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Abstract

Going further on that walk:
Examining the internationalization of public and private not-for-profit American higher education institutions

by
Lucia Maria Greve
Claremont Graduate University: 2018

The purpose of this study is to contribute to the field of internationalization by investigating the differences in the outputs (the amount and types of activity undertaken in support of internationalization efforts) and outcomes of internationalization (results of the process of internationalization) between public and private not-for-profit American higher education institutions (HEIs) in 2011 and 2016.

Using a mixed methods approach, the quantitative strand of this research uses data from the American Council on Education (ACE) 2011 and 2016 Mapping Internationalization surveys to examine through descriptive statistics the differences in the outputs of internationalization of public and private not-for-profit HEIs. Then, running several ordered logit regressions I examine among the six categories of ACE’s Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) Model for Comprehensive Internationalization, which categories exert the most influence on the perceived level of internationalization in public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016. The qualitative strand of this research analyzes interviews with key campus officers from American public and private not-for-profit higher education institutions that had already participated in the ACE internationalization laboratory to find out the perceived outcomes of internationalization.

The results of the quantitative strand show that there are several differences in the outputs of internationalization in 2011 and 2016 between public and private not-for-profit HEIs.
The results of the qualitative strand indicate that public HEIs are more advanced in cycle of the process of internationalization than private not-for-profit HEIs. Moreover, participants reported only level one (students and other institutional stakeholders) and level two (individual higher education institution) outcomes, not mentioning level three (national level) and level four (global and supra-national) outcomes. I find that many higher education institutions treat internationalization as a temporary program that is vulnerable to the oscillations of leadership. In fact, internationalization requires a change in the mentality of the higher education institution and must be embedded in the culture to guide the paths of the institution in a globalized economy. This study has implications for policy, practice, and research.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

“Education … should cultivate the factual and imaginative prerequisites for recognizing humanity in the stranger and the other …. Ignorance and distance cramp the consciousness.” (Nussbaum, 1996, p. 133)

Martha C. Nussbaum, For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism

According to Merryfield (2008), the world we live in is characterized by economic, political, cultural, environmental, and technological interconnectedness that creates numerous challenges. In fact, our survival and well-being in this interrelated world are directly associated with our capacity to understand and deal responsibly and effectively with a number of topics that transcend the boundaries of nations (Kambutu & Nganga, 2008). The higher education system in the 21st century needs to prepare students for this interconnected world and for a labor market that is beyond national geographic boundaries, and for jobs that have not yet even been imagined (Hunter, White, & Godbey, 2006).

In addition, higher education systems around the world are facing the challenges of the global knowledge economy that demands world-quality higher education, graduate education, and internationalization (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2016, p. 27). Consequently, “over the years internationalization has moved from a reactive to a pro-active strategic issue, from added value to mainstream, and also has seen its focus, scope and content evolve substantially” (de Wit, 2011, p. 242). So, scholars and organizations in education, such as the American Council on Education (ACE) through its Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) have been advocating for internationalization of American higher education institutions (HEIs).

As internationalization becomes more relevant in higher education, institutions should give more attention to monitoring and evaluating the progress, quality, results, and impact of
internationalization efforts “to make sure that we are ‘doing the right things’ and ‘doing things in the right way’” (Knight, 2008, p.39). The Program Logic Model for internationalization (Deardorff, 2005) allows us to frame assessment efforts that can help higher education senior administrators to develop a more comprehensive strategy for internationalization. The model describes logical connections among program inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes related to a specific situation, which in the case of my research will be the process of internationalization.

Defining Internationalization

Internationalization is not a new term. It has been used for centuries in politics and governmental relations. However, its use in the education field has only increased since the early 1980s (Knight, 2004). Paige and Mestenhauser (1999) defined internationalization as “a complex, multidimensional learning process that includes the integrative, intercultural, interdisciplinary, comparative, transfer of knowledge-technology, contextual, and global dimensions of knowledge construction” (p. 504), but in 2003, Bartell stated that internationalization is far from a clearly defined concept. However, a definition formulated by Knight (2003) has gained general acceptance in the research community and has served as a reference point for the academic community as it strives to internationalize and obtain support from institutional leaders and policy makers. Knight (2003) defines internationalization as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (p. 2). Moreover, according to the Association of International Educators – NAFSA (previously known as the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers) (2016) if a HEI wants to succeed in this process of internationalization, it needs to engage the academic community actively in terms of global networks and partnerships.
Terms such as “internationalization,” “globalization,” and “multiculturalism” are often used interchangeably. This ambiguity presents challenges to those attempting to set and respond to internationalization policies within HEIs (Buczynski, Lattimer, Inoue & Alexandrowicz, 2010).

Like internationalization, globalization has been defined in several ways. Because both phenomena affect not only higher education, but most aspects of society, the terms are often used interchangeably according to the purposes of the authors using them. But the two terms are not identical and should not be used interchangeably (Teichler, 2004). In fact, efforts have been made to avoid using the term globalization of education and instead focus on the internationalization of education (Knight, 2003). According to Teichler and Yağci (2009), internationalization is related to academic cooperation, knowledge transfer, and physical mobility, whereas globalization carries the idea that borders are ephemeral, the nation-state may weaken and eventually come to an end. Therefore, globalization is frequently linked to competition and market-driven, transnational education, as well as commercial knowledge-transfer while internationalization is associated with higher-level academic transactions. Van der Wende (2003) sees internationalization as the increasing interconnectedness between national education systems, and globalization as the increasing convergence and interdependence of economies and liberalization of trade and markets.

With respect to multiculturalism, Davenport (2000) stated that although it shares many of the same concerns with globalization, “the former is based in a domestic intra-national context and the latter deals with issues in the international or cross-national arena” (p. 361). Furthermore, Bennett and Bennett (1994) reported that in the U.S., multiculturalism is related historically to K-12 education. It refers to ethnic differences within the country, and, in
particular, to various efforts to change the curriculum to reflect the cultures and social groups represented in the U.S. Olson, Evans, and Shoenberg (2007) maintain that in the U.S., domestic diversity has been the focus of multiculturalism in education, while knowledge of cultures outside the United States has been the focus of internationalization.

The ACE has been working for decades with HEIs in their efforts to internationalize; this organization has defined comprehensive internationalization as “a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate international policies, programs, and initiatives, and positions colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally connected” (ACE, 2012, p. 3). Additionally, this process of comprehensive internationalization influences curriculum, institutional policies and programs. Therefore, this process demands a well-defined commitment by top-level institutional leaders, resulting in a continuous incorporation of international perspectives and activities throughout the institution (McGill & Helms, 2015, p.29). While other definitions address important aspects of internationalization, the ACE’s definition is most beneficial for my research because it offers a more specific application of internationalization that aligns closely with my own research project.

**Conceptual Framework**

Deardorff (2005) created the Program Logic Model for Internationalization based on the Program Logic Model also known as Logic Model. I will use the Program Logic Model for Internationalization as my conceptual framework.

The Program Logic Model is a tool that has been used for more than twenty years by program managers and evaluators to describe the effectiveness of their programs. The model describes logical connections among program inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes related to
a specific problem or situation. Once a program has been described in terms of the logic model, critical measures of performance can be identified (McLaughlin & Jordan, 1999).

Deardorff (2005) adapted the Program Logic Model for the process of internationalization creating the Program Logic Model for Internationalization. According to Deardorff and van Gaalen (2002), the specific components of this Model are:

**Inputs**

“What is needed to achieve the stated goals? Inputs are the resources needed to develop and implement activities that will achieve the goals” (p.169). For example, staff, faculty, administrators, time, money, partners, facilities are considered inputs needed to develop the process of internationalization at HEIs.

**Activities/ Components**

“What are the specific activities undertaken to achieve the goals?” (p.169). In the case of this study, I will consider as components the six interconnected target areas (or categories) presented at CIGE’s Model for Comprehensive Internalization (ACE, 2012, p.4). These categories are:

- Articulated Institutional Commitment (mission statements, strategic plans and formal assessment mechanisms);
- Administrative structure and staffing (reporting structures and staff and office configuration);
- Curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes (general education and language requirements, co-curriculum activities and programs, and specified learning outcomes);
• Faculty policies and practices (hiring guidelines, tenure and promotion policies, and faculty development opportunities);

• Student mobility (education abroad programs, and international recruitment and support);

• Collaboration and Partnerships (joint-degree or dual/double degree programs, branch campuses, and other offshore programs)

**Outputs**

“What are the direct results of activities?” (p.169). These inputs or activities lead to certain outputs or results; for instance, the number of international students, the number of joint-degree programs, and the amount of international research funding. Output is what was created in the end of the process and output measures do not address the value of the process of internationalization for the stakeholders.

**Outcomes**

“What are the results of the activity for individuals, programs, the institution, and society? These are the expected or resulting effects of the outputs of an intervention (activities)” (p. 169/170). Outputs are direct consequences from inputs; outcomes are related to overall achievements. Outcomes can be considered as the final results of internationalization activities and are normally formulated at a higher level of abstraction than outputs. The main difference is that outcomes usually cannot be directly linked to one activity or action, as it is not clear which one caused it. On the other hand, outputs can be directly linked to one action or activity. Outcomes could refer for example to the competencies of graduates such as intercultural competence, the quality of education programs and research, increased institutional reputation, or increased national visibility
(Beerkens, Brandenburg, Evers, van Gaalen, Leichsenring and Zimmermann, 2010). In sum, according to Jones (2012), outcomes assess the success of the process of internationalization.

According to Deardorff (2005), the chosen combination of inputs and activities will create outputs and outcomes during the process of internationalization that will result in a long-term impact of internationalization in HEIs. The Program Logic Model for internationalization allow us to frame assessment efforts that can help higher education senior administrators to develop a more comprehensive strategy for internationalization. However, a limitation of this Model is that we cannot assume causal attribution, since there are many factors that may influence outcomes, including external factors such as new immigration policies for example. In addition, the same activity can result in different outputs and outcomes. For instance, offering more options to education abroad (activity) can provide students with more opportunities to find their learning interests and needs. This, in turn, is assumed to increase the number of students abroad (output) and perhaps improve the quality of learning (outcome). However, an increase in the number of options (activity) may also reduce the economies of scale of individual programs (output), thereby raising program costs to students (output) and, as a result, actually lowering participation rates (output), not reflecting in the overall quality of learning of the institution (outcome) (Hudzik & Stohl, 2009, p.15).

Figure 1 graphically presents the steps of the Program logic model for internationalization (Deardorff, 2005, p.27), the CIGE’s Model for comprehensive internationalization (ACE, 2012, p.4), and the relationship with my research questions. As I used a modified version of the figure created by Dr. Darla Deardorff to represent the Program logic model for internationalization, I
asked her permission to use that modified version in my dissertation and she kindly granted me permission (See Appendix A).

Figure 1. Program logic model for internationalization, CIGE’s Model for Comprehensive Internationalization and Research Questions. Adapted from “A matter of logic?” by D. K. Deardorff, 2005, International Educator, 14 (3), p. 27. Used by permission of author.

Research Problem

Several gaps were identified in the research of internationalization in American HEIs. The great majority of dissertations on internationalization in higher education use case studies to perform their analyses (Cichoki, 2005; Savishinsky, 2012; Malek, 2012), which means that results cannot be generalized to a wider population as we are not sure whether the cases investigated are representative of the population. In addition, these dissertations typically focus on a single point in time and do not have the benefit to detect any changes over time. Those
changes over time are important to analyze because higher education institutions work in a dynamic environment and senior administrators might change the priorities of the institution and internationalization might not be among them anymore. As Hudzik (2015) stated rationales or reasons to internationalize change over time depending on internal organizational dynamics or environmental factors. For example, according to Altbach (2010) before the dissemination of world university rankings and the spread of institutions competing globally, institutional global reputation as a motivation for internationalization was far less relevant. In short, reasons to internationalize and the weight assigned to each one of them will undergo changes over time. As reasons and their weights change, priorities also will change (Hudzik, 2015). Other institutional priorities with higher weights might come up and internationalization might not be viewed as part of the priorities anymore.

In addition to that, the methodologies in many published research on internationalization have limitations such as using limited sample size and relying on case studies (Hudzik, 2015). Furthermore, frequently the focus of research measuring internationalization topics revolves around inputs and outputs of the process. According to Hudzik (2015), there is an absence of systematic data to verify the number of outcomes of this process. On the other hand, studies that focus on a single outcome indicator are limited to individual level indicators such as intercultural competence (Deardorff, 2006), graduate outcomes (Cuthbert, Smith & Boey, 2008), or global learning outcomes (Musil, 2006) and do not examine institutional level indicators such as institution reputation.

My goal is to fill these gaps by not only investigating outputs of internationalization in a representative number of public and private not-for-profit American HEIs at two points in time, but also by exploring the outcomes that those institutions have already reached.
Statement of the Problem

Rodenberg (2010) stated that, over the years, efforts have been made to move from the rhetoric of internationalization to the actual implementation of these ideas on campuses around the world. At the same time, more efforts have been made to increase the sophistication in measuring the status of internationalization on these campuses as well as to develop instruments to assess the degree of internationalization of HEIs. In the literature, there are several attempts to measure this degree in individual or in a small group of institutions (Lujan, 2000; Hser, 2003; Malek, 2012; Ratliff, 2013; Chan, 2013; Butler, 2016; and Maddox, 2016), but undoubtedly the most extensive work to measure institutional internationalization efforts comes from the ACE (Rodenberg, 2010). So far, the ACE has produced four comprehensive surveys examining several aspects of the internationalization process in American HEIs. As quoted in Fisher (2008), Green stated, “This survey isn’t about the talk, it is about the walk. I think there is still a very big gap between the rhetoric and what actually happens on campuses” (p. A24). While this assessment and others like it have greatly contributed to an advancement in the field, the majority have measured only the inputs (resources available to support internationalization efforts) and outputs (the amount and types of activity undertaken in support of internationalization efforts). Public and private HEIs have different inputs for this process of internationalization and I want to examine if those different inputs result in different outputs and outcomes. For instance, differences between public and private not-for-profit HEIs in terms of governance, legal distinction, size, and revenue base might lead to different outputs and outcomes. Public HEIs are governed by small boards often selected by the governor and legislative leaders, while private HEIs are governed by large boards that tend to be self-perpetuating. As an agency of state government, public HEIs must hire and fire employees
according to specific procedures of the state personnel laws, while private HEIs can adopt policies that reflect their own needs and no other. Public HEIs enroll more students than private HEIs, although there are more private HEIs in the U.S. than public ones. Thus, private HEIs have, on average, smaller class sizes, while public HEIs tend to have larger class sizes. Public HEIs rely more on revenues from state appropriations, endowments, capital campaigns, while private HEIs rely more on revenues from tuitions, endowments, and fundraising. Differences in institutional commitment, administrative structure, curriculum, faculty policies and practices, student mobility, and partnerships will also be examined.

