; Goodin, 1996; Knight, 2008). Bruce, Burnett and Huisman, and Goodin were particularly resolute regarding the importance of intentional internationalization planning, and pointed out that planning is intensified when it is strategic. de Wit declared that internationalization had now become a strategic process in higher education. The SEU3 officials believed so strongly in the importance of planning that, while identifying the
success it had generated at the institution, they still saw it as the indicator most needed to be embraced by the university to achieve continued and sustained internationalization success.

In addition to the interviews data set, SEU3’s comprehensive planning process was very evident in the documents and audio-visual reviews, and in the researcher’s field observations, particularly in the development of the 2010 QEP, the incorporation of global learning requirements into the curriculum, the creation of SIPA and the OGLI, and the development of the 2010-2015 Strategic Plan and a five-year internationalization assessment plan. These engagements were also manifestations of the convergence of planning with other prominent indicators of intentional internationalization at SEU3, such as internationalization of the curriculum, global response, and a culture of commitment.

Outcomes of the analysis of audio-visual materials and the researcher’s observations concluded, for example, that globalization response, university awareness of strategic priorities, and a top/down down/up culture of commitment were very prevalent in the following expressions of intentional internationalization at SEU3: the designation of specific areas as halls of flags; the use of different languages to name buildings; the existence of various monuments honoring global issues; promotions of international programs and activities; and, the presence of numerous posters and banners across the campus advertising the Worlds Ahead branding initiative.

While internationalization of the curriculum emerged as the second highest indicator of intentional internationalization at SEU3, the researcher found it necessary to highlight it in the findings of this study due to its high association with the planning indicator. Curricular determinations were the outcomes of strategic planning efforts,
particularly the 2010 QEP. In the documents review and researcher’s field observations, expressions of planning were generally connoted with the internationalization of the curriculum. This level of internationalization operationalization at SEU3 is supported by Knight’s (2008) emerging internationalization rationale concerning knowledge production at the institutional level (Table 2.1). This rationale proposes that internationalization is being driven by the knowledge that is needed in society.

Vaira (2004) also highlighted that globalization is impacting what knowledge is needed and taught in society, and Tierney (2004) indicated that globalization is reshaping college and university curricula. Colleges and universities are, therefore, seeking to incorporate international components into their curricula (Capalbo, 2011; Gacel-Avila, 2005). For these reasons, Knight (2008) emphasized the criticalness of strategized internationalization planning that produces programs that would prepare students to be internationally competent and able to function professionally in an increasingly multicultural world. Furthermore, Green, Luu, and Burris (2008) highlighted the need for higher education institutions to invest in the internationalization development of faculty, which also features as one of the emerging rationales proposed by Knight as a driver of internationalization at the institutional level (Table 2.1).

A strategic response to globalization and a culture of commitment were the next highest indicators that emerged from the quantitative data analysis of this investigation. These indicators are also of importance to this discussion since they are integrally linked to strategic and systematic planning. Global response, for example, resulted as the indicator with the highest frequency rate in the analysis of the audio-video materials and the researcher’s field observations data sets, most of which highly represented strategic
internationalization planning at SEU3.

Stromquist (2007) indicated that the dynamics of globalization are inspiring responses form colleges and universities, and Childress (2009) expressed that institutions are embracing internationalization as the way to coordinate institutional responses to the globalization impact. Altbach and Knight (2007), furthermore, emphasized that internationalization proposes policies and practices to be used by higher education institution to respond to globalization.

SEU3s commitment to purposefully pursue internationalization was evident in the outcomes of the analysis of the data sets of this study. Most of the interviewees, for example, identified this indicator when directly answering the question concerning what they believed to be the strongest indicator of intentional internationalization at SEU3. Therefore, if this question were analyzed in isolation, commitment would be the strongest indicator of intentional internationalization at SEU3. However, in the context of the entire interview and the other data sets, it emerged as the fourth strongest indicator. Notwithstanding, the high level of commitment to internationalization at SEU3 was obvious in the institution’s investment of time, effort, and resources in planning for internationalization, and in its execution of the plan.

Of added importance to this research regarding the emergence of the commitment indicator was that, in addition to its relevance to planning, it was moreover amplified as a best practice of intentional internationalization, in the form of leadership commitment. Furthermore, this indicator was intricately linked to other emerging best practices, such as resource allocation, structure establishment, employee engagement, competencies establishment, creativity and experimentation, and a systematic approach to intentional
internationalization. Smith (1994) affirmed that, in an environment motivated by strategic intent, commitment eliminates barriers that would prevent vision realization, and offers employees the opportunity to collaborate with the leaders of the organization. Hamel and Prahalad (1989) stressed that, when activated by strategic intent, commitment stimulates a winning attitude among employees at all levels of the organization.

In terms of the emergence of leadership commitment as a best practice of intentional internationalization at SEU3, this theme resulted as the most salient best practice in the strategic intent area corresponding to the creation of a vision for internationalization. Interview participants of this study expressed that the institution’s internationalization was stimulated and sustained by SEU3’s senior leadership, particularly in the form of tactical resource allocation, which was, coincidentally, the second highest best practice in this stage of strategic intent at the institution.

These two best practices, along with the emergence of the best practice of vision in planning, particularly evident in the institution’s Worlds Ahead re-branding initiative, suggest the establishment of a deliberate framework for accomplishing systemic internationalization at SEU3. This level of vision creation is supported in the literature by one of Knight’s (2008) emerging rationales driving internationalization at the institutional level, known as international branding and profile (Table 2.1). Additionally, Hamel & Prahalad (1989) sustained that visionary leadership is at the core of strategic intent.