In sum, following the paths that had already been taken in the field of internationalization, I want to go further on that walk. First I will examine more deeply these outputs disaggregating the data by type of higher education control (public or private), and then, I will explore the outcomes or results of this process of internationalization for American HEIs.

**Significance of Study**

Going beyond the study of outputs and investigating the outcomes of internationalization is important because the latter will reveal a more complete picture of what is going on in terms of internationalization inside a higher education institution. While outputs will show the results of the activities, outcomes will uncover how much value internationalization added to the institution. As stated by Hudzik (2015), assessing outcomes will allow stakeholders to know what the returns were from investing in institutional internationalization, not only in terms of revenue but also in terms of reputation, image, network, capacities, organization, and visibility. In a time of limited resources and containment of expenses, investment decisions are made based on what will bring the most return to the institution. Therefore, what internationalization has
brought to the institution (the outcomes) must be clearly exposed so that stakeholders could evaluate if it is worthwhile to continue investing on the process.

Lastly, as public and private not-for-profit HEIs have several organizational differences, disaggregating the outcomes by type of institution control will add a new perspective to the topic.

Those organizational differences revolve around several areas that will result in different resources available to support internationalization efforts (inputs). For example, differences could be found in how they are governed, how they are able to hire and fire their employees, how large their institutions and their classes are, and from what sources they obtain their revenues. In addition, more differences could be found in how committed to internationalization their institutions are, how their administrative structure is organized, what is included in their curriculum, how they support faculty and staff in internationalization issues, how they deal with student mobility, and how they manage their partnerships.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this study is to identify the differences in the outputs in 2011 and 2016 and in the outcomes of internationalization between two types of HEIs (public and private not-for profit) through the lens of key campus officers at American HEIs.
Research Questions

This study will attempt to examine the following questions:

1) What are the main distinctions between public and private not-for-profit HEIs according to the outputs of internationalization in 2011 and 2016?
   a) How do the results differ across 2011 and 2016?

2) Among the six categories\(^1\) of CIGE’s Model for Comprehensive Internationalization, which ones exert the most influence on the perceived level of internationalization in public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016?
   a) How do the results differ across 2011 and 2016?

3) What are the perceived outcomes of internationalization for public and private not-for-profit HEIs?

Summary of first chapter

The overall objective of this research is to investigate and identify differences in the outputs of internationalization in a representative number of public and private not-for-profit American HEIs in 2011 and 2016, and to explore the outcomes that those institutions have already reached through the lens of key campus officers at American HEIs.

In the following sections, I will present the literature review, the methodology, the results, discussions, and the conclusion of this research.

\(^1\) Also referred as target areas or components
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The main goal of this literature review is to provide an overview of the importance of internationalization in HEIs, of the factors influencing the level of internationalization, of the importance of measuring it, and of how organizations are measuring it. Considering this, the focus of this research is on public and private-not-for-profit HEIs and I will finish this review explaining why I have chosen to focus on them. I will cover the following areas: (1) Rationales or motivations for internationalization; (2) Factors influencing the level of internationalization; (3) The Internationalization Cycle; (4) Importance of measuring internationalization; (5) Measuring internationalization; and (6) Reason to focus on public and private HEIs.

Rationales or motivations for internationalization

Mansilla and Jackson (2011) argued that the world for which educators are preparing their students now is qualitatively different from the industrial world in which American public school systems were created and a series of reports and policy statement have highlighted the need for new skills for the 21st century. Therefore, providing the most relevant education to students who will be the citizens of tomorrow is one of the main goals of the process of internationalization in higher education (Hénard, Diamond & Roseveare, 2012).

Knight (1997) stated that there are a number of different rationales, reasons or motivations for internationalization just as there are several ways to define internationalization and she presented them in four categories: political, economic, academic, and cultural/social. Rationales or motivations are aspirational, while outcomes express the reality, that is, what was actually achieved (Hudzik, 2015).

The political rationale is more relevant to a national standpoint than to an institutional standpoint. Along the history, foreign policy used international education as a national security
tool to promote peace and mutual understanding among nations. However, the increased globalization of economies also brought the risk of the homogenization of cultures, a threat called Westernization by smaller and/ or developing countries. Thus, smaller and/ or developing countries now consider internationalization as a way to strengthen and promote their national identity (Knight, 1997). For a better understanding of how internationalization is a way to strengthen national identity, it is important to bring up again the difference between globalization and internationalization. Globalization is the flow of people, money, goods, and services around the globe in response to political and market forces, while internationalization is a cultural flow that transcends borders, engenders a deeper understanding between nations, and contributes to an advancement of human knowledge (Svensson and Wihlborg, 2010). Furthermore, Carano (1991) has asserted that internationalization can help students to perceive their own culture from a different perspective and to learn to respect and coexist with other cultures in a world that is increasingly interconnected. In fact, according to Fortuijn (2002), one of the goals of internationalization is to increase diversity once the direct contact between people with different backgrounds can be an efficient way to learn about cultural differences.

On the other hand, Jackson (2003) pointed out that it is important to make sure that internationalization does not become a tool for cultural colonization used to depreciate non-Western cultures. Furthermore, Teichler (2004) warned about the potential shortcomings of internationalization, stating that although it may be mutually beneficial, it can also encourage the devaluation of local culture, the decrease of language diversity, the weakness of academic and cultural diversity, or the dissemination of neo-imperialism. Studying the inequality in globalization, Altbach (2004) found that the biggest challenge of internationalization is to create a global academic environment that ensures equal academic relationships. Only promoting the
interaction between international and domestic students is not enough to guarantee internationalization because a cultural conflict might occur preventing academic cooperation (Kondakci, Broeck, and Yildirim, 2008).

Higher education is also viewed as a diplomatic investment for future political and economic relations as giving scholarships for international students, who might turn out to be leaders in their countries, might be beneficial in terms of diplomatic and business relationships in the future (Knight, 1997).

The economic rationale has been growing in importance due to the economic, scientific and technological competitiveness among countries. Developing a highly skilled and knowledgeable workforce and investing in applied research are vital to improve and maintain competitiveness and higher education plays an important role in both strategies. Therefore, at national and regional level, internationalization of higher education is important to the economic and technological development of the country (Knight, 1997).

The massification of higher education also increased the interest of some countries to export education products and services. This market orientation is growing in importance at the institutional level and there is a debate of whether this orientation is contributing to internationalization. An important goal of internationalization is to improve the quality of higher education and not to develop international export markets, so it is imperative that those international export education activities that are income generating have a positive impact on the teaching, research and service functions of the institution (Knight, 1997).

Changes in the labor market are also influencing the internationalization of higher education. The greater flow of trade and professional workers across borders requires the development of international standards for licensing and accreditation, so HEIs need to pay more
attention to international accreditation systems for those trades and professions that are accredited at national level only. The labor market also dictates the competencies that are essential for new graduates to work in a global economy and HEIs must be aware of this (Knight, 1997).

The academic rationale for internationalization is to achieve international standards of excellence in scholarship and research. The ultimate goal is to enhance the quality of education, and it is assumed that by enhancing the international dimension of teaching, research and service there is a value added to the quality of the higher education system. Moreover, internalization activities such as student and faculty mobility, joint research projects, partnerships require major institutional planning activities that help with institution building through the enhancement of the human, technical or management infrastructure systems (Knight, 1997).

Viewed as a strong rationale for internationalization, the cultural/social one aims to preserve and promote the national culture, acknowledging cultural and ethnic diversity within and between countries. The goal is to provide students with a strong knowledge and skill base in intercultural relations and communications so that in the future he/she can become a global citizen (Knight, 1997).

It is valid to notice that these four rationales are not distinct categories, but a complex and interconnected set of reasons that evolve with time in response of changes in the environment (Hudzik, 2015).

Reviewing these categories in 2004, Knight stated that these four categories are still useful to analyze rationales for internationalization, but given the increasing emphasis on competition at the international level, new emerging categories divided into national and institutional level rationales might be added to these four.
At the national level, some of the emerging rationales are human resources development (brainpower), strategic alliances, commercial trade, nation building, and social and cultural development (Knight, 2004).

Demographic shifts, mobility in the labor market, increased trade in services and the knowledge economy era raised the importance of recruiting human capital or brainpower through international education initiatives. This affects recruitment strategies and incentives to attract and to retain students and academics with potential for increasing the human capital of the country and encourages the inclusion of international topics in research and teaching to better equip domestic students and academics to contribute to the country (Knight, 2004).

Economic purposes turned out to be more important when developing strategic alliances through internationalization in higher education than cultural purposes. Income-generating opportunities such as new franchise arrangements, satellite campuses, and online courses are also examples of a more commercial approach to internationalization (Knight, 2004).

In 1997, Knight mentioned the interest of some countries to export education products and services. In her 2004 article, she added the interest of some countries to import education products and services for nation-building purposes. Having an educated and trained population in the labor market and a workforce able to do research and generate new knowledge are essential to the future of a nation, so countries with a lack of human capital are importing education products and services. On the other hand, in 2004 she verified that social and cultural rationales have become less important than economic and political rationales.

At the institution level, Knight (2004) cited the following emerging rationales: international profile or reputation, student and staff development, income generation, strategic alliances, and research and knowledge production.
Institutions are making every effort to create an international reputation and name brand to gain competitive advantage. In addition, information and communication technologies have increased the need for deeper knowledge and understanding of the world. That need highlighted all internationalization activities on campus with the purpose of enhancing the international and intercultural understanding and skills for students and staff. On the other hand, institutions are increasingly looking for internationalization activities to generate alternative sources of income. Furthermore, as institutions mature in their approach to internationalization, less inactive and paper-based arrangements are created and more strategic alliances with meaningful purposes are developed. Lastly, the international dimension of research and knowledge production became a prominent rationale for internationalization of higher education, as global issues and challenges cannot be addressed at the national level only and international and interdisciplinary collaboration is essential to solve these issues (Knight, 2004).

**Factors influencing the level of internationalization**

The literature presents several attempts to find the major factors that affect the process of internationalization on HEIs. Studying the internationalization of curriculum in American universities, Harari (1981) found that the institution size had an impact on the level of internationalization but he also found some exceptions where the level of internationalization was high in some small institutions, and low in some large institutions.

On the other hand, in the same study Harari (1981) found that institutional location was not an important factor in the level of internationalization. In another study, Henson, Noel, Gillard-Byers & Ingle (1991) stated that higher levels of internationalization in American HEIs were normally found at medium and large universities, but some small universities also presented high levels of internationalization. Henson et al (1991) also found that one of the most
important factors in the level of internationalization was funding. Universities with more funding had higher levels of internationalization.

The presence of international faculty on campus also encourages the level of internationalization (Robinson & Colenso-Semple, 1999) and according to Kuhlman (1992), HEIs that have referred to internationalization in their mission statements have considered that international faculty have increased the level of internationalization on campuses.

Finally, Knight (1994b), in her doctoral dissertation on the internationalization of Canadian universities, found that the most critical factors for the level of institutional internationalization were commitment and support of senior leadership, faculty and staff; adequate funding plus support from external agencies; and existence of an international office with experienced personnel.

The access to the results of two comprehensive surveys examining several aspects of the internationalization process in American HEIs will allow me to find out the factors that exert the most influence on the level of internationalization with more current quantitative data.

**The Internationalization Cycle**

Dr. Jane Knight (1994a, 1994b) presented with a series of interconnected and flexible phases the idea that the process of internationalization works as a cycle where colleges and universities would move through at their own pace. She created figure 2 to represent this so-called internationalization cycle, and I asked her permission to use that figure in my dissertation and she kindly consented to it (See Appendix B).
According to Knight (1994a, 1994b) the six phases of the internationalization cycle are:

1. Awareness - This first phase involves creating consciousness of the importance and benefits of internationalization on campus, so discussions about the topic should be stimulated including the risks, challenges, strategies, and goals. The discussion cannot be seen as exclusive to one group. Everybody should express their opinions such as senior administration, faculty, staff, and students. However, awareness is not enough; it must be turned into commitment.

2. Commitment - This phase is of critical importance. Senior administration should demonstrate their full support to internationalization both in concrete and symbolic
ways. For instance, new funds allocated to internationalization activities is a sign of commitment, but attitude, recognition and rewards towards internationalization efforts are also important. Faculty, staff and students should also support senior administration in converting commitment into planning strategies. Senior administration will lead the process, but the “real engine of internationalization” (Knight, 1994a, p.12) will be faculty and staff.

3. Planning – Each institution will have its plan for internationalization, and it needs to take into account the specific interests, characteristics and objectives of the HEIs. At the institution level, the plan has to show that internationalization is a priority and provide a framework and guidance. Also relevant is to include a reference to the international dimension in the mission statement. Encouraging initiatives at local level such as academic departments, research centers, and administrative units also contributes to the success of the process of internationalization. With the vision of an internationalized campus created, the institution must put the operational plan in practice.

4. Operationalize – This phase has three components playing a major role: academic activities and services, organizational factors and guiding principles. Staff/faculty exchanges, study abroad programs, recruitment and hosting international students, joint research initiatives, intercultural training are examples of academic activities and services. However, Knight (1994a) pointed out that these academic activities and services around internationalization must be supported by a permanent organizational structure and commitment. This support is what she called the organizational factors. Among those factors, the most critical ones are commitment and support of senior
leadership, faculty and staff; adequate funding both internally and externally; international office or position with experienced personnel. Other essential factors but not so critical to internationalization are: policy statements; acknowledgment in faculty/staff hiring, performance and promotion criteria; communication channels and public relations support; and integration into annual plans and budgets of academic and administrative units. Moreover, Knight (1994a) stated that every organization has informal components that are less visible but play an important role in the culture and climate of the institution, and may determine the success or failure of the process of internationalization. Examples of these informal components are patterns of power and influence; personal views of organizational and individual competencies; patterns and groupings of interpersonal relations and communication systems; group sentiments and norms; perceptions of trust; openness; and the sense of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Examining these informal components, each HEI should develop its own set of guiding principles that will be inspired by the existing culture and climate of the institution and by the goals for internationalization.

5. Review – This phase entails in monitoring and assessing the value of internationalization activities to make sure that the goals are being reached. In addition, it is necessary to do a systematic review to incorporate internationalization into the annual review and budgeting process of the administrative units and academic departments of the HEI.

6. Reinforcement – Valuing and rewarding faculty and staff who are involved in the process is very important to sustain commitment to internationalization.
Then, as in a cycle, reinforcement will lead to renewed awareness and commitment that in turn will generate new planning processes and then changes in existing programs and policies and development of new activities and services. Continuously monitoring, reviewing, and reinforcing internationalization through incentives, recognition and rewards keeps the cycle spinning.

It is valid to note that although these phases occur in a sequence, there is also a two-way flow between the different phases as indicated by the two-way arrows.

**Importance of measuring internationalization**

According to Rodenberg (2010), along the years educational institutions all over the world have been promoting internationalization initiatives on their campuses, and it has reached the point that the idea of internationalization is no longer a marginal topic, but it has become a central matter of educational missions. In fact, internationalization became a key part of the rhetoric of presidents, chancellors, vice rectors and provosts, but often there is a gap between the assertions of institution’s administrators, mission statements, strategic plans, and the daily realities of those working with internationalization issues (Rodenberg, 2010). Therefore, Rodenberg (2010) claimed that it is important to develop useful instruments to help practitioners to determine the real degree of internationalization on their campuses.

Knight (2008) also stated that the importance and attention given to supporting internationalization initiatives has increased in HEIs, but more attention should also be given to monitoring and evaluating the progress, quality, results, and impact of internationalization efforts “to make sure that we are ‘doing the right things’ and ‘doing things in the right way’” (p.39). Educational institutions need to pay attention not only the quantity of
internationalization activities but also to the quality and contribution to the entire institutional goals (Green, 2012).

Rather than a final goal, internationalization is currently seen as a means to an end that aims to produce globally competent citizens and to improve student learning (Green, 2012). In fact, according to Deardorff (2015), global competence will be included in the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) as a worldwide measure in 2018. Moreover, before thinking about measuring internationalization activities, it is important to find out what is the reason for following a specific internationalization strategy and how it contributes to larger institutional goals (Green, 2012). Among several reasons to measure internationalization, Green (2012) mentioned the following: “a component of overall institutional performance, to judge the effectiveness of an institution’s internationalization strategy or its components, to benchmark with other institutions, and to improve internationalization programs and practices” (p.4). Therefore, to understand these potential reasons while examining internationalization helps facilitate reaching its goal of fostering global competence among students.

**Measuring internationalization**

In a comprehensive overview of indicators for internationalization provided by Beerkens et al. (2010), the authors stated that measuring internationalization has three basic drivers: knowing where the institution stands (mapping) in terms of internationalization, examining the value of the internationalization efforts (evaluating), and setting an organizational identity (profiling) (p. 9).

Mapping, the first driver of the need for indicators of internationalization, now requires much more sophisticated data about the internationalization activities developed by HEIs, as internationalization became a more complicated and more comprehensive process. For instance,
a while ago it was enough to find out the number of international students or the number of exchange students to determine the international nature of an institution. Now mapping internationalization requires a much wider set of indicators (Beerkens et al., 2010).

The second driver, evaluating, derived from the growing deregulation and decentralization seen in higher education systems all over the world. On the one hand, deregulation and decentralization gave more autonomy to educational institutions, but on the other hand, they demanded more accountability towards governments, students and other stakeholders. HEIs have to show how much internationalized they are to be eligible certain funding sources or to be considered for accreditation (Beerkens et al., 2010).

The third driver, profiling, emerged from the increased global competition and the importance of rankings where institutions need indicators to show that they are internationally oriented. In addition, governments, students, and labor markets are demanding more transparency about the content and quality of programs and facilities in those institutions, so internationalization indicators are one of the sets of indicators that can be used to inform the public (Beerkens et al., 2010).

In order to present a comprehensive overview of indicators for internationalization, Beerkens et al. (2010) listed 33 efforts worldwide to create these indicators. This overview analyzed the set of indicators through different angles and specific characteristics were taken into account such as:

- Type of data: inputs, outputs and outcomes
- Purpose: self-evaluation, benchmarking, classification, ranking
- Level of assessment: institutional level, school or faculty level, program level
- Methods of data collection: surveys, institutional data collection, peer reviews or panel visits or data collection from external databases like (inter)national statistical offices.

Table 1 show the characteristics of some efforts to create indicators carried out by organizations in different parts of the globe.

Table 1

*Characteristics of some efforts to create indicators*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of data</td>
<td>Focus: Europe</td>
<td>Type of data: Input, Output</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Purpose: Self-evaluation and information provision and ranking</td>
<td>Purpose: Self-evaluation and benchmarking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Institution: Program, Institution, and intermediate levels</td>
<td>Institution: Program, Institution, and intermediate levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Methods of data collection</td>
<td>Methods of data collection and Peer review</td>
<td>Methods of data collection and Peer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Methods of data collection</td>
<td>Methods of data collection and Statistical data (Federal Statistics office)</td>
<td>Methods of data collection and Statistical data (Federal Statistics office)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is interesting to note that none of the indicators analyzed by Beerkens et al. (2010) examined outcomes. In fact, Hudzik (2015) noted that there are many assumptions without hard data about the outcomes of internationalization, relying instead on anecdotal evidence. For instance, the OECD 2012 report on higher education internationalization (Hénard et al. 2012) suggests the following outcomes of internationalization: increase international visibility; leverage institutional strengths through strategic partnerships; enlarge the academic community within which to benchmark their activities; mobilize internal intellectual resources; add important, contemporary learning outcomes to the student experience; and develop stronger research groups.

Hudzik (2015) went further and explained that there are four levels of analysis that could be used to assess outcomes of internationalization:

- **Level 4**: This is the highest and most aggregated level where the global and supranational outcomes of internationalization are analyzed such as world peace and justice; the global economy; the global environment; and global prosperity.
- **Level 3**: This is the national level where outcomes of internationalization from national higher education systems are analyzed such as to build and educated and knowledgeable citizenry; to enhance national capacities; and to provide the basis for citizenry and workforce to compete and collaborate successfully across borders.
- **Level 2**: At this level, the focus is on the individual higher education institution and institutional outcomes are analyzed such as institutional reputation or rank; enhanced institutional instructional and research capacities; and increased or diversified revenue streams.
Level 1: The focus at this level is on students and other institutional stakeholders and customers such as governments, communities, business and employers, contractors, and professional groups. Outcomes of internationalization at this level examine for example what students have learned or what they can do after completing an internalized curriculum, what the consequences of institutional cross-border research partnerships were, and how internationalization met the workforce needs of employers.

According to Deardorff & van Gaalen (2012), the focus is frequently not on outcome but on output indicators that are developed for specific institutional or national contexts and, which, consequently do not allow broader international comparisons. In fact, the few studies that focus on outcome indicators assess only at the first level (students and other institutional stakeholders and customers) such as studies on intercultural competence (Deardorff, 2006), graduate outcomes (Cuthbert, Smith & Boey, 2008), or global learning outcomes (Musil, 2006).

Therefore, my goal in this research is not only to investigate outputs of internationalization in public and private not-for-profit American HEIs, but also to explore the outcomes that those institutions have already reached.

Why public and private American HEIs?

The Program Logic Model for internationalization stated that there are logical connections among inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes related to the process of internationalization (Deardorff, 2005), so depending on the combination of inputs and activities, different outputs and outcomes will be created during the process of internationalization. Public and private HEIs have different inputs (resources available to support internationalization
efforts) for this process of internationalization and I want to examine if those different inputs result in different outputs and outcomes.

Several social and economic differences that end up producing different inputs exist between private and public universities or colleges in the U.S. According to White (2003), the differences can be found in four areas:

1. Governance – Public HEIs are governed by small boards, whose members are selected by elected officials, often the governor or the governor and legislative leaders. On the other hand, private HEIs are governed by large boards that tend to be self-perpetuating (White, 2003).

As governors or the governor and legislative leaders select board members of public HEIs, board members of public HEIs are more susceptible to changes in government and political scenario and to changes that might occur every time a new gubernatorial term begins than board members of private HEIs. As the development of the process of internationalization depends on the commitment of the institution leadership to internationalization, changes in the leadership might cause changes in the process of internationalization or even the interruption of the process if the new leadership decides to prioritize other issues. Those changes might occur more often in public HEIs than in private HEIs.

2. Legal distinction – the way certain laws and regulations apply to public and private institutions are different. As an agency of state government, a state college must hire and fire employees according to specific procedures of the state personnel laws. State procurement laws also specify what can be purchased and how. State statutes are written by legislative committees to apply across-the-board to every agency of state government. Private institutions, on the other hand, adopt policies that reflect their
own needs and no other. For instance, they follow their own institutional policies on constructions, procurement, human resources, and other topics. Moreover, faculty members at public universities are legally authorized to belong to unions, while faculty at private universities are generally not eligible to do so. At public institutions, employees belong to state personnel systems and their jobs must align with similar jobs at other government agencies for payroll and other purposes. Due to that, state universities normally have less flexibility than private universities in recruitment as well as in paying and retaining key personnel (White, 2003).

Having less flexibility to hire new people than private HEIs, public HEIs might find it harder to create new administrative structures and to hire new personnel specialized to fulfill the needs of internationalization activities. They might have to work with the personnel they already had which sometimes could be underprepared to deal with internationalization issues. On the other hand, if they already created a well-equipped structure focused on internationalization issues, it would be harder to dismantle it.

3. Size – Although there are more private HEIs in the U.S. than public ones, public institutions enroll more students (White, 2003). For instance, updating the numbers presented by White (2003) and examining data from Fall 2013 (the last year with complete figures in the National Center for Education Statistics - NCES database), of the 4,726 HEIs in the U.S, 34% were public (1,623) and 66% were private (3,103). Out of the 3,103 private institutions, 53% (1,652) were not-for-profits and 47% (1,451) were for-profits. Yet in the same fall, 76% (13.3 million) of the 17.5 million total enrolled students attended public institutions (NCES, 2017). So, on average public institutions enrolled 8,194 students and private institutions enrolled 1,353
students, less than one-fifth the size of average in a public institution. Those differences in size produce a distinct experience for students. On average, private institutions have smaller class sizes, which promotes closer relationships between student and professors and more class discussion opportunities. Public institutions tend to have larger class sizes, especially at the introductory level, which may result in less direct access to professors and fewer class discussions (White, 2003).

Small class sizes found in private institutions could facilitate the integration of international students allowing him/her to express more easily his/her ideas and difficulties. On the other hand, small classes might be composed of a homogeneous group of students who never had contact with people from different backgrounds and ideas. This might be a huge obstacle for the integration of international students. Huge class sizes found in public institutions could present more heterogeneity among its students, which could give international students a better chance to be welcomed and well integrated. On the other hand, in huge class sized there is less opportunities for discussions with faculty, which might be another hurdle that international students would have to overcome.

4. Revenue base - Public and private HEIs obtain their revenues from different sources, which affects the way they are organized. Public institutions rely more on revenues from state appropriations, endowments, capital campaigns. As another source of revenue, they also count on appropriations from legislative bodies – state legislatures in case of public four-year institutions, county councils in case of public two-year institutions. Although private institutions generate income from federal student financial aid, federal grants and contracts, state capitation, student aids, and facilities programs, they receive less support from states than public institutions and rely more
on revenues from tuitions, endowments, and fundraising. For that reason, private institutions normally have larger and more sophisticated fundraising operations than public ones (White, 2003).

According to National Center for Education Statistics – NCES (2018), the sum of revenues at degree-granting postsecondary institutions in the United States in the academic year 2010-11 was $559 billion (in current dollars). Total revenues at public HEIs were $324 billion, at private not-for-profit HEIs were $207 billion, and at private for-profit HEIs were $28 billion. In the academic year 2015-16, total revenues were $563 billion (in current dollars). Total revenues at public HEIs were $364 billion, at private not-for-profit HEIs were $182 billion, and at private for-profit HEIs were $17 billion.

The percentages from these revenue sources varied by type of institution control. Figure 3 shows the percentages from these revenue sources in 2010-11 and in 2015-16 for public HEIs and private not-for-profit HEIs, which are the focus of this study.
Figure 3. Percentage distribution of total revenues at public and private not-for-profit HEIs by source of funds, 2010-11 and 2015-16

It is valid to notice that Pell Grants are included in federal grant revenues at public HEIs but normally are included in tuition and fees, and auxiliary enterprises revenues at private not-
for-profit HEIs. Therefore, some categories of revenue data are not directly comparable across type of institution control.

In 2015–16, student tuition and fees constituted the largest percentage of total revenues at private not-for-profit HEIs (39.5 percent). Moreover, comparing with the academic year 2010-11, private-not-for-profit HEIs became more dependent on tuitions and fees in 2015-16. According to Hegarty (2014), international students make a significant contribution to the financial well-being of a higher education institution, as the majority of them pays full tuition. Therefore, this increase in dependency of tuition and fees might motivate private for-profit HEIs to engage in more internationalization activities and to recruit more international students to their institutions than public HEIs. However, considering that public HEIs had larger revenues than private not-for-profit HEIs in both 2010-11 and 2015-16, the amount of revenue coming from tuition and fees was higher at public HEIs ($61.56 billion) compared with private not-for-profit HEIs ($60.03 billion) in 2010-11. In 2015-16, although the percentage of student tuition and fees contributing to the total revenue at public HEIs did not increase much compared to 2010-11 (19 percent to 21 percent), the total amount of student tuition and fees increased from $61.56 billion to $118.23 billion. As international students make large contributions to tuitions and fees, the interest of public HEIs in engaging in more internationalization activities and in recruiting more international students likely was also high.

In sum, it is clear that private and public institutions count on different resources to support internationalization efforts (inputs), which probably affects the outputs and outcomes of this process of internationalization. Nevertheless, studies in this field did not examine thoroughly differences in the process of internationalization that might be associated with type of control. For example, the ACE’s Mapping internationalization 2017 report (ACE, 2017), presented a one-
page overview of the differences found in public and not-for-profit HEIs, but did not examine the
differences in detail and using a quantitative approach. So far, case studies in this field have
examined several topics in private (Wade, 2012; Moore, 2013; Terzuolo, 2016) or public (Lujan,
2000; Croom, 2010; Manzke, 2015) HEIs separately. In addition, when case studies have
examined public and private HEIs at the same time, they focused on differences found about a
specific topic such as the experiences and perspectives of faculty members who developed study
abroad programs for undergraduate students (Savishinsky, 2012).

This is why I decided to disaggregate Mapping survey datasets by type of institution
control to examine the differences between public and private not-for-profit institutions in terms
of outputs and outcomes.