In the strategic intent area of organizational commitment to internationalization, findings of this study uncovered structure establishment as the best practice at SEU3. Data outcomes revealed, for example, the establishment of a strategic framework for
internationalization, and the creation of SIPA and the OGLI. Knight (1999) identified structure as the pragmatic expression of organizational commitment that serves to sustain internationalization by connecting students with the academic and service areas.

Beyond physical and administrative structures, however, the aspect of structure that resulted as most salient during this investigation was the prominence of a planning structure at SEU3 that strategically committed the entire university to an intentional process of internationalization. All of these aspects of structure were intrinsically linked to the other two best practices of intentional internationalization that surfaced in this area of this study, which were employee engagement and competencies establishment.

Prahalad and Hamel (1990) stressed that, while core competencies are developed within the units of a company, they also propel the strategic architecture of the organization. The findings of this study suggest that, as core competencies are established and further developed, they optimized internationalization at SEU3. For example, at the end of SEU3’s Tuesday Times Roundtables, in which current globalization issues were discussed every Tuesday, a film crew from the university recorded the reactions of the participants and posted the video reactions on the university’s website. This allowed the OGLI to evaluate the program and plan for improvements. According to Prahalad and Hamel, organizational leaders need to commit the necessary resources to the establishment of core competencies, particularly because core competency building converts companies into global winners.

The most salient best practices of intentional internationalization that emerged from the data analysis of this study in the strategic intent area of practice were creativity and experimentation, a systematic approach to internationalization, and the development
of change agents. Interview participants underscored that the development of the 2010 QEP led the internationalization innovation at SEU3 by planning new and creative programs, such as: an internationalized curriculum; increased research partnerships with other countries through the Minority Health International Training Program, among others; the Tuesday Times Roundtable events; and, the Alternative Spring Break program.

These programs were geared to meet students’ needs to develop global skills that would enable them to become global citizens, and competitive professionals in the global marketplace. Data analyses outcomes of this investigation corroborated that the development and implementation of these programs were the result of a systematic approach to internationalization by SEU3, in the process of which several internationalization change agents and champions were developed. These accomplishments are validated by several of Knight’s (2008) emerging importance rationales that drive internationalization at the institutional level, specifically: quality enhancement/international standards; student and staff development; strategic alliances; and, knowledge production (Table 2.1).

The systematic approach to internationalization best practice finding at SEU3 is, furthermore, substantiated in this literature review by Bruce’s (2009) declaration that engaging in, and accomplishing, a systematic and intentional approach to internationalization is essential to leveraging competitiveness. Additionally, Burnett and Huisman (2010) surmised that a high degree of systematization in response to globalization, and an overall systematic approach to globalization, were vital to a successful process.
Conclusions

Through a mixed methods investigation, this study sought to determine how organizational intentionality had impacted successful internationalization at public research universities. Several conclusions can be drawn from the results of this study.

Findings in the first, quantitative, phase of the investigation established that intentionality contributed at varying degrees in successful campus internationalization at public research universities in the Southeast region of the United States. Since there was no attempt at causality in this study, outcomes did not show as having an impact on the level of internationalization success at the institutions studied. Rather, outcomes suggest that that college and university strategy, such as internationalization, can be associated with varying degrees of organizational intentionality.

Outcomes, furthermore, reveal that overall intentionality in accomplishing campus internationalization is the outcome of positive relationships among all of the areas of strategic intent, which are intentionality in the creation of a vision, intentionality in organizational commit, and practice. The more one stage of strategic intent increases, the more each of the other stages and the overall strategic intent increases. It is the desire of the researcher that these outcomes draw the attention of the leadership of colleges and universities to the value of intentionality in successful vision accomplishment and in the activation of positive organizational change.

With regard to the demographics of the subjects studied, several positive relationships emerged from the researcher’s computation of a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (see Appendix N). For example, the longer subjects had worked in higher education, the longer they had remained in their current positions. This finding
infers that senior internationalization officers become increasingly committed internationalization as they progress in their higher education careers.

Additionally, findings revealed that the longer a respondent had been at their institution, the higher they rated intentionality in the creation of a vision for internationalization, intentionality in organizational commitment to internationalization, and the degree of contribution of intentionality in campus internationalization (see Appendix N). However, there was no significant correlation between this demographic and responses regarding intentionality in the practice of internationalization, even though this area recorded the highest average score among the mean scores of the three areas of strategic intent (Table 4.1). The researcher infers, therefore, that while the subjects believed internationalization was being highly practiced at their institutions, there might be other extraneous variables beyond the scope of this study, and for which this investigation did not control, that might have influenced the relationship between this demographic and the practice of intentional internationalization.

In the second, qualitative, phase of the investigation, the results of this study identified planning as the strongest indicator of intentional internationalization at a public research university among the seventeen indicators that surfaced at SEU3 (Figure 4.1). Furthermore, the outcomes revealed that the best practices of intentional internationalization at a public research university are leadership commitment, resource allocation, vision in planning, structure establishment, employee engagement, competencies establishment, creativity and experimentation, systematic approach, and the development of change agents. The first three of these best practices correspond to the first stage of the theory of strategic intent (Figure 4.2), the second three correspond to the
second stage (Figure 4.3), and the last three correspond to the final stage (Figure 4.4).

Of particular importance to sustainability was that, inasmuch as the findings in this study uncovered systematic internationalization as one of the most salient best practices of intentional internationalization at SEU3, interview participants still emphasized the need for a single administrative structure to manage all of the international education areas and undertakings on campus. This outcome reveals that SEU3 has an opportunity to add value to its systematic approach to intentional internationalization and increase the sustainability of this process through structure optimization. The researcher concludes that this ought to be of significant interest to the institution’s leadership, especially since the internationalization officials seem eager and ready to support such action, based on the explicitness of their responses indicating the need.