Summary of Literature Review

One of the main goals of the process of internationalization in higher education is to
provide the most relevant education to students who will be the citizens of tomorrow (Hénard,
Diamond & Roseveare, 2012). For this reason, the literature presents several attempts to find the
major factors that affect this process on HEIs. Still, the literature of internationalization in
American HEIs has several gaps. The use of case studies is recurrent in studies about
internationalization, which means that results cannot be generalized to a wider population. In
addition, studies normally focus on a single point in time, not allowing readers to identify any
changes over time. As internationalization became a key part of the rhetoric of presidents,
chancellors, vice rectors and provosts, Rodenberg (2010) claimed that it is important to develop
useful instruments to help practitioners to determine the real degree of internationalization on
their campuses. Therefore, various organizations around the world have endeavored to create
indicators for internationalization. However, the majority of those indicators measure the inputs
and outputs of the process of internationalization, and not the outcomes of this process. Some studies focus on a single outcome indicator but they are limited to individual level indicators and do not look at institutional level indicators. Taking into consideration that private and public institutions count on different resources to support internationalization efforts (inputs), which probably affects the outputs and outcomes of this process of internationalization, I want to focus this research on public and private not-for profit HEIs, examining if those different inputs result in different outputs and outcomes.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The central premise of this study is that the process of internationalization can be described by a Program Logic Model for Internationalization that displays several inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes specific to this process, but we cannot assume causal attribution among them, since there are many factors that will end up influencing outcomes, including external factors. The unit of analysis in this study is the American HEI. Stage 1 of this research is a quantitative study that has examined the differences between public and private not-for-profit HEIs according to the outputs of internationalization in 2011 and 2016. Then, I have examined the main categories of CIGE’s Model for Comprehensive Internationalization that have influenced the perceived level of internationalization in public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016. Stage 2 has explored the perceived outcomes of internationalization for public and private not-for-profit HEIs using qualitative methods. A mixed methods approach has provided a more complete analysis of the research problem.

Quantitative strand

Instrumentation.

In 2001, the ACE developed and conducted a survey on American HEIs to discover their level of internationalization and which strategies they used to become more international. At that time there was no national data available to evaluate the extent to which campuses were engaged in different internationalization policies and practices, and questions were limited to education and did not include research or development cooperation activities. Questions revolved around six categories: articulated commitment; academic offerings; organizational infrastructure; external funding, institutional investment in faculty; and international students and student
programs (Beerkens et al., 2010). The work of Madeleine Green and others from the ACE represented the culmination of the efforts of international education scholars over a long period, moving from merely discussing the need for internationalization to actually measuring it (Rodenberg, 2010).

In 2006, the ACE convened an advisory group of experts who reviewed and refined the previous survey. The majority of the 2001 questions were kept, but some were revised for clarity. Additional ones were created within the existing categories, and new ones were added to examine if American institutions offered programs (entirely or in part through face-to-face instruction) outside the United States for non-U.S. students leading to a degree from these American institutions only (not including joint degree programs). The categories in the 2006 survey were institutional commitment; organizational structure and staffing; financial support; foreign-language requirements and offerings; international/global course requirements and offerings; education abroad; faculty policies and opportunities; student activities and services; use of technology for internationalization; and degree programs offered abroad to non-US students (Beerkens et al., 2010).

In 2011, the ACE conducted another survey reviewing the questions from the previous survey and adding new ones. The major change was the inclusion of a section focusing on the actual internationalization work carried out by the institutions as opposed to planned work. The categories in that survey were: institutional commitment; organizational structure and staffing; financial support; internationalizing curriculum and academic requirements; education abroad; faculty policies and opportunities; student activities and services; use of technology for internationalization; offshore education programs for non-US students; and internationalization as an accelerated institutional focus (ACE, 2012).
Finally, in 2016, the ACE continued this longitudinal survey reviewing the questions once again. New questions around services provided for international students and education abroad programs/experiences were included. Questions about international collaboration and partnerships were more detailed, and to better understand the funding for internationalization initiatives, a question about how these funding levels have changed in recent years was included (Helms, 2016).

In sum, Mapping surveys measure the inputs and outputs at the institutional level and for this research, I have used only data from the 2011 and 2016 surveys. The main reason for not using 2001 and 2006 surveys is that both surveys have not included the question about the perceived level of internationalization by the HEIs, which I have selected as my dependent variable. In addition, the 2001 survey has not asked any questions about collaboration and partnerships, one of the categories for this research, and the 2006 survey has asked just very few questions on that category.

2011 Mapping Internationalization Survey.

An online survey with 44 questions and 33 sub questions was sent to 3,357 accredited, degree-granting postsecondary institutions in the U.S. It is important to note that institutions of all 2010 Carnegie Classification types were present in this survey, including community colleges and special focus institutions (defined as institutions awarding baccalaureate or higher-level degrees where a high concentration of degrees - more than 75 percent - is in a single field or set of related fields). Participants also had the option of completing a paper version of the survey and submitting it by mail. The survey obtained 1,041 valid responses, resulting in a 31% response rate. Table 2 shows the distribution of institutions participating in this survey by type of control (ACE, 2012).
Table 2

Distribution of degree-granting postsecondary institutions by type of control in
2011 Mapping survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of control</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private not-for-profit</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private for-profit</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2016 Mapping Internationalization Survey.

An online survey with 60 questions was sent to 2,945 postsecondary institutions in the U.S. These included accredited, degree-granting institutions that had a designated Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) identification number, and were listed in the Higher Education Publications, Inc.’s Higher Education Directory database. It is valid to note that institutions of all 2016 Carnegie Classification types were present in this survey, including community colleges and special focus institutions. Participants also had the option of completing a paper version of the survey and submitting it by mail. It is valid to note that the 2011 and 2016 responding institutions are not a matched sample, so results found in both years cannot be attributed to the same specific set of institutions. The survey obtained 1,164 valid responses, yielding a 39.5% response rate. Table 3 shows the distribution of institutions participating in this survey by type of control (ACE, 2017).
Table 3

Distribution of degree-granting postsecondary institutions by type of control in 2016 Mapping survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of control</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private not-for-profit</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private for-profit</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have focused my analysis on public and private-not-for-profit institutions, as the number of valid responses from private for-profits institutions both in Mapping 2011 and 2016 was very low.

Participants.

Participants were presidents, chief academic officers, chief international officers, and institutional research directors of U.S. postsecondary institutions.

Protection of Human Subjects.

This research involves the analysis of non-publicly available secondary data that do not contain private identifiable information about living individuals which means that it does not include direct identifiers (names, social security numbers, addresses, phone numbers, etc.) or indirect identifiers (codes or pseudonyms that are linked to the subject’s identity) of the participants. In addition, it does not contain institutional identifiers or data that could lead to the identification of said institutions.

I have obtained permission for the use of the data from the American Council on Education (ACE) through its Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) and
have agreed to keep safe from unauthorized access, accidental loss or destruction. There was no potential risk in this study.

**Data Analysis.**

**First question.**

What are the main distinctions between public and private not-for-profit HEIs according to the outputs of internationalization in 2011 and 2016, and how do the results differ across 2011 and 2016?

This question was analyzed using descriptive statistics. As Mapping surveys measure the inputs and outputs of internationalization, first I have chosen the outputs that I could use as variables for my analysis and that were present in both Mapping 2011 and 2016 surveys. I have chosen 119 independent variables separated by categories according to my conceptual framework and after a closer examination of the datasets.Appendix C shows the list of those variables separated by categories. There was no need to reverse the code for any variable. After that, I examined how many variables had missing values. As they were all dichotomous variables, if more than 10 percent of the values were missing in a variable, I have chosen the mode to fill in the otherwise missing values. Often a simple choice, this method is one of many methods based on replacing missing data on a variable with a measure of central tendency for that variable (mean, median or mode). For categorical variables, where there is no mean nor median, the mode (the most frequent value) could be used as the default to fill in for the otherwise missing values (Cheema, 2014).

To overcome the problem of lack of national representation, I applied a weighting adjustment. Ideally, a selected sample should reflect the population, which in my case should reflect the same distribution of public, private-not-for-profit and private for-profit HEIs in the
United States. Table 4 shows the number of HEIs by type of control in the survey and in the population in 2011 and 2016. This table shows that Mapping 2011 and 2016 surveys over-represented public and private not-for-profit HEIs and under-represented private for-profit HEIs.

Table 4

*Number of HEIs by type of control in the survey and in the population in 2011 and 2016*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Public</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>1682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52.07%)</td>
<td>(35.89%)</td>
<td>(52.49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Private not-for-profit</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(46.11%)</td>
<td>(35.74%)</td>
<td>(45.53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Private for-profit</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.83%)</td>
<td>(28.38%)</td>
<td>(1.80%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both 2011 and 2016 datasets I had a variable named “control” that was coded “1” if a HEI is public, “2” if a HEI is private not-for-profit and “3” if a HEI is private for-profit. To calculate the weights for each Mapping survey separately, I created a new variable named “Stratum_Pop” and determined that for each HEI, the corresponding “Stratum_Pop” value would be the population of that HEI’s type of control in the year of the survey. Then, I generated another variable named “weight” and determined that for each HEI, the corresponding “weight” value would be the weight of that HEI’s type of control in the year of the survey. For instance, the “weight” of each public HEI in 2011 was the total population of public HEIs in 2011 (1682) divided by the total sample of public HEIs in 2011 Mapping (542), which was 3.103321.

I then applied the probability weights to the data so that estimates would represent the population size, rather than the sample.
Based on the list of variables and using the weighted values for them, I examined the main differences between public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016 in each category of CIGE’s Model for Comprehensive Internationalization.

It is valid to note that I could not perform a panel data analysis because I did not have access to the name of the institutions or their identification numbers.

Second question.

Among the six categories\(^2\) of CIGE’s Model for Comprehensive Internationalization, which ones exert the most influence on the perceived level of internationalization in public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016, and how do the results differ across 2011 and 2016?

To analyze this question I followed several steps. Using the same 119 independent variables separated by categories mentioned in the first research question that had already been treated for missing values and received a weighting adjustment, I analyzed this question using ordered logit regression through STATA Version 14. Ordered logistic regression (often just called “ordered logit regression”) is used to predict an ordinal dependent variable given one or more independent variables. By running ordered logistic regression, I was able to determine which of the independent variables (if any) have a statistically significant relationship with the dependent variable. According to O’Connell (2006), the following four assumptions are required to obtain a valid result in ordered logistic regressions:

1. The dependent variable should be measured at the ordinal level.
2. One or more independent variables should be continuous, ordinal or categorical (including dichotomous variables).

---

\(^2\) Also referred as target areas or components
3. There is no multicollinearity. Multicollinearity occurs when two or more independent variables are highly correlated with each other.

4. The relationship between each pair of outcome groups is the same. In other words, ordered logistic regression assumes that the coefficients that describe the relationship between, say, the lowest versus all higher categories of the response variable are the same as those that describe the relationship between the next lowest category and all higher categories, etc. This is called the proportional odds assumption or the parallel regression assumption. Because the relationship between all pairs of groups is the same, there is only one set of coefficients (only one model).

My dependent variable, measured at the ordinal level, was the level of internationalization perceived by the HEIs. Table 5 presents the distribution of perceived level of internationalization by HEIs in 2011 and 2016.

**Table 5**

*Distribution of perceived level of internationalization by HEIs in 2011 and 2016 Mapping surveys*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011 Frequency</th>
<th>2011 Percent</th>
<th>2016 Frequency</th>
<th>2016 Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very high</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>1122</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1041 100.0 1164 100.0
So, to have a more balanced sample size I decided to combine the levels very high and high, and the levels low and very low, reducing the number of levels from five (very high, high, moderate, low, very low) to three (high, moderate, low). Table 6 presents the final distribution of perceived level of internationalization by HEIs in 2011 and 2016.

Table 6

New distribution of perceived level of internationalization by HEIs in 2011 and 2016 Mapping surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, Table 7 shows the distribution of perceived level of internationalization by public and not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016.

Table 7

Distribution of perceived level of internationalization by public and not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016 Mapping surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public</th>
<th></th>
<th>Private not-for-profit</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency (Percent)</td>
<td>Frequency (Percent)</td>
<td>Frequency (Percent)</td>
<td>Frequency (Percent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>144 (26.9)</td>
<td>186 (31.4)</td>
<td>164 (34.5)</td>
<td>204 (40.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>192 (36.0)</td>
<td>239 (40.4)</td>
<td>185 (39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>198 (37.1)</td>
<td>167 (28.2)</td>
<td>126 (26.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>534 (100.0)</td>
<td>592 (100.0)</td>
<td>475 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To answer this second research question, I performed two separate procedures using ordered logistic regressions.

For the first procedure, I created a composite variable (or index) adding all variables that belonged to the same category (articulated commitment, administrative structure and staffing; curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes; faculty policies and practices; student mobility; and collaboration and partnerships).

Acknowledging that each index was the sum of variables in each category, which meant that indexes with a larger number of variables might create a greater impact in the results, I standardized the indexes to be able to compare them.

Then, I ran ordered logistic regressions separately for public and private-not-for-profits in 2011 and 2016 considering the following specification:

\[
\text{PLI}_{\text{year}} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{(Commitindex)} + \beta_2 \text{(Admindex)} + \beta_3 \text{(Curricuindex)} + \beta_4 \text{(Facultyindex)} + \beta_5 \text{(Studentindex)} + \beta_6 \text{(Collaboindex)} + \varepsilon_i
\]

In this equation, PLI (perceived level of internationalization) was regressed on: Articulated commitment index (Commitindex), Administrative structure and staffing index (Admindex); Curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes index (Curricuindex), Faculty policies and practices index (Facultyindex), Student mobility index (Studenindex), Collaboration and partnerships index (Collaboindex), and a random error term (\(\varepsilon_i\)).

As I used a large number of variables (119 independent variables) and there was a great risk of multicollinearity, I decided to perform a principal component analysis where highly collinear variables were combined into a single factor, reducing the number of them. Therefore, for the second procedure, I ran a principal component analysis for each category separately and for each public or private not-for-profit datasets in 2011 and 2016. Then, I created a single index
for each category by estimating a factor score. This factor score is the standardized weighted average of all the items in each category, which I used as an index to represent each category. Finally, I ran ordered logistic regressions with just these factor scores separately for public and private-not-for-profits in 2011 and 2016 considering the following specification:

$$PLI_{\text{year}} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 (\text{comindex}) + \beta_2 (\text{adindex}) + \beta_3 (\text{currindex}) + \beta_4 (\text{facindex}) + \beta_5 (\text{studindex}) + \beta_6 (\text{colindex}) + \varepsilon_i$$

In this equation, PLI (perceived level of internationalization) was regressed on: factor score of Articulated commitment (comindex); factor score of Administrative structure and staffing index (adindex); factor score of Curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes (currindex); factor score of Faculty policies and practices (facindex); factor score of Student mobility (studindex); factor score of Collaboration and partnerships (colindex); and a random error term ($\varepsilon_i$).