This study has identified how the concept of intentionality, as defined through the theory of strategic intent, impacts the internationalization of higher education, particularly in leveraging leadership opportunity to achieve sustainable internationalization (Figure 1.1). In addition to influencing an institution’s creation of a vision for internationalization, and its commitment and practice of internationalization, intentionality plays a significant role in an institution’s overall strategic planning efforts. It can also be a meaningful tool in determining and ascertaining what are the institution’s strong indicators and best practices of internationalization.

Findings in this study have shown, therefore, how the concept of intentionality can be an asset of significant added value to an institution’s strategic plan for internationalization. The researcher concludes that a plan which integrates intentionality
optimizes strategic planning, since it instigates leadership vision, encourages the building of internal capacity, and inspires systemic internationalization as the institution seeks to respond effectively to the challenges of globalization.

**Recommendations**

The following are the recommendations of the researcher for implementing investigation results based on the findings reported in Chapter 4 of this study. Since the data sets used in this study were specific to this research, the researcher does not assume that the findings of this investigation are applicable to other institutions beyond the sample of this study. Notwithstanding, given the high level of affinity of the literature outcomes with the investigative results of this study, and the rich and thick descriptions supporting these results, the researcher is confident in offering these observations and recommendations to higher education institutions seeking to accomplish, and sustain, successful campus internationalization. The researcher believes, therefore, that colleges and universities may find the following recommendations useful:

1. Given that intentionality may have a varying range of impact on higher education internationalization, the researcher recommends that colleges and universities utilize the “Organizational Intentionality in Campus Internationalization Survey” (see Appendix B) to assess the degree of contribution of intentionality on their campus internationalization processes. The results of this assessment may lead to a determination of whether organizational intentionality plays a significant role in internationalization at particular campuses, and help officials ascertain which areas of strategic intent in their internationalization requires intentional considerations.
2. The researcher recommends that colleges and universities explore their highest indicators and most prominent best practices of intentionality based on the findings of this study. This type of evaluation would allow institutions to ensure that their missions adequately reflect their internationalization agenda, become more purposeful in their strategic planning engagements, and determine the best course of action in establishing internationalization priorities and optimizing resources.

3. The researcher recommends that campus leaders utilize the findings in this study to intentionally create a vision for campus internationalization, commit the entire institution to a process of internationalization, and practice internationalization on their campuses. This type of engagement would help institutions move from change management neutral to breakthrough results in their internationalization efforts (Figure 2.1).

4. Outcomes of the quantitative investigation of this study revealed significantly positive relationships between the number of years a subject served at their universities and their responses regarding intentional internationalization in the areas of vision creation, organizational commitment, and the degree of contribution of intentionality in campus internationalization. However, since no significant correlation was established between this demographic variable and the practice of intentional internationalization, the researcher recommends further research to investigate this absence of correlation in this study.

5. The researcher recommends further study exploring SEU3s lower score in intentionality in the practice of internationalization, as compared with its
higher scores in the other two areas of strategic intent.

6. The researcher recommends further study exploring the reasons for SEU3s higher scores in intentionality in the commitment of internationalization, as compared with the other participating institutions’ lower scores in this area.

7. The researcher recommends further study exploring why international student recruitment did not emerge as an indicator of intentional internationalization at SEU3 in this investigation.

In addition to the aforementioned recommendations based on the data sets outcomes of this study, in the course of this investigation, other ideas emerged for future research. Consequently, the researcher offers the following suggestions for consideration:

1. To the knowledge of the researcher, this is the first study that explores the impact of organizational intentionality on successful internationalization in higher education. Therefore, the researcher recommends the need for further studies to provide additional and more exhaustive insights regarding the findings of this study.

2. During the researcher’s investigation of a theoretical framework on which to base intentionality in organizational planning, the researcher found only one theory in research, which is the theory of strategic intent. Based on this literature review, the concept of strategic intent had been developed as a business principle, which the researcher applied to an educational setting, vis-à-vis internationalization of higher education. The researcher, therefore, recommends further, and more exhaustive, applications of the theory of strategic intent in higher education. The researcher believes that the
application of this model by future researchers will lead to constant improvement of the model, and to the development of more targeted models, thus increasing the value of intentionality to strategic planning in higher education.

3. Since this literature investigation revealed a limited amount of research on the use of intentionality in higher education planning, the researcher recommends further exploration of this concept in higher education research.

4. While intentionality has been promoted, or alluded to, in the studies supporting this investigation, the researcher did not find in research any instruments that measure intentionality. For this reason, this study used a limited data set to explore the impact of intentionality on higher education internationalization efforts. Consequently, the researcher recommends repeating the “Organizational Intentionality in Campus Internationalization Survey” (see Appendix B) with a larger sample allowing for increased transferability and broader insight. Additionally, because this survey was derived primarily from one premise, the theory of strategic intent, the researcher recommends the development of a more comprehensive and scientific instrument to measure organizational intentionality to increase generalizations.

5. Since this study narrowly defined successful higher education internationalization to represent an institution’s student population in which 1% percent of its enrollment were foreign students, which this literature study revealed is only one indicator of successful internationalization, the researcher
recommends that several other indicators be factored into determining successful internationalization in future research. Such indicators might include: international prominence of a university; tier classification of a research university, based on Carnegie classifications (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, 2010); national and international rankings of a university; geographic location; cost of attendance; and, international marketing efforts.