**Qualitative strand**

The qualitative strand was used to answer my **third research question**: What are the perceived outcomes of internationalization for public and private not-for-profit HEIs?

**Site/Context.**

Only HEIs that experienced the process of internationalization on their campuses and had a clear understanding of what this process means could evaluate what the outcomes of this process were. Therefore, it would have made sense to ask questions about these outcomes to the institutions that considered themselves as highly internationalized but I did not have access to the name of the institutions in the datasets. To overcome this problem I decided to conduct this study in HEIs selected according to their participation in previous internationalization laboratories led by the ACE.
The ACE’s Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement has a program called Internationalization Laboratory that provides assistance to leadership teams at HEIs as they engage in the internationalization process. The interested institutions receive support from the ACE for about 18-20 months and so far, more than a hundred institutions have participated in the program.

Participants.

Participants in this research were eight key campus officers from HEIs that had already participated in the ACE internationalization laboratory (four from public institutions and four from private not-for-profit institutions). As part of the internationalization laboratory, the ACE provides assistance to leadership teams from each institution as they engage in a comprehensive review of internationalization efforts on their campuses. Key campus officers were members of these leadership teams. Due to the nature of this research design, only a limited number of people in HEIs with specific characteristics could serve as primary data sources, so I opted to use the purposive sampling method. Also known as judgmental, selective, or subjective sampling, purposive sampling relies on the judgement of the researcher to select the units (people, cases/organizations, events) to be studied. The main goal of purposive sampling is to focus on particular characteristics of a population of interest, which will be the best to answer the research questions. There are several types of purposive sample and I chose the expert sampling, which is used to obtain information from individuals that have particular expertise. This expertise is especially important in the exploratory stage of qualitative research to highlight new aspects of the topic (Patton, 2002).
Protection of Human Subjects.

The organization of the study guaranteed privacy and safety to the participants. The names of the participants and the information gathered from them was kept confidential. Each participant was assigned a number. Records were kept in a locked file cabinet. Once participants were selected, they signed an informed consent form to be part of the study. Information was provided about the study and the participants’ expected roles and activities and the conditions under which they might have withdrawn from the study. Issues of anonymity, confidentiality, and dissemination of results were clarified, in written form, before the study. There was no potential risk in this study (See Appendix D for a copy of the informed consent form). The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Claremont Graduate University (CGU) considered my study exempt from IRB supervision under CGU policy and federal regulations.

Instrumentation.

The current study used semi-structured interview questions as sources of data collection. I formulated the questions based on the conceptual framework and the literature review. Appendix E presents the interview protocol for this study. With the purpose of validating the questions and making sure they are clear and serve the goal of this project, I submitted the interview protocol to two experts in the field of internationalization in higher education and then I adjusted the interview protocol based on their feedback.

Data Collection Procedures.

First, I selected four public and four private-not-for-profit HEIs from the list of American institutions that have participated in the internationalization laboratory from 2012 onwards. In 2012 the internationalization laboratory program changed and required more time to be fulfilled, so that was the reason I opted to interview only HEIs that participated in the laboratory starting
from 2012. The ACE publishes the list of all institutions that have ever participated in the laboratory on its website. Then, ACE granted me access to the email addresses of the key campus officers of the chosen HEIs and I made contact with all of them asking for an interview about my research project. Interviews are a rich tool to gather significant details on the study in question. Interviewing is a keystone of qualitative approach because as Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) state, its purpose is to “obtain more information and clarify vague statements, build trust and rapport with respondents, thus making it possible to obtain information that the individual probably would not reveal by any other data-collection method” (p. 289).

All contacted interviewees, except for one, agreed to schedule an interview after my first contact. For just one interviewee I had to send a follow-up email to obtain his agreement and to schedule the interview. In addition, interviewees were asked to sign the informed consent form at the beginning of the interview (See Appendix D).

I interviewed all participants via Skype or WebEx from December 6, 2017 to January 19, 2018. Interviews lasted from 45 minutes to one hour and half and were recorded on a password-protected IPhone that only I have access to. Interview data was stored only on a password-protected computer.

**Data Analysis.**

First, I transcribed all interviews and then I started analyzing the data using the constant comparative method.

The constant comparative method consists of breaking down the data into discrete ‘incidents’ (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) or ‘units’ (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) and coding them to categories. According to Taylor and Bogdan (1984), in the constant comparative method the researcher “simultaneously codes and analyses data in order to develop concepts; by continually
comparing specific incidents in the data, the researcher refines these concepts, identifies their properties, explores their relationships to one another, and integrates them into a coherent explanatory model” (p126). Moreover, inspired by the work of Glaser and Strauss (1967), and Lincoln and Guba (1985) in the development of the constant comparative method, Maykut and Morehouse (1994) stated, “Words are the way that most people come to understand their situations. We create our world with words. We explain ourselves with words. We defend and hide ourselves with words” (p.18). Consequently, in qualitative data analysis and presentation, the researcher’s assignment is “to find patterns within those words and to present those patterns for others to inspect while at the same time staying as close to the construction of the world as the participants originally experienced it” (p18).

Therefore, I wrote notes, comments, and observations for each interview transcription and then I compared those remarks separately for public and private not-for-profit HEIs trying to find main concepts.

Then, I looked for relationships among those concepts to create categories. Going further, I analyzed if those main categories could be inserted into themes. To assist me in that process, I used NVivo 11 as a document and coding management system to give clarity to the coding and analytical processes. In fact, NVivo 11 was a tool that helped me systematically to organize, to code, to annotate, and to visualize the large amount of data I collected. In sum, I did the analysis and just used the software for assistance in managing and exploring the data.

Finally, I created an intermediate data analysis product drawing a figure that represented the main perceived outcomes of internationalization for public and private not-for-profit HEIs in the United States.
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Researcher’s Positionality.

As an international doctoral student in Education at an American university, my role in this research was only limited to be an observer, but rather, my experience as an international student contributed to the analysis. My experience allows me to testify about how gratifying and sometimes arduous it is to have daily contact with another culture. What I have found out is that building global competence, which is an important goal of internationalization, is a long but rewarding process. Above any hardships, this is undoubtedly a very enriching experience and a unique opportunity in anyone’s life. This made me believe how important it is for the 21st century educator to spend some time immersed in another culture and making contact with colleagues in different parts of the world. Moreover, being in contact with many American future educators, I felt the process of internationalization is even more urgent at HEIs since the majority of these American future educators had only very short experiences as tourists abroad. This will make these American future educators unprepared to teach for diversity and unable to understand the impact of globalization in the lives of their students, jeopardizing their student’s future as global citizens.

In addition, I have already conducted qualitative studies in Brazil and the United States, doing interviews, analyzing focus groups, historical documents, and transcribing and analyzing interviews. Some of that work was in Portuguese, my native language, and some in English.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter shows the results of the quantitative and qualitative analysis performed for this study organized according to each research question. I will present at the end of the first and second research questions an overall summary of the findings and at the end of the third research question a discussion with some interesting remarks made by the participants about those outcomes. Because my first research question is descriptive in nature, I do not present a separate descriptive summary of the quantitative sample.

First research question

What are the main distinctions between public and private not-for-profit HEIs according to the outputs of internationalization in 2011 and 2016, and how do the results differ across 2011 and 2016?

Appendix F shows the missing values for the chosen variables in 2011 and 2016 and for the dependent variable. Highlighted in the Appendix F were variables with more than 10 percent of the values missing. For those variables, I have chosen to use the mode to fill in these missing values.

Then, to overcome the problem of lack of national representation I applied a weighting adjustment using the number of HEIs by type of control in the population in 2011 and 2016 found in IPEDS (NCES, 2017). Mapping 2011 and 2016 surveys over-represented public and private not-for-profit HEIs and under-represented private for-profit HEIs. Therefore, using the distribution of HEIs by type of control in the population found in IPEDS (NCES, 2017) in 2011 and 2016, I calculated the weights.

Finally, based on the list of variables and using the weighted values for them, I examined the main differences between public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016. I will
present below the results organized by each category of CIGE’s Model for Comprehensive Internationalization and discuss them in the end.

**Articulated institutional commitment**

Higher education institutions articulated their commitment to internationalization in several ways during Mapping 2011 and 2016 surveys. The main differences between public and private not-for-profit HEIs were found in questions about international or global education as a priority in institution-wide strategic plans; separate plans addressing internationalization; campus-wide committees or task forces; main reasons for internationalizing; and formal assessment mechanisms.

**International or global education as a priority in institution-wide strategic plans**

![Figure 4](image-url)

*Figure 4.* Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs with international or global education among the top five priorities in the institution's current strategic plan in 2011 and 2016

In 2011, in approximately only 18 percent of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs, international or global education was among the top five priorities in the institution’s strategic plan. It was clear that international or global education became a much higher priority in 2016.
compared with 2011 for both types of HEIs, with 48.46 percent of public HEIs and 59.01 percent of private not-for-profit HEIs choosing international or global education as one of the top five priorities in the strategic plan.

*Separate plans addressing internationalization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private not-for-profit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011</strong></td>
<td>33.96%</td>
<td>33.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016</strong></td>
<td>31.48%</td>
<td>27.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5.* Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs with a separate plan specifically addressing institution-wide internationalization in 2011 and 2016

Although the interest in international and global education has increased in both types of HEIs that same increase in interest was not seen in the elaboration of a separate plan specifically addressing institution-wide internationalization. In public HEIs, approximately 34 percent reported having such plan in 2011 and 2016, and in private not-for-profit HEIs that interest decreased by 12.58 percent with 31.48 percent reporting it in 2011 and 27.52% in 2016.


**Campus-wide committees or task forces**

![Bar chart showing the percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs with a campus-wide committee or task force working solely on advancing internationalization efforts on campus in 2011 and 2016.]

**Figure 6.** Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs with a campus-wide committee or task force working solely advancing internationalization efforts on campus in 2011 and 2016.

Once again, we have seen another area with a decrease in interest. This time both types of HEIs reported a decrease in having a campus-wide committee or task force working solely on advancing internationalization efforts on campus from 2011 to 2016. While in 2011, 56.71 percent of public HEIs reported having a committee or task force working to promote internationalization on campus, 54.95 percent of public HEIs did that in 2016, a decrease of 3 percent. With private-not-for-profit HEIs, the lack of interest was repeated. From 48.19 percent in 2011 to 45.87 percent in 2016, private-not-for-profit HEIs showed a decrease in 4.8 percent in acknowledging a committee or task force to advance internationalization efforts on campus.
Main reasons for internationalizing

The three main reasons for internationalizing were the same and followed the same order of importance for public and private not-for-profit HEIs, but I noticed a change from 2011 to 2016. The third most important reason in 2016 was to become more attractive to prospective students at home and overseas for both types of HEIs and no longer the one found in 2011 (to respond to the growing public demand for global competitiveness in knowledge creation/innovation and talent development).

Figure 7. Main reasons for internationalizing at public or private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016

The three main reasons for internationalizing were the same and followed the same order of importance for public and private not-for-profit HEIs, but I noticed a change from 2011 to 2016. The third most important reason in 2016 was to become more attractive to prospective students at home and overseas for both types of HEIs and no longer the one found in 2011 (to respond to the growing public demand for global competitiveness in knowledge creation/innovation and talent development).
innovation and talent development). In addition, comparing 2016 with 2011, a higher percentage of public and private not-for-profit HEIs stated that to diversify students, faculty and staff on campus was an important reason for internationalization, and a lower percentage of public and private not-for-profit HEIs stated that to improve student preparedness for a global era was a vital reason. Nevertheless, to improve student preparedness for a global era continued to be the number one reason for internationalizing in both types of HEIs in 2016.

*Formal assessment mechanisms*
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*Figure 8.* Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs that formally accessed the impact or progress of its internationalization efforts in the previous 5 years (Mapping 2011) or in the previous 3 years (Mapping 2016)

From 2011 to 2016, a lower percentage in both types of HEIs reported formally assessing the impact of internationalization efforts. This decrease in percentage was almost the same in both type of HEIs, 27.72 percent at private not-for-profit HEIs and 27.74 percent at public HEIs.

*Administrative structure and staffing*

Administrative structure and staffing discusses organizational structure, staff, and office configuration. The main differences between public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and
2016 were found in questions about the administrative structure of the internationalization activities and programs at their institutions; the person in charge of overseeing or coordinating multiple internationalization activities or programs; and about activities with specific funding for staff.

Administrative structure of the internationalization activities and programs

Figure 9. Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs without a particular office leading the international activities and programs in 2011 and 2016

As identified by Knight (1994a), one of the most critical organizational factors in the process of internationalization is the existence of an international office or position with experienced personnel. Figure 9 shows that from 2011 to 2016, the percentage of public and private not-for-profit HEIs that are conducting their international activities without a leading office have increased. The increase in the percentage of HEIs without a leading office leading the international activities and programs at the institution was higher for private not-for-profit than for public HEIs going from 16.46 percent to 40.20 percent, an increase of 144.23 percent. However, only examining the results of this question, does not allow us to find out how exactly most HEIs have organized their structure in 2016 in order to carry on with their international
activities. Not having a particular office leading the international activities and programs does not mean that those HEIs have decided to end their international activities. On the contrary, some HEIs might have created multiple offices hiring a coordinator to oversee all the activities in several offices.

*Person in charge of overseeing or coordinating multiple internationalization activities or programs*

![Diagram showing percentage of public and private not-for-profit HEIs with full-time administrator overseeing or coordinating multiple internationalization activities or programs in 2011 and 2016.]

*Figure 10.* Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs with full-time administrator overseeing or coordinating multiple internationalization activities or programs in 2011 and 2016

Although the percentage of both types of HEIs not having a particular office leading the international activities and programs increased in 2016 compared with 2011, the percentage of both types of HEIs having a full-time administrator overseeing or coordinating multiple international activities and programs increased in 2016 compared with 2011. Therefore, it seems that both HEIs are going through a change in the administrative structure of internationalization programs. Maybe, a higher percentage of both types of HEIs are opting to have just a full-time administrator coordinating the internationalization activities instead of a single office or multiple
offices leading the internationalization activities. Furthermore, examining 2011 and 2016 datasets the percentage of public HEIs having a full-time administrator remained higher than the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs having a full-time administrator.