6. While the findings in this research established that intentionality contributed at varying degrees to successful campus internationalization, this research did not seek to show causality between foreign student enrollment and the degree of contribution of intentionality. Consequently, the researcher could not establish whether intentionality contributes to an institution’s success in internationalization, vis-à-vis foreign student enrollment. The researcher, therefore, recommends for future study investigations into whether intentionality influences frequencies in foreign student enrollment at higher education institutions, or otherwise impacts successful internationalization.

7. The research recommends that this study be repeated with samples of universities in other states, and with private universities.

8. The researcher recommends that this study be repeated with a sample of the top U.S. universities enrolling international students, based on the IIE Opendoors 2010 fast facts report (Institute of International Education, 2010b).

9. The researcher recommends that this study be repeated with a sample of students.
Dissemination

The researcher will ensure that this study is disseminated in the following ways:

1) The researcher will seek to publish this research in U.S. and overseas journals on internationalization of higher education, and strategic planning in higher education.

2) The researcher will attend national and international conferences related to international education and present workshop sessions on what colleges and universities can do to strategically internationalize their campuses, particularly in making use of the theory of strategic intent to systematize internationalization.

3) The researcher will attend national and international conferences related to educational planning and present workshop sessions on how colleges and universities can incorporate intentionality into their institutional strategic planning processes to lead change.

4) The researcher will make this research available to public and private U.S. and overseas higher education institutions, organizations, and agencies supporting the internationalization of higher education and strategic planning in higher education.

5) The researcher will make this research available to other researchers investigating internationalization of higher education and strategic planning in higher education.

6) The researcher will provide a copy of this study to SEU3.
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APPENDIX A

“INTERNATIONAL STUDENT ENROLLMENT AT PUBLIC RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES IN THE SOUTHEAST REGION OF THE U.S.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Total Headcount</th>
<th>International Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Percentage of International Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*SEU1</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>12,261</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU2</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>27,707</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU3</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>44,010</td>
<td>2,677</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU4</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>40,838</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU5</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>53,603</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU6</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>50,841</td>
<td>4,920</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU7</td>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>47,306</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU8</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>11,630</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Did not participate in the study
APPENDIX B

“ORGANIZATIONAL INTENTIONALITY IN CAMPUS INTERNATIONALIZATION SURVEY”
Part 1
Demographics

1. What university do you represent?

2. What is the title of your current position?

3. How many years have you been in your current position?

4. How many years have you been involved in higher education internationalization?

5. What is the total number of years you have served at this university?

6. What is the total number of years you have served in higher education administration?

7. What is the highest degree you have earned?
   - Bachelors
   - Masters
   - Specialist
   - Doctorate
   Other (please specify)
Part 2

Introduction of the role of intentionality on internationalization

In reviewing the literature for my study, intentionality stood out glaringly as the vital ingredient needed for higher education administrators to successfully internationalize their campuses, particularly in accomplishing systemic rather than ad hoc internationalization. The scholars all pointed to intentionality as a purposeful and holistic organizational approach to campus internationalization, at the core which is the creation and support of a vision for internationalization by the institution’s leadership; the establishment of a solid administrative structure and activities that align with the vision; commitment and engagement of the entire organization in accomplishing the vision; and the creation of a culture of organizational flexibility, innovation, and enthusiasm that inspire everyone to work toward the achievement of the vision. In summary, through intentionality, the internationalization vision is accomplished by means of a deliberate planning process that begins with the end in mind. With this concept of intentionality in mind, I decided to explore its role in internationalization at research universities to see if indeed it impacts successful internationalization.

To the best of your knowledge, please rate the following items pertaining to your university by checking the appropriate box based on the following scale:

| Level of agreement with each statement: From “Least Agree With” (1) to “Most Agree With” (5) |
|--------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| A. Intentionality in Creating a Vision for Internationalization | Least 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Most 5 |
| 1. Campus internationalization at this university began with the institution’s leadership establishing a vision that had the end in mind. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2. The leadership of this university committed to internationalizing the institution based on what the institution will look like in the future, and not based on the institution’s current or past identity. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3. The process of internationalizing at this university was initiated by a charge from the leadership of the institution. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4. This university’s leadership ensured that the vision for campus internationalization was clearly articulated in the institution’s mission statement. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5. This university’s leadership ensured that the vision for campus internationalization was clearly articulated in the institution’s strategic plan. |   |   |   |   |   |
| 6. The leadership of this university is committed to the accomplishment of internationalizing this |   |   |   |   |   |
1. This university has developed a strategic plan for campus internationalization based on the vision established by the leadership of the institution.

2. This university’s strategic plan for campus internationalization is amply publicized throughout the institution.

3. The scope of the challenge to internationalize this university is clearly outlined and communicated to employees at all levels of the organization.

4. The core competencies, along with policies and operational procedures, required for internationalizing this university are clearly established and communicated to employees at all levels of the organization.

5. Employees at all levels of the organization have a sense of identity with the internationalization vision of this university.

6. Employees at all levels of the organization have an opportunity to become critically engaged in the internationalization vision of this university.

7. Employees at all levels of the organization are committed to the internationalization vision of this university.

8. This university has established one or more competent administrative structures to implement the campus internationalization vision of the institution.
9. All the administrative structures of this university work in a coordinated manner to accomplish the campus internationalization vision of the institution.

10. All activities pertaining to internationalizing this university are clearly detailed and communicated to employees at all levels of the organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. <strong>Intentionality in the Practice of Internationalization</strong></th>
<th>Least</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Most</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A culture of organizational flexibility, innovation, and enthusiasm exists at this institution regarding campus internationalization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Employees at this university feel inspired as they work toward the achievement of the vision of internationalizing the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Internationalization change agents have been developed in the process of internationalizing this university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Champions of the new culture of internationalization have emerged in the process of internationalizing this university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Continuous risk-taking and improvisation is seen as critical in the process of internationalizing this university.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Innovation during the process of internationalization is accomplished through creativity and experimentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. During the process of internationalization, as barriers are overcome and goals are met, employees’ enthusiasm and drive to succeed increase, momentum accelerates, and change is mastered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. This university embarks on internationalization with an enterprising campus spirit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. This university engages in a systemic approach to internationalization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. This university has a mechanism in place to successfully assess the effectiveness of the internationalization process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

“PERMISSION FROM DR. JANE KNIGHT TO USE THE TABLE ON RATIONALES DRIVING INTERNATIONALIZATION (Knight, 2008)”
Dear Adrian

I am delighted to hear that you are preparing your PhD research and dissertation on the Internationalization of Higher Education. Our field is a complex and changing one and we need to have PhD students such as yourself tackling some of the critical issues.

It is a pleasure to give you permission to use the chart on rationales in your dissertation.

Good luck with your research.
With all good wishes
Jane Knight

---

Dear Dr. Knight:

As a doctoral candidate in higher education administration at Georgia Southern University (in Statesboro, GA, U.S.A.), my research interest is in the internationalization of higher education, for which reason, my dissertation is focused on the intentional internationalization of higher education as a strategic institutional response to the pressures of globalization.

I have researched several of your publications, including your 2008 book entitled "Higher Education in Turmoil: The Changing World of Internationalization," and was particularly impressed with your "Internationalization Model" (Chapter 2). I would, therefore, like to include your table ("Rationales for Driving Internationalization") in my research. Please accept this e-mail as my request to be able to do so.

On a related issue, I would like to also request your kind assistance in pointing me to any additional publications (or researchers) on assessments of campus internationalization, particularly theories and models related to assessing organizational (and/or leadership) intentionality in campus internationalization processes.

By the way, I am copying my advisor, Dr. Teri Melton, in case you might be interested in contacting her on the status, or scope, of my research.

Please accept my appreciation for all the work you have done, and continue to do, in this fascinating and increasingly relevant field of higher education internationalization, in which, as a higher education scholar/practitioner, I have become extremely interested.

Many thanks for your time and consideration of my request.

Sincerely,
Adrian

Adrian Cornelius
adrawdiius@gmail.com
Doctoral Candidate
Georgia Southern University
Statesboro, GA
http://coe.georgiasouthern.edu/lthd/leadership.html
APPENDIX D

“PERMISSION FROM DR. CHARLES SMITH TO USE & ADAPT THE MERLIN FACTOR™”
Hi Adrian,

I enjoyed our conversation as well.

Thanks for your thesis description.

Good job and thanks for the acknowledgment.

Here is a brief version of an assessment that measures collective energy in any goal based project or system by giving weights to the questions. It will be easy for you to add questions if you wish.

Also, here is a copyrighted and proprietary toolbox relating to increasing energy in the same categories and then bringing it into focus.

Inversely, this ought to suggest ways of measuring the strength and effectiveness of strategic intent in any given context with a defined group.

Also, here is some text that elaborates on the Merlin Factor.

Please use the material with discretion and in a way that makes it hard for someone else to sell it or claim credit.

Please stay in touch.

Charlie

Please stay in touch.

-----Original Message-----
From: Adrian Raul Cornelius <adrawdius@gmail.com>
To: 'Charlie Smith' <smicharlie@aol.com>
Sent: Tue, Apr 12, 2011 4:38 pm
Subject: Follow-Up to Our Conversation This Afternoon

Dr. Smith, it was indeed a pleasure speaking with you today. I appreciate your insights and look forward to your e-mail with the information we discussed, relative to how I might measure organizational intentionality/strategic intent/energy ...

Once again, many thanks for taking the time to talk with me and for your willingness to be of assistance. I am pleased to share with you the attached excerpt from my research. It will give you a better picture of how I'm integrating the concept of strategic intent into my study of internationalization of higher education. Thank you for any additional comments, feedback, insights, etc. Also, thank you for keeping the attached confidential, as I will do the same with all the materials you send me.
I look forward to remaining in touch with you and will also be happy to share further updates with you.

With appreciation,

Adrian

Adrian Cornelius
adrawdius@gmail.com
Tel: 941-539-8086
Doctoral Candidate
Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA http://coe.georgiasouthern.edu/lthd/leadership.html
APPENDIX E

“DR NANCY SHUMAKER’S AGREEMENT TO PILOT-TEST THE ORGANIZATIONAL INTENTIONALITY IN CAMPUS INTERNATIONALIZATION SURVEY”
Hi Adrian,

I assumed that is what you meant by leadership but I did find myself thinking about deans when the question had to do with 'across the campus' since VPs don't have much impact directly across the campus. It's the deans that have the direct impact at the academic college level.

Nancy S

On Tue, Jun 14, 2011 at 6:45 PM, Adrian Raul Cornelius <adrawdius@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Dr. Shumaker:

Thank you very much for your kind and prompt response, and insightful comments. I will revise the survey to specify the term "leadership." Its use in this survey is referring to the President and Vice Presidents. I wonder if this clarification would change your responses to the first part of the survey. If so, please feel free to resend that part to me.

Once again, thank you very much for all your wonderful and expert assistance. Knowing that I could count on you was very significant to my peace of mind regarding my methods section.

With appreciation,

Adrian

Cornelius,

I've completed the survey and I've been pretty critical of our own internationalization process just because I think we have not been as systematic about it as we should have been. Too many changes at too many levels with regard to strategic planning and assessment of the need for university-wide internationalization. Anyway, I'm attaching it to this e-mail.