**Activities with specific funding for staff**

![Figure 11. Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs with full-time administrator overseeing or coordinating multiple internationalization activities or programs in 2011 and 2016](image)

Comparing 2016 with 2011, a larger percentage of both types of HEIs provided specific funding for activities related to internationalization to their staff members. A larger percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs compared with the percentage of public HEIs provided funding to staff for leading students on study abroad programs and for travelling to meeting or conferences abroad in both 2011 and 2016. On the other hand, in 2011 a larger percentage of public HEIs compared with the percentage of private-not-for-profit HEIs provided funding to staff for
studying or conducting research abroad, and for other professional development opportunities abroad. However, in 2016 a larger percentage of private-not-for-profit HEIs compared with the percentage of public HEIs provided funding to staff for studying or conducting research abroad, and other professional development opportunities abroad. It is valid to note the huge increase in percentage from 2011 to 2016 observed in both types of HEIs providing funding to staff for studying or conducting research abroad, and other professional development opportunities abroad. A much higher percentage of public HEIs (an increase of 166.8 percent) and private not-for-profit HEIs (an increase of 354.57 percent) reported providing funding to staff for studying or conducting research abroad from 2011 to 2016. In addition, a much higher percentage of public HEIs (an increase of 356.39 percent) and private not-for-profit HEIs (an increase of 662.78 percent) reported providing funding to staff for other professional development opportunities abroad from 2011 to 2016.

**Curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes**

The category curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes analyzes general education and language requirements, co-curriculum activities and programs, and specified learning outcomes. The main differences between public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016 were found in questions about engagement in any initiatives to internationalize the undergraduate curriculum; foreign language graduation requirement for undergraduates; and globally-oriented co-curricular programs or activities.
Engagement in any initiatives to internationalize the undergraduate curriculum

The percentage of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs reporting engagement in any initiatives to internationalize undergraduate curriculum decreased from 2011 to 2016. The percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs decreased by 8.4% and the percentage of public HEIs by 8.2%.

Foreign language graduation requirement for undergraduates

Figure 12. Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs engaged in any initiatives to internationalize the undergraduate curriculum in 2011 and 2016

Figure 13. Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs with a foreign language graduate requirement for undergraduates in 2011 and 2016
The percentage of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs with a foreign language graduate requirement for undergraduates increased in 2016 compared with the same percentage in 2011. But a higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs compared with the percentage of public HEIs had this requirement in both 2011 and 2016.

**Globally-oriented co-curricular programs or activities for undergraduates**

*Figure 14.* Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs offering globally-oriented co-curricular programs or activities for undergraduates in 2011 and 2016.
The percentage of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs offering globally-oriented co-curriculum programs or activities for undergraduates increased from 2011 to 2016. In 2011, the percentage of public HEIs reporting each one of the programs/activities was higher than the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs reporting the same activities. That pattern was maintained in 2016 except for two programs/activities: residence hall with special programs designed to facilitate the integration of U.S. and international students, and regular and on-going international festivals or events on campus. In 2016, a higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs compared with the percentage of public HEIs offered those two programs/activities.

**Faculty policies and practices**

Faculty policies and practices discusses hiring guidelines, tenure and promotion policies, and faculty development opportunities. The main differences between public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016 were found in questions about activities with specific funding for faculty; faculty promotion and tenure; faculty hiring decisions; workshops and opportunities to faculty on internalization issues; and recognition awards.
Activities with specific funding for faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization of courses or programs</td>
<td>32.29%</td>
<td>32.58%</td>
<td>32.71%</td>
<td>40.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting international faculty</td>
<td>48.15%</td>
<td>42.16%</td>
<td>44.17%</td>
<td>48.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching at institutions abroad</td>
<td>30.44%</td>
<td>33.10%</td>
<td>33.54%</td>
<td>39.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading students on study abroad programs</td>
<td>63.65%</td>
<td>70.36%</td>
<td>74.58%</td>
<td>77.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to meetings or conferences abroad</td>
<td>57.20%</td>
<td>64.64%</td>
<td>67.92%</td>
<td>78.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying or conducting research abroad</td>
<td>41.51%</td>
<td>46.78%</td>
<td>49.58%</td>
<td>62.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty development seminars abroad</td>
<td>13.65%</td>
<td>24.48%</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>35.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15. Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs reporting activities with specific funding for faculty in 2011 and 2016.

The percentage of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs providing specific funding for all faculty activities related to internationalization increased from 2011 to 2016, except for hosting international faculty. A lower percentage of public HEIs reported funding for hosting international faculty from 2011 to 2016. In addition, in 2011, a lower percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs provided funding for hosting international faculty compared with the percentage
of public HEIs. The increase from 2011 to 2016 in the percentage of both types of HEIs offering faculty development seminars abroad was the highest. The percentage of public HEIs offering such seminars increased by 79.34 percent and the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs offering the same seminars increased by 100.86 percent.

*Faculty promotion and tenure*

![Bar chart](chart.png)

**Figure 16.** Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs with guidelines specifying international work or experience for faculty promotion and tenure in 2011 and 2016

A small percentage of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs reported having guidelines specifying international work or experience for faculty promotion and tenure in 2011 and 2016. The percentage of public HEIs having such guidelines was just slightly higher than the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs in both 2011 and 2016.
Faculty hiring decisions

Figure 17. Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs giving preference to candidates with international background, experience, or interests when hiring faculty in fields not explicitly international/global in 2011 and 2016

The percentage of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs giving preference to candidates with international background, experience, or interests when hiring faculty in fields not explicitly international/global increased from 2011 to 2016. However, a higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs expressed this preference compared with the percentage of public HEIs in both years.
Figure 18. Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs offering workshops and opportunities to faculty on internalization issues in 2011 and 2016

The percentage of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs providing workshops and opportunities on internationalization issues increased from 2011 to 2016, except for workshops on internationalizing the curriculum. The percentage of public HEIs offering all workshops and opportunities was higher than the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs in both 2011 and 2016, except for workshops on global learning in 2016.
Recognition awards

Figure 19. Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs giving awards specifically for international activity in 2011 and 2016

The percentage of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs providing recognition awards to faculty for international activity were not high in both 2011 and 2016. Nevertheless, this percentage increased from 2011 to 2016. Public HEIs had a very small increase of just 3.8 percent compared with the increase of private not-for-profit HEIs of 38 percent. Despite this increase, the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs providing recognition awards to faculty for international activity was less than half of the percentage of public HEIs providing the same awards in 2011 and approximately half of the percentage of public HEIs providing the same awards in 2016.

Student mobility

Student mobility revolves around education abroad programs, and international recruitment and support. The main differences between public and private not-for-profit HEIs
were found in questions about funding to recruit degree-seeking international undergraduate students; funding to recruit degree-seeking international graduate students; strategic international student recruitment plan with specific enrollment targets; and programs or support services to international students.

_Funding to recruit full-time degree-seeking international undergraduate students_

![Graph showing funding types for international undergraduate students](image)

_Figure 20._ Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs providing funding to recruit full-time degree-seeking international undergraduate students in 2011 and 2016

The percentage of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs providing funding to recruit full-time degree-seeking international undergraduate students increased from 2011 to 2016. The percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs providing all types of funding was higher than the percentage of public HEIs in both 2011 and 2016. The percentage increase observed both at public and private not-for-profit HEIs in hiring overseas student recruiters was the highest of all
types of funding. The percentage of public HEIs providing funding to hire overseas student recruiters increased by 145.49 percent and the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs providing the same funding increased by 99.08 percent from 2011 to 2016.

*Funding to recruit full-time degree-seeking international graduate students*

![Figure 21. Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs providing funding to recruit full-time degree-seeking international graduate students in 2011 and 2016](image)

The percentage of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs providing scholarships or other financial aid, providing travel funds for recruitment officers and hiring overseas student recruiters as an effort to recruit full-time degree-seeking international graduate students increased from 2011 to 2016. Once again, as already observed in the recruitment of full-time degree-seeking international undergraduate students, the percentage increase observed both at
public and private not-for-profit HEIs in hiring overseas student recruiters to recruit full-time
degree-seeking international graduate students was the highest of all types of funding. The
percentage of public HEIs providing funding to hire overseas student recruiters to recruit full-
time degree-seeking international graduate students increased by 154.85 percent from 2011 to
2016 and the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs providing the same funding increased by
80.3 percent from 2011 to 2016.

*Strategic international student recruitment plan with specific enrollment targets*

![Figure 22. Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs with strategic international student recruitment plan including specific enrollment targets in 2011 and 2016](image)

The percentage of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs with strategic international student recruitment plan including specific enrollment targets increased from 2011 to 2016. However, a higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs confirmed having this plan compared with the percentage of public HEIs in both years.
Figure 23. Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs with programs or support services to international students in 2011 and 2016

The percentage of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs offering programs or support services to international students increased from 2011 to 2016, except for ESL programs at public HEIs and host-family programs. A higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs
compared with the percentage of public HEIs offered individualized academic support services, orientation to the United States and the local community, orientation to the institution and/or the U.S. classroom, institutional advisory committee of international students, international alumni services and/or chapters, and host-family program for international students in both 2011 and 2016. On the other hand, a higher percentage of public HEIs compared with the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs offered support services for dependents of international students, and English as a second language (ESL) program in both 2011 and 2016. In 2011, a higher percentage of public HEIs compared with the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs offered assistance in finding housing, but in 2016 a higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs compared with the percentage of public HEIs offered that service.

**Collaboration and partnerships**

Collaboration and Partnerships category is interested in learning more about institutional partnerships, joint-degree or dual/double degree programs, branch campuses, and other offshore programs. As participants of 2011 and 2016 Mapping Internationalization surveys were presidents, chief academic officers, chief international officers, and institutional research directors of U.S. postsecondary institutions, the exact definition of partnerships was not provided and respondents answered based on their own perceptions.

The main differences between public and private not-for-profit HEIs were found in questions about joint-degree and double or dual degree programs, countries/regions with most active partnerships, and approaches to international partnerships.
Joint-degree and double or dual degree programs

Figure 24. Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs with joint-degree and double or dual degree programs in 2011 and 2016

The percentage of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs offering double or dual degree programs (students take courses and receive a degree or diploma from each participating institution) were higher than the percentage of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs offering joint-degree programs (students receive a single diploma or degree endorsed by both participating institutions) in both 2011 and 2016. A higher percentage of public HEIs compared with the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs offered joint-degree and double or dual degree programs in both 2011 and 2016. It is interesting to notice that from 2011 to 2016, the percentage of public and private not-for-profit HEIs offering joint-degree programs decreased, while in the same period the percentage of public and private not-for-profit HEIs offering double...
or dual degree programs increased. The percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs offering double or dual degree programs increased the most (59.10 percent).

**Countries/regions with most active partnerships**

![Figure 25. Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs with active partnerships in selected countries/regions in 2011 and 2016](image)

Figure 25. Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs with active partnerships in selected countries/regions in 2011 and 2016
The countries/regions presented above were the ones with the most active partnerships selected by public and private not-for-profit HEIs in both 2011 and 2016. The percentage of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs having active partnerships in all those countries/regions increased from 2011 to 2016. A highest percentage of public and private not-for-profit HEIs in both 2011 and 2016 had active partnerships with China. However, the percentage of public HEIs reporting active partnerships with Brazil, Mexico and Canada increased the most from 2011 to 2016. In 2011, only 1.85 percent of public HEIs reported having active partnerships with Brazil, 2.21 percent with Mexico and 1.66 percent with Canada, while in 2016, 23.57 percent reported having active partnerships with Brazil, 26.02 percent with Mexico and 13.26 percent with Canada. In addition, the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs reporting active partnerships with Israel, Brazil, and South Africa increased the most from 2011 to 2016. In 2011, only 1.25 percent of private not-for-profit HEIs reported having active partnerships with Israel, 1.88 percent with Brazil and 1.46 percent with South Africa, while in 2016, 12.45 percent reported having active partnerships with Israel, 16.79 percent with Brazil and 12.26 percent with South Africa.

In 2011, the percentage of public HEIs having active partnerships was higher than the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs having active partnerships in the following countries: China, India, Hong Kong SAR, Turkey, South Africa, and Israel. On the other hand, in 2011, the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs having active partnerships was higher than the percentage of public HEIs having active partnerships in the following countries: Singapore, Mexico, Brazil, Canada, and United Arab Emirates. In 2016, the percentage of public HEIs having active partnerships was higher than the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs having active partnerships in the following countries: China, India, Turkey, Mexico, Brazil, South
Africa, Canada and United Arab Emirates. On the other hand, in 2016, the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs having active partnerships was higher than the percentage of public HEIs having active partnerships in the following countries: Singapore, Hong Kong SAR, and Israel.

**Approach to international partnerships**

**Figure 26.** Percentage of public or private not-for-profit HEIs that started, expanded or reduced partnerships in 2011 and 2016

Comparing 2016 with 2011, a higher percentage of public HEIs and a lower percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs started partnerships for the first time. In terms of expanding the number of partnerships, a higher percentage of public and private not-for-profit HEIs did it from 2011 to 2016, and in terms of moving toward fewer partnerships, a lower percentage of public and private not-for-profit HEIs did it from 2011 to 2016.
First research question summary

In sum, in terms of “articulated institution commitment”, although in both types of HEIs the interest in international and global education has increased and become a much higher priority in 2016 compared with 2011, that same increase in interest was not observed in the elaboration of a separate plan specifically addressing institution-wide internationalization. American HEIs also did not show an increase in the creation of a campus-wide committee or task force working solely on advancing internationalization efforts on campus. Showing interest in international or global education is a good sign, but it has to be endorsed by concrete actions such as creating a more detailed plan on how to advance internationalization across the campus and a task force responsible for it. A lower percentage of public and private-not-for-profit HEIs reported having that plan in 2016 compared with 2011. However, not having a separate plan specifically addressing institution-wide internationalization is not necessarily a bad sign. Some institutions might be so advanced in the process that they may have incorporated internationalization in their overall institution plans thereby negating the need for a separate plan. As noticed by Knight (1994a, 1994b), the awareness and commitment phases should be followed by the planning phase in order to keep the internationalization cycle spinning. Even more disconcerting was the fact that a lower percentage of American HEIs reported formally assessing the impact of internationalization efforts from 2011 to 2016. Without proper assessment, it is difficult to evaluate the benefits and to fix the mistakes and most important of all, to create solid arguments to keep senior administration committed to internationalization.