The one thing that I had problems with is the term 'leadership'. As Assistant VP and Director of the Center, I rank as part of the leadership of the university. I would think any dean or department chair would, also. Is that correct? Or do you mean upper leadership --- VPs and above? I think you may find that there might be some confusion with regard to the definition of that term. You could define it for the survey-taker at the beginning of the survey.

Good luck with the survey. I hope you get a good response.

with best regards,

Nancy Shumaker
On Tue, Jun 14, 2011 at 12:25 PM, Adrian Raul Cornelius <adrawdius@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Dr. Shumaker:

Attached is the survey on “Organizational Intentionality in Campus Internationalization.” Once again, thank you so very much for your kindness in piloting it for me. In addition to taking the survey, please feel free to offer me any feedback you deem necessary.

Looking forward to your responses.

With appreciation,

Adrian

From: Nancy Shumaker [mailto:shumaker@georgiasouthern.edu]
Sent: Monday, April 25, 2011 8:23 AM
To: Adrian Raul Cornelius
Subject: Re: RE2: Kind Request for Short Consultation

Adrian,

I'll be glad to test the survey for you.

Nancy Shumaker

On Sun, Apr 24, 2011 at 2:11 PM, Adrian Raul Cornelius <adrawdius@gmail.com> wrote:

Dr. Shumaker, I am in the process of developing the survey (as we discussed), and would like to ask if you wouldn't mind pilot-testing it for me and offering some feedback. It will just take few minutes to complete (probably 10-15 minutes the most), and this wouldn't be for another couple of weeks.

Please let me know, and thank you so much.

Adrian
APPENDIX F

“STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE”
Part 1
Demographics

1. What is the title of your current position?

2. How many years have you been in your current position?

3. How many years have you been involved in higher education internationalization?

4. What is the total number of years you have served at this university?

5. What is the total number of years you have served in higher education administration?

6. What is the highest degree you have earned?
   - Bachelors
   - Masters
   - Specialist
   - Doctorate
   - Other (please specify)
Part 2
Introduction of the role of intentionality on internationalization

In reviewing the literature for my study, intentionality stood out glaringly as the vital ingredient needed for higher education administrators to successfully internationalize their campuses, particularly in accomplishing systemic rather than ad hoc internationalization. The scholars all pointed to intentionality as a purposeful and holistic organizational approach to campus internationalization, at the core which is the creation and support of a vision for internationalization by the institution’s leadership; the establishment of a solid administrative structure and activities that align with the vision; commitment and engagement of the entire organization in accomplishing the vision; and the creation of a culture of organizational flexibility, innovation, and enthusiasm that inspire everyone to work toward the achievement of the vision. In summary, through intentionality, the internationalization vision is accomplished by means of a deliberate planning process that begins with the end in mind. With this concept of intentionality in mind, I decided to explore its role in internationalization at research universities to see if indeed it impacts successful internationalization.

The reason you and I are meeting today, besides your kindness in accepting to participate in this study, is because your university ranked highest in my research regarding the degree of contribution of organizational intentionality in internationalizing a campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Sub-Question #1:</th>
<th>What is the strongest indicator of intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Questions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Supporting Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What do you consider to be the reasons why this institution has been highly intentional in its efforts to internationalize?</td>
<td>Altbach &amp; Knight, 2007; Bruce, 2009; Burnett &amp; Huisman, 2010; Childress, 2009; Davies, 2001; de Wit, 2002; Felin &amp; Foss, 2004; Knight, 2008; McCabe, 2001; Stromquist, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Why is internationalization important to this university?</td>
<td>Altbach, 2004, 2009; Bruce, 2009; de Wit, 2002; Johnstone, 2001; Knight, 2004, 2008; McIntosh, 2005; Rivzi &amp; Lingard, 2000; Spring, 2005; Stromquist, 2007; Tierney, 2004; Vaira, 2004;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What do you consider are the indicators of intentional internationalization at this university?</td>
<td>Altbach &amp; Knight, 2007; Burnett &amp; Huisman, 2010; Capalbo, 2011; de Wit, 2002; Gacel-Avila, 2005; Green, Luu, &amp; Burris, 2008; Hamel &amp; Prahalad, 1989; Knight, 2008; Luijten-Lub, van der Wende, &amp; Huisman, 2005; Olsen &amp; Kroeger, 2001; Prahalad &amp; Hamel, 1990; Smith, 1994; Stromquist, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In your estimation, of those indicators, what are the two most important indicators of intentionality in successful internationalization at this university?</td>
<td>Burnett &amp; Huisman, 2010; Cudmore, 2006; Hamel &amp; Prahalad, 1989; Knight, 1999, 2008; Olsen &amp; Kroeger, 2001; Prahalad &amp; Hamel, 1990; Smith, 1994; Stromquist, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Based on your experience in higher education internationalization, do you believe there are other indicators of intentional internationalization that this university has yet to embrace? Bruce, 2009; Burnett & Huisman, 2010; Cudmore, 2006; Hamel & Prahalad, 1989; Knight, 1999, 2008; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990; Smith, 1994; Stromquist, 2007

7. How does this university assess its success in internationalization? Davies, 2001; De Wit, 2002; Knight, 2008; Stromquist, 2007

8. What does the future look like for internationalization at this university? Altbach, 2004; Bruce, 2009; de Wit, 2002; Goodin, 1996; Knight, 2008; van der Wende, 2003

Research Sub-Question #2: What are best practices relative to intentionality in successful internationalization at a public research university?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
<th>Supporting Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the driving force behind internationalization at this university?</td>
<td>Altbach &amp; Knight, 2007; Beerkens, 2003; Bruce, 2009; Burnett &amp; Huisman, 2010; Capalbo, 2011; de Wit, 2002; Gacel-Avila, 2005; Johnstone, 2001; Knight, 2004, 2008; McCabe, 2001; Spring, 2005; Stromquist, 2007; Tierney, 2004; Vaira, 2004; van der Wende, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is this university employing a specific internationalization model or approach as a strategy to internationalize?</td>
<td>Altbach &amp; Knight, 2007; Bruce, 2009; Burnett &amp; Huisman, 2010; Hamel &amp; Prahalad, 1989; de Wit, 2002; Goodin, 1996; Knight, 1999, 2004, 2008; Knight &amp; de Wit, 1995; Melin, 1992; Siaya &amp; Hayward, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Based on your experience in higher education internationalization, what do you believe are the best practices in intentional internationalization of a university?</td>
<td>Bruce, 2009; Burnett &amp; Huisman, 2010; Davies, 2001; de Wit, 2002; Goodin, 1996; Knight, 1999, 2008; Stromquist, 2007; van der Wende, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you believe this university is</td>
<td>Bruce, 2009; Burnett &amp; Huisman, 2010;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What are some of the best practices relative to intentional internationalization that have contributed to successful internationalization at this institution?</td>
<td>Davies, 2001; de Wit, 2002; Goodin, 1996; Knight, 1999, 2008; Stromquist, 2007; van der Wende, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are there some best practices relative to intentional internationalization that contribute more than others at this university? If so, why?</td>
<td>Bruce, 2009; Burnett &amp; Huisman, 2010; Davies, 2001; de Wit, 2002; Goodin, 1996; Knight, 1999, 2008; Stromquist, 2007; van der Wende, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What sustains such a high level of intentionality in internationalization at this university?</td>
<td>Bruce, 2009; Burnett &amp; Huisman, 2010; Hamel &amp; Prahalad, 1989; Knight, 2004, 2008; Prahalad &amp; Hamel, 1990; Smith, 1994; Schoorman, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What do you consider are some improvements that can be made at this university relative to best practices in intentional internationalization?</td>
<td>Hamel &amp; Prahalad, 1989; Knight, 2004, 2008; Prahalad &amp; Hamel, 1990; Smith, 1994; Schoorman, 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

“FOLLOW-UP E-MAIL TO SUBJECTS WHO HAVE INFORMED OF THEIR WILLINGNESS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SURVEY”
Dear ______________________ [Name of Subject]:

It was great having the opportunity to talk with you on _______________ [Date]. Thank you very much for your kind willingness to participate in the Organizational Intentionality in Campus Internationalization Survey, as per our prior communications. As a reminder, this survey is designed to gather data for my dissertation research on the impact of organizational intentionality on campus internationalization.

You can expect to receive a link to the survey via e-mail in the coming weeks. The survey will be introduced by an informed consent form, followed by a two-part survey which should take approximately ten minutes to complete.

Once again, please accept my appreciation for your kind collaboration with my study.

Best regards,

Adrian Cornelius
APPENDIX H

“ONLINE SURVEY INFORMED CONSENT FORM”
Dear Research Participant:

Please accept this request for your valuable participation in this research. The title of this fascinating study is *Intentional Internationalization of Higher Education: A Strategic Response to Globalization*. The proposed study will be conducted with officials who are senior international education officers on their campuses. The research focuses on organizational intentionality as a strategy that steers organizational planning processes toward systemic accomplishment. The purpose of the study is to determine how intentionality has impacted successful internationalization at public research universities in the United States.

Your participation will involve answering questions in a confidential online survey designed to gauge your assessment of the degree of intentionality in internationalization at your university. The anticipated time to complete the survey is fifteen minutes, and it will be available for online completion for five days.

While this is not an anonymous study, the risks of involvement to you are minimal. The study has been designed to ensure participant confidentiality, and your participation is voluntary. If you elect not to participate, to discontinue your participation in the study, or decline to answer any part of the questions on the survey, you may do so at any time without penalties. The results of the research may be published, but your name will not be used. Although there are no direct benefits to you, your participation in this study may help offer insights regarding the role of organizational intentionality in strategically internationalizing higher education.

Findings from this study will be presented in my dissertation project for completion of the degree of Doctor of Education in Higher Education Administration from Georgia Southern University. Please be assured that strict confidentiality will be maintained throughout this study. My handling of your data will be consistent with the standards of the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (Federal Register, 1991) and the Ethical Principles in the Conduct of Research with Human Participants (APA, 1982). Survey data and your signed consent form will be kept in separate locked file cabinets in the researcher’s home office, to which only the researcher has access. All data will be destroyed three years following the completion of the study.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study or your participation in the study, you may contact me as the principal investigator of the project, Adrian Cornelius,
via email at adrawdius@gmail.com, or by telephone at (941) 539-8086. You may also contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Teri Melton via e-mail at tamelton@georgiasouthern.edu. For questions concerning your rights as a research participant, contact Georgia Southern University Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs at 912-478-0843.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board under tracking number H12013.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this research study. If you consent to participate in this research study and to the terms above, please click on the “Consent” button below.

Yes, I voluntarily consent to participate in this study.
[Embedded logic will allow participant access to the questionnaire]

No, I do not consent to participate in this study.
[Embedded logic will deny access to the questionnaire]
APPENDIX I

“INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE INFORMED CONSENT FORM”
Dear Research Participant:

Please accept this request for your valuable participation in this research. The title of this fascinating study is *Intentional Internationalization of Higher Education: A Strategic Response to Globalization*. The proposed study will be conducted with higher education officers involved in internationalization on their campuses. The research focuses on organizational intentionality as a strategy that steers organizational planning processes toward systemic accomplishment. The purpose of the study is to determine how intentionality has impacted successful internationalization at public research universities in the United States.