Still, both public and private not-for-profit HEIs listed relevant reasons for internationalizing. “To improve student preparedness for a global era” remained the main reason for both types of HEIs in 2011 and 2016. The second reason, “To diversify student, faculty, and
staff home campus”, became more relevant in 2016. Then, the third most important reason changed in 2016 for both types of HEIs. “Becoming more attractive to prospective students at home and overseas” was considered more relevant in 2016 than “responding to the growing public demand for global competitiveness in knowledge creation/ innovation and talent development.”

Comparing public with private not-for-profit HEIs in terms of “articulated institutional commitment” in 2016, a higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs than the percentage of public HEIs reported that international or global education was among their top five priorities and that they formally accessed the impact of its internationalization efforts in the previous five years. However, a lower percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs than the percentage of public HEIs reported having a separate plan specifically addressing institution-wide internationalization, and having a campus-wide committee or task force working solely on advancing internationalization efforts on campus.

In reference to the “administrative structure and staffing”, although the percentage of both types of HEIs having a full-time administrator coordinating internationalization activities on campus increased from 2011 to 2016, the percentage of both types of HEIs without a particular office leading those internationalization activities also increased from 2011 to 2016. With so many options for internationalization activities, the best way to coordinate them is to have experienced personnel working under the supervision of an expert in internationalization, and the administrative structure to accomplish that could be organized in several ways. Some HEIs might prefer to have multiple offices under the supervision of a full-time administrator instead of just one single office taking care of all of the activities. The most important is to make sure that the process of internationalization is regarded as a joint effort of the whole university and not as an
activity of a single person. As in one of the interviews I did, participant 2 (private not-for-profit HEI), a full-time administrator in charge of all internationalization activities on campus, stated,

I think that there is some idea that they can just leave internationalization up to me. Rather than realizing that in order for it to work, it's got to be all of us. It is a project. It is not just an individual project that I'm doing. It is what we've all got to do together. Everybody is busy with their own things, and they feel like internationalization is my thing. So they're leaving that to me to some degree. They didn't grasp, they didn't understand that it is a joint effort of everybody.

The good news in “administrative structure and staffing” category is that in 2016, a higher percentage of both types of HEIs provided for their staff members specific funding for activities related to internationalization compared with the percentage of both types of HEIs in 2011.

Comparing public with private not-for-profit HEIs in terms of “administrative structure and staffing” in 2016, a higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs than the percentage of public HEIs reported that they did not have a particular office coordinating the international activities and programs. But a lower percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs than the percentage of public HEIs reported having a full-time administrator overseeing or coordinating multiple international activities and programs. However, a higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs than public HEIs reported providing funding to staff for activities related to internationalization.

Regarding “curriculum, co-curriculum and learning outcomes”, a lower percentage of public and private-for-profit HEIs reported the engagement in any initiatives to internationalize the undergraduate curriculum in 2016 compared with 2011. On the other hand, a higher
percentage of public and private not-for-profit HEIs offered globally-oriented co-curricular programs or activities for undergraduates in 2016 compared with 2011. Therefore, it seems that the interest in internationalizing the curriculum is declining, and internationalization programs and activities are becoming co-curricular activities, which are normally optional. To make sure that this is a trend, the results of those questions need to be investigated beyond just the years 2011 and 2016.

Although a lower percentage of both types of HEIs reported an engagement in any initiatives to internationalize the undergraduate curriculum from 2011 to 2016, a higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs reported this engagement than the percentage of public HEIs in both 2011 and 2016. In addition, a higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs than the percentage of public HEIs had a foreign language graduate requirement for undergraduates in both 2011 and 2016.

“Faculty policies and practices” offered good perspectives for the process of internationalization. A higher percentage of both types of HEIs provided funding to faculty for most activities related to internationalization and offered several workshops and opportunities to faculty on internationalization issues in 2016 compared with 2011. Although still a small percentage of both types of HEIs provided recognition awards to faculty for international activity in both 2011 and 2016, that percentage increased in both types of HEIs from 2011 to 2016. Also a small percentage of public or private-not-for-profit HEIs had guidelines specifying international work or experience for faculty promotion and tenure in 2011 and 2016 and this might affect the motivation of faculty to do such work, but having an international background, experience, or interests has been increasingly appreciated by both types of HEIs in faculty hiring decisions.
A higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs compared with the percentage of public HEIs provided funding to faculty for activities related to internationalization but a higher percentage of public HEIs compared with the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs offered workshops and opportunities to faculty on internationalization issues in both 2011 and 2016.

On faculty hiring decisions, a higher percentage of private-not-profit HEIs compared with the percentage of public HEIs gave preference to candidates with international background, experience, or interests in both 2011 and 2016. However, when it came time to recognize this international activity, a small percentage of public HEIs provided recognition awards to faculty and an even smaller percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs did so in both 2011 and 2016.

“Student mobility” also presented some optimism to the process of internationalization. The percentage of both public and private not-for-profit HEIs offering most programs or support services to international students increased from 2011 to 2016. Also, the percentage of both types of HEIs providing all types of funding to recruit full-time degree-seeking international undergraduate and graduate students increased from 2011 to 2016. More public and private not-for-profit HEIs reported providing funding to recruit full-time degree-seeking international undergraduate students than providing funding to recruit full-time degree-seeking international graduate students. This increase in the provision of funding in 2016 was clearly backed up by a strategic plan with a higher percentage of both HEIs reporting a strategic international recruitment plan including specific enrollment targets.

In general, a higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs compared with public HEIs provided funding to recruit full-time degree-seeking international undergraduate and graduate students, reported having a strategic international student plan with enrollment targets, and provided programs or support services to international students in both 2011 and 2016.
Finally, in the area of “collaboration and partnerships” there was an expansion movement from 2011 to 2016. The percentage of both types of HEIs having active partnerships in 11 countries/regions increased from 2011 to 2016. Those were the countries/regions with the most active partnerships in both years. In addition, a higher percentage of both types of HEIs expanded the number of their partnerships from 2011 to 2016, and a lower percentage of both types of HEIs reduced the number of their partnerships from 2011 to 2016. Double or dual degree programs also had an expansion. A higher percentage of both types of HEIs offered them in 2016 compared with 2011.

Comparing public with private-not-for-profit HEIs, in 2011, a higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs started partnerships for the first time or expanded their partnerships compared with the percentage of public HEIs, but a lower percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs moved toward fewer partnerships compared with the percentage of public HEIs. In 2016, a higher percentage of public HEIs started partnerships for the first time or reduced the number of their partnerships compared with the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs, but a lower percentage of public HEIs expanded the number of partnerships compared with the percentage of public HEIs. In addition, although the percentage of both types of HEIs offering joint-degree programs decreased from 2011 to 2016, still a higher percentage of public HEIs compared with the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs offered them in both 2011 and 2016.

Taking into account the six categories of CIGE’s Model for Comprehensive Internationalization, I noticed that over time, HEIs remained committed to internationalization and especially committed to the idea of improving student preparedness for a global era. However, less HEIs are formally assessing the progress of their internationalization efforts, which might bring negative outcomes for the future of the internationalization process. It is
important to be prepared to provide solid arguments to justify the investment in the process, so regular assessments are imperative. The organization of the administrative structure to support all of the endeavors around internationalization activities has also changed. More HEIs have a full-time administrator coordinating all of the international activities and programs and more HEIs are offering activities related to internationalization for faculty and staff. At the same time, the efforts to recruit full-time degree-seeking international undergraduate and graduate students have grown a lot. On the other hand, initiatives to internationalize the undergraduate curriculum have decreased and HEIs have been emphasizing the co-curriculum activities more. In terms of faculty policies and practices, some areas did not see much improvement. International work or experience still has a small impact for faculty promotion or tenure and very few HEIs give awards to faculty in recognition of their international activities. On the other hand, more HEIs are giving preference to candidates with an international background, experience or interests when hiring faculty in fields not explicitly international. Lastly, the biggest change occurred in the area of collaboration and partnerships, where there is a clear movement to expand the number of partnerships focusing in specific countries.

**Second research question**

Among the six categories of CIGE’s Model for Comprehensive Internationalization, which ones exert the most influence on the perceived level of internationalization in public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016, and how do the results differ across 2011 and 2016?

Chapter 3 has already presented the descriptive statistics of the dependent variable (see Table 6). I used two procedures to answer this question.

---

3 Also referred as target areas or components
**First procedure**

For the first procedure, I created a composite variable (or index) adding all variables that belonged to the same category (articulated commitment, administrative structure and staffing; curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes; faculty policies and practices; student mobility; and collaboration and partnerships). The list of variables included in each index can be found in Appendix C. Then, I standardized the indexes to be able to compare them.

After that, I ran ordered logistic regressions separately for public and private-not-for-profits in 2011 and 2016.

First, I will present the results of ordered logistic regressions for public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and then, I will present the results of ordered logistic regressions for public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2016. I will discuss them in the end.

The results are displayed as proportional odds ratios. Odds ratios greater than 1 means that a predictor variable is positively associated with the perceived level of internationalization, while odds ratios less than 1 means that a predictor variable is negatively related. One asterisk indicates significant odds ratios at the .05 level, two asterisks indicate significant odds ratios at the .01 level, and three asterisks in the tables indicate highly significant odd ratios at the .001 level.
Table 8

Results of ordered logistic regression for public HEIs in 2011

Survey: Ordered logistic regression

| Perceived level of internationalization | Odds Ratio | Linearized Std. Err | t     | P>|t|   | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|----------------------------------------|------------|---------------------|-------|-------|---------------------|
| zcommitindex                           | 2.22       | .323                | 5.50  | 0.000*** | 1.672               | 2.958 |
| zadmindex                              | 1.30       | .204                | 1.68  | 0.093   | .957                | 1.770 |
| zcurricuindex                          | 1.37       | .245                | 1.76  | 0.079   | .964                | 1.945 |
| zfacultyindex                          | 1.92       | .343                | 3.67  | 0.000*** | 1.356               | 2.731 |
| zstudentindex                          | 1.86       | .284                | 4.08  | 0.000*** | 1.380               | 2.511 |
| zcollaboindex                          | 1.02       | .143                | 0.12  | 0.908   | .771                | 1.340 |

*p ≤ .05    **p ≤ .01   ***p ≤ .001

Three indexes (zcommitindex, zfacultyindex, and zstudentindex) were found to be statistically significant at the .01 level and positive predictors in this ordered logistic regression analysis. The same three indexes were also statistically highly significant at the .001 level and positive predictors in this ordered logistic regression analysis.

In 2011 at public HEIs for a one unit increase in zcommitindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 2.22 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant.

Then, for a one unit increase in zfacultyindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.92 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant. Finally, for a one unit increase in zstudentindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the
combined moderate and low levels are 1.86 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant.

This means that for public HEIs in 2011 increases in “articulated institutional commitment”, “faculty policies and practices”, and “student mobility” indexes are associated with increases in the likelihood of high-perceived level of internationalization.

**Ordered logistic regression for private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011**

Table 9

*Results of ordered logistic regression for private-not-for-profit HEIs in 2011*

Survey: Ordered logistic regression

| Perceived level of internationalization | Odds Ratio | Linearized Std. Err | t  | P>|t| | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|----------------------------------------|------------|---------------------|----|------|-----------------|
| zcommitindex                           | 1.44       | .205                | 2.59 | 0.010** | 1.093, 1.908     |
| zadmindex                              | 1.98       | .317                | 4.28 | 0.000***| 1.449, 2.715     |
| zcurricuindex                          | 1.28       | .180                | 1.75 | 0.081  | .970, 1.687      |
| zfacultyindex                          | 1.54       | .241                | 2.76 | 0.006** | 1.132, 2.094     |
| zstudentindex                          | 1.68       | .250                | 3.47 | 0.001***| 1.251, 2.247     |
| zcollaboindex                          | 1.32       | .233                | 1.55 | 0.122  | .929, 1.864      |

*p ≤ .05  **p ≤ .01  ***p ≤ .001

Four indexes (zcommitindex, zadmindex, zfacultyindex, and zstudentindex) were found to be statistically significant and positive predictors at the .01 level in this ordered logistic regression analysis, but only two of them (zadmindex and zstudentindex) were also statistically highly significant at the .001 level and positive predictors in this ordered logistic regression analysis.
In 2011 at private not-for-profit HEIs for a one unit increase in zcommitindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.44 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant. For a one unit increase in zadmindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.98 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant. For a one unit increase in zfacultyindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.54 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant. Finally, for a one unit increase in zstudentindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.68 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant.

This means that for private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 increases in “articulated institutional commitment”, “administrative structure and staffing”; “student mobility”; and “faculty policies and practices” indexes are associated with increases in the likelihood of high-perceived level of internationalization.
**Ordered logistic regression for public HEIs in 2016**

Table 10

*Results of ordered logistic regression for public HEIs in 2016*

Survey: Ordered logistic regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of strata</th>
<th>Number of obs</th>
<th>Population size</th>
<th>Design df</th>
<th>F (6, 586)</th>
<th>Prob &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>1,594.82</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>37.23</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four indexes (zcommitindex, zadmindex, zfacultyindex, and zstudentindex) were found to be statistically significant at the .01 level and positive predictors in this ordered logistic regression analysis, but only one of them (zcommitindex) was also statistically highly significant at the .001 level and a positive predictor in this ordered logistic regression analysis.

In 2016 at public HEIs for a one unit increase in zcommitindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.99 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant.

Then, for a one unit increase in zadmindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.53 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant. For a unit increase in zfacultyindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined
moderate and low levels are 1.50 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant. Finally, for a one unit increase in zstudentindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.40 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant.

This means that for public HEIs in 2016 increases in “articulated institutional commitment”, “administrative structure and staffing”, “faculty policies and practices”, and “student mobility” indexes are associated with increases in the likelihood of high-perceived level of internationalization.

**Ordered logistic regression for private not-for-profit HEIs in 2016**

Table 11

Results of ordered logistic regression for private not-for-profit HEIs in 2016

Survey: Ordered logistic regression

| Perceived level of internationalization | Odds Ratio | Linearized Std. Err | t    | P>|t|  | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|----------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|------|--------|---------------------|
| zcommitindex                           | 1.32       | .189                 | 1.96 | 0.050* | 1.000               | 1.751               |
| zadmindex                              | 1.31       | .174                 | 2.06 | 0.040* | 1.013               | 1.704               |
| zcurricuindex                          | 1.34       | .177                 | 2.19 | 0.029* | 1.031               | 1.733               |
| zfacultyindex                          | 1.46       | .209                 | 2.65 | 0.008**| 1.102               | 1.933               |
| zstudentindex                          | 1.79       | .238                 | 4.40 | 0.000***| 1.381              | 2.325               |
| zcollaboindex                          | 1.20       | .132                 | 1.66 | 0.098  | .967                | 1.490               |

*p ≤ .05  **p ≤ .01  ***p ≤ .001

Two indexes (zfacultyindex, and zstudentindex) were found to be statistically significant at the .01 level and positive predictors in this ordered logistic regression analysis, but only one of
them (zstudentindex) was also statistically highly significant at the .001 level and a positive predictor in this ordered logistic regression analysis.