Your participation will involve answering questions in a confidential interview questionnaire to describe your unique experience with internationalization at your university. The anticipated time for completion of the interview is one hour.

While this is not an anonymous study, the risks of involvement to you are minimal. The study has been designed to ensure participant confidentiality, and your participation is voluntary. If you elect not to participate, to discontinue your participation in the study, or decline to answer any questions during the interview, you may do so at any time without consequences. The results of the research may be published, but your name will not be used. Although there are no direct benefits to you, your participation in this study may help offer insights regarding the role of organizational intentionality in strategically internationalizing higher education.

Findings from this study will be presented in my dissertation project for completion of the degree of Doctor of Education in Higher Education Administration from Georgia Southern University. Please be assured that strict confidentiality will be maintained throughout this study. My handling of your data will be consistent with the standards of the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (Federal Register, 1991) and the Ethical Principles in the Conduct of Research with Human Participants (APA, 1982). The interview will be audio recorded on the researcher’s personal laptop computer, which requires a password for access that only the researcher knows. Interview transcriptions and your signed consent form will be kept in separate locked file cabinets in the researcher’s home office, to which only the researcher has access. All data will be destroyed three years following the completion of the study.
If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study or your participation in the study, you may contact me as the principal investigator of the project, Adrian Cornelius, via email at adrawdius@gmail.com, or by telephone at (941) 539-8086. You may also contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Teri Melton via e-mail at tamelton@georgiasouthern.edu. For questions concerning your rights as a research participant, contact Georgia Southern University Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs at 912-478-0843.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records. This project has been reviewed and approved by the GSU Institutional Review Board under tracking number H12013.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this research study. If you consent to participate in this research study and to the terms above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

____________________________________  __________________
Participant Signature                Date

I, the undersigned, verify that the above informed consent procedure has been followed.

____________________________________  ________________
Investigator Signature               Date
APPENDIX J

“DOCUMENT AND AUDIO-VISUAL REVIEW FORM”
Document & Audio-Visual Review Form

Type of Document or Audio-Visual Material: □ Document □ Audio-Visual

Title: ________________________________________________________________

Author(s) (if provided): _________________________________________________

Operation Produced by: _________________________________________________

Affecting what Aspect of Campus Internationalization: ________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

Date of Publication: ___________________________

1. What indicators of intentional internationalization at this university are published in this document or audio-material?

   ________________________________________________________________

2. Among the indicators of intentional internationalization at this university present in this document or audio-visual material, which one surfaces as the strongest indicator?

   ________________________________________________________________

3. What best practices relative to intentional internationalization at this university are published in this document or audio-visual material?

   ________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX K

“OBSERVATION FORM”
Observation Form

Participant Designation: ___________________ Date: ____________

What indicators of intentional internationalization are prominently displayed in this university’s environment?

Among the indicators of intentionality prominently displayed in this university’s environment, what seems to be the strongest of them all?

What best practices in intentional internationalization are prominently displayed in this university’s environment?
APPENDIX L

“DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF QUANTITATIVE INVESTIGATION RESPONDENTS”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEU2</td>
<td>What is the title of your current position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many years have you been in your current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>position?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many years have you been involved in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>higher education internationalization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the total number of years you have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>served at this university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the total number of years you have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>served in higher education administration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the highest degree you have earned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU3</td>
<td>Director of the Office of International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU4</td>
<td>Director of the Center of Global Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU5</td>
<td>Assistant Vice President for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internationalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU6</td>
<td>Executive Director of the University’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU7</td>
<td>Director of International Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEU8</td>
<td>Director of the International Student Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M

“DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF QUALITATIVE INVESTIGATION RESPONDENTS”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>What is the title of your current position?</th>
<th>How many years have you been in your current position?</th>
<th>How many years have you been involved in higher education internationalization?</th>
<th>What is the total number of years you have served at this university?</th>
<th>What is the total number of years you have served in higher education administration?</th>
<th>What is the highest degree you have earned?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IO1</td>
<td>Director of International Student and Scholar Services</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO2</td>
<td>Vice-Provost for Academic Planning and Accountability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO3</td>
<td>Director of the Office of Global Learning Initiatives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO4</td>
<td>Associate Vice-President for Planning and Institutional Research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO5</td>
<td>Executive Director of the School of International and Public Affairs &amp; Professor of Politics and International Relations and Law</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO6</td>
<td>Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO7</td>
<td>Director of the Office of Education Abroad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO8</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX N

“CORRELATIONS MATRIX OF OUTCOMES OF THE “ORGANIZATIONAL
INTENTIONALITY IN CAMPUS INTERNATIONALIZATION SURVEY”
## Correlations Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Strategic Intent</th>
<th>Years in Current Position</th>
<th>Years at Current University</th>
<th>Years in Higher Education Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>r=0.962**</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>r=0.800*</td>
<td>r=0.885**</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Intent</td>
<td>r=0.977**</td>
<td>r=0.993**</td>
<td>r=0.901**</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Current Position</td>
<td>r=0.463</td>
<td>r=0.425</td>
<td>r=0.342</td>
<td>r=0.438</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at Current University</td>
<td>r=0.876**</td>
<td>r=0.801*</td>
<td>r=0.514</td>
<td>r=0.801*</td>
<td>r=0.771*</td>
<td>r=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Higher Education Administration</td>
<td>r=0.099</td>
<td>r=0.177</td>
<td>r=0.130</td>
<td>r=0.120</td>
<td>r=0.771*</td>
<td>r=0.409</td>
<td>r=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level  
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level