In 2016 at private not-for-profit HEIs for a one unit increase in zfacultyindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.46 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant. Then, for a one unit increase in zstudentindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.79 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant.

This means that for private not-for-profit HEIs in 2016 increases in “faculty policies and practices” and “student mobility” indexes are associated with increases in the likelihood of high-perceived level of internationalization.

If I had decided to be less strict and had increased my alpha level to .05, “articulated institutional commitment”, “administrative structure and staffing”, and “curriculum, co-curriculum and learning outcomes” would have been significant as well. However, increasing the alpha level from 0.01 to 0.05 increases the chance of a false positive (Type I error), so I have opted to present the results at the .01 level and at the .001 level.

**First procedure summary**

In creating indexes using a composite variable adding all variables that belonged to the same category and then standardizing these indexes, I found the following results for ordered logistic regressions at public and private not-profit HEIs. While “articulated institutional commitment”, “faculty policies and practices”, and “student mobility” indexes were significant at the .01 level for public HEIs in 2011, “articulated institutional commitment”, “administrative structure and staffing”, “faculty policies and practices”, and “student mobility” indexes were the
significant ones at the .01 level in 2016. For private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011, “articulated institutional commitment”, “administrative structure and staffing”, “student mobility”, and “faculty policies and practices” indexes were significant at the .01 level; and in 2016 only “student mobility”, and “faculty policies and practices” indexes were the significant ones at the .01 level. Examining this procedure, the most consistent drivers of overall perceived internationalization level were the “student mobility”, “articulated institutional commitment”, and “faculty policies and practices” indexes.

**Second procedure**

For the second procedure, I ran a principal component analysis for each category separately for each public or private not-for-profit datasets in 2011 and 2016. Then, I created a single index for each category by estimating a factor score. This factor score is the standardized weighted average of all the items in each category, which I used as an index to represent each category. Finally, I ran ordered logistic regressions with just these factor scores separately for public and private-not-for-profits in 2011 and 2016.

First, I will present the results of ordered logistic regressions with factor scores for public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and then, I will present the results of ordered logistic regressions with factor scores for public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2016. I will discuss them in the end. Once again, the results are displayed as proportional odds ratios.
Ordered logistic regression with factor scores for public HEIs in 2011

Table 12

Results of ordered logistic regression with factor scores for public HEIs in 2011

Survey: Ordered logistic regression

Number of strata = 1  Number of obs = 490
Number of PSUs = 490  Population size = 1,520.63
Design df = 489  F (6, 484) = 34.60
Prob > F = 0.0000

Three indexes (comindex, facindex, and studindex) were found to be statistically significant at the .01 level and positive predictors in this ordered logistic regression analysis. The same three indexes were also statistically highly significant at the .001 level and positive predictors in this ordered logistic regression analysis.

In 2011 at public HEIs for a one unit increase in comindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.60 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant.

Then, for a one unit increase in facindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.35 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant. Finally, for a one unit increase in studindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the
combined moderate and low levels are 1.24 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant.

This means that for public HEIs in 2011 increases in “articulated institutional commitment”, “faculty policies and practices”, and “student mobility” indexes are associated with increases in the likelihood of high-perceived level of internationalization.

If I had decided to be less strict and had increased my alpha level to .05, “curriculum, co-curriculum and learning outcomes” would have been significant as well.

**Ordered logistic regression with factor scores for private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011**

Table 13

*Results of ordered logistic regression with factor scores for private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011*

Survey: Ordered logistic regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of strata = 1</th>
<th>Number of obs = 440</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of PSUs = 440</td>
<td>Population size = 1,535.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design df = 439</td>
<td>F (6, 434) = 27.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob &gt; F = 0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Perceived level of internationalization | Odds Ratio | Linearized Std. Err | t | P>|t| | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|----------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|---|-------|------------------|
| comindex                               | 1.36       | .119                 | 3.46 | 0.001*** | 1.140           | 1.609 |
| adindex                                | 1.34       | .113                 | 3.40 | 0.001*** | 1.129           | 1.577 |
| currindex                              | 1.19       | .082                 | 2.54 | 0.012*   | 1.040           | 1.361 |
| facindex                               | 1.24       | .097                 | 2.73 | 0.007**  | 1.061           | 1.444 |
| studindex                              | 1.25       | .102                 | 2.79 | 0.006**  | 1.069           | 1.471 |
| colindex                               | 1.03       | .059                 | 0.55 | 0.585    | .922            | 1.155 |

*p ≤ .05  **p ≤ .01  ***p ≤ .001

Four indexes (comindex, adindex, facindex, and studindex) were found to be statistically significant and positive predictors at the .01 level in this ordered logistic regression analysis, but
only two of them (comindex and adindex) were also statistically highly significant at the .001 level and positive predictors in this ordered logistic regression analysis.

In 2011 at private not-for-profit HEIs for a one unit increase in comindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.36 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant. For a one unit increase in adindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.34 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant. Then, for a one unit increase in facindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.24 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant. Finally, for a one unit increase in studindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.25 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant.

This means that for private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 increases in “articulated institutional commitment”, “administrative structure and staffing”; “student mobility”; and “faculty policies and practices” indexes are associated with increases in the likelihood of high-perceived level of internationalization.

If I had decided to be less strict and had increased my alpha level to .05, “curriculum, co-curriculum and learning outcomes” would have been significant as well.
Ordered logistic regression with factor scores for public HEIs in 2016

Table 14

Results of ordered logistic regression with factor scores for public HEIs in 2016

Survey: Ordered logistic regression

| Perceived level of internationalization | Odds Ratio | Linearized Std. Err | t     | P>|t| | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|---------------------------------------|------------|---------------------|-------|-----|------------------------|
| comindex                              | 1.70       | .154                | 5.89  | 0.000*** | 1.425                   |
| adindex                               | 1.16       | .086                | 2.02  | 0.043*  | 1.005                   |
| currindex                             | 1.01       | .072                | 0.08  | 0.932    | .874                    |
| facindex                              | 1.19       | .093                | 2.22  | 0.027*  | 1.020                   |
| studindex                             | 1.19       | .060                | 3.55  | 0.000*** | 1.082                   |
| colindex                              | 1.18       | .074                | 2.61  | 0.009**  | 1.042                   |

* p ≤ .05   ** p ≤ .01   *** p ≤ .001

Three indexes (comindex, studindex, and colindex) were found to be statistically significant at the .01 level and positive predictors in this ordered logistic regression analysis, but only two of them (comindex and studindex) were also statistically highly significant at the .001 level and positive predictors in this ordered logistic regression analysis.

In 2016 at public HEIs for a one unit increase in comindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.7 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant.

Then, for a one unit increase in studindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.19 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant. Finally, for a one unit increase in
colindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.18 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant.

This means that for public HEIs in 2016 increases in “articulated institutional commitment”, “student mobility”, and “collaboration and partnerships” indexes are associated with increases in the likelihood of high-perceived level of internationalization.

If I had decided to be less strict and had increased my alpha level to .05, “administrative structure and staffing”, and “faculty policies and practices” would have been significant as well.

**Ordered logistic regression with factor scores for private not-for-profit HEIs in 2016**

Table 15

*Results of ordered logistic regression with factor scores for private not-for-profit HEIs in 2016*

Survey: Ordered logistic regression

| Perceived level of internationalization | Odds Ratio | Linearized Std. Err | t | P>|t| | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|----------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|---|------|------------------|
| comindex | 1.30 | .126 | 2.69 | 0.007** | 1.073 - 1.570 |
| adindex | 1.18 | .093 | 2.06 | 0.040*   | 1.008 - 1.374 |
| currindex | 1.13 | .073 | 1.83 | 0.068 | .991 - 1.280 |
| facindex | 1.19 | .095 | 2.20 | 0.028* | 1.019 - 1.396 |
| studindex | 1.33 | .075 | 5.07 | 0.000*** | 1.192 - 1.488 |
| colindex | 1.10 | .066 | 1.65 | 0.100 | .981 - 1.242 |

*p ≤ .05  **p ≤ .01  ***p ≤ .001

Two indexes (comindex and studindex) were found to be statistically significant at the .01 level and positive predictors in this ordered logistic regression analysis, but only one of them
(studindex) was also statistically highly significant at the .001 level and a positive predictor in this ordered logistic regression analysis.

In 2016 at private not-for-profit HEIs for a one unit increase in comindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.3 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant.

Then, for a one unit increase in studindex, the odds (or likelihood) of high perceived level of internationalization versus the combined moderate and low levels are 1.33 greater, given that all of the other indexes in the model are held constant.

This means that for private not-for-profit HEIs in 2016 increases in “student mobility”, and “articulated institutional commitment” indexes are associated with increases in the likelihood of high-perceived level of internationalization.

If I had decided to be less strict and had increased my alpha level to .05, “administrative structure and staffing”, and “faculty policies and practices” would have been significant as well.

**Second procedure summary**

After running a principal component analysis to estimate a factor score for each category and use it to represent the category, I found the following results for ordered logistic regressions at public and private not-for-profit HEIs. While for public HEIs in 2011, “articulated institutional commitment”, “faculty policies and practices”, and “student mobility” indexes were significant at the .01 level; in 2016 “articulated institutional commitment”, “student mobility”, and “collaboration and partnerships” indexes were the significant ones at the .01 level. For private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011, “articulated institutional commitment”, “administrative structure and staffing”, “student mobility”, and “faculty policies and practices” indexes were significant at the .01 level; in 2016 only “student mobility”, and “articulated institutional commitment” indexes
were the significant ones at the .01 level. Examining this procedure, the most consistent drivers of overall perceived internationalization level were the “student mobility” and “articulated institutional commitment” indexes.

**Summary of results**

Table 16 presents a summary of the results for the second research question found in the first and second procedures for public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016 at .01 and .001 levels.

Table 16

**Summary of results for the second research question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private NFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st procedure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.01 level</strong></td>
<td>zcommitindex</td>
<td>zfacultyindex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zfacultyindex</td>
<td>zstudentindex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.001 level</strong></td>
<td>zcommitindex</td>
<td>zfacultyindex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zfacultyindex</td>
<td>zstudentindex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2nd procedure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.01 level</strong></td>
<td>comindex</td>
<td>facindex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adindex</td>
<td>facindex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.001 level</strong></td>
<td>comindex</td>
<td>facindex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>studindex</td>
<td>studindex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Final remark**

Finally, I am aware that some results of my ordered logistic regressions might have turned out to be significant merely by virtue of having many variables. Therefore, for every ordered logistic regression I could have used the Bonferroni correction, which is an adjustment made to P values when several dependent or independent statistical tests are being performed simultaneously on a single data set. Then, in order to avoid a lot of false-positive results (type I errors), the alpha value needs to be lowered to account for the number of comparisons being performed. However, the “ologit” command in Stata does not have an option for Bonferroni correction. This is why I have chosen to use the more stringent value of .01 in determining statistical significance and also present the results at a very stringent value of .001. However, the significance levels of the results must nonetheless be interpreted with caution.

**Third research question**

What are the perceived outcomes of internationalization for public and private not-for-profit HEIs?

As already mentioned above, outcomes can be considered as the final results of internationalization activities and are normally formulated at a higher level of abstraction than outputs (Beerkens, Brandenburg, Evers, van Gaalen, Leichsenring and Zimmermann, 2010). Therefore, to find out what some of those final results of the internationalization process were in public and private not-for-profit HEIs, I asked eight key campus officers (four from public institutions and four from private not-for-profit institutions) what they perceived as outcomes from the process of internationalization at their institutions. Table 17 shows the type of institution control that each one of the eight participants comes from.
After analyzing the data, I found two major themes: accomplished outcomes and not-accomplished outcomes. I will describe below the two themes as well each category found inside each theme. In each theme, I found some common categories for public and private not-for-profit HEIs and some categories mentioned by just one type of HEI. I will present evidence for each category based on data.

To represent the themes and categories of the perceived outcomes of internationalization for public and private not-for-profit HEIs, I created an intermediate data analysis product drawing Figure 27.

Table 17

*Participant number by type of institution control*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant number</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private not-for-profit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As accomplished outcomes, I found seven common categories, three categories mentioned only by private not-for-profit HEIs and four categories mentioned only by public HEIs. The seven common categories were the following: “centralized internationalization activities”; “empowered staff working with internationalization”; “increased students’ opportunities to learn about global issues”; “encouraged faculty to support internationalization activities”; “motivated students to study abroad”; “took steps to combat parochialism”; and “developed a new vision about partnerships.” The three categories mentioned only by private not-for-profit HEIs were the following: “turned internationalization into a common vision and purpose on campus”;
“valued international student voice on campus”; and “enabled next generation to work in an interconnected world.” The five categories mentioned only by public HEIs were the following: “recognized internationalization as one of the priorities, systematically reviewing it”; “provided real world projects for students”, “diversified the body of international students”; “leveraged institutional strengths through partnerships”; and “recognized internationalization efforts.”

As not-accomplished outcomes, I found two common categories, two categories mentioned only by private not-for-profit HEIs and one category mentioned only by public HEIs. The two common categories were the following: “to improve data for assessment about internationalization outcomes”, and “to increase students’ interest in learning foreign languages.” The two categories mentioned only by private not-for-profit HEIs were the following: “to capitalize in all the ways the relationship with partners”, and “to diversify the body of international students.” The category mentioned only by public HEIs was “to create stronger international collaborative research groups.”
Accomplished outcomes

HEIs reported here the perceived outcomes they have already achieved.

Common to both public and private not-for-profit HEIs.

Both types of HEIs mentioned those perceived outcomes.

Centralized internationalization activities. Having people dedicated solely to internationalization activities working in an office that centralized all the activities related to internationalization on campus was considered extremely important. The centralization of all internationalization activities on campus was seen as a great achievement. As expressed by participant 4 (private not-for-profit HEI),

The second goal, which was probably the more important one, was to begin to define a much more comprehensive international and global approach, and a plan which would then have an administrative structure, which could be carried out by a body, which would be responsible for that.” Therefore, “this was the first institute that the college created, and the first body that had this kind of responsibility across all of the different divisions. It got academics, student affairs, development, admissions, running across the entire college.” .... “prior to that, we had a [name of Center] which really focused only on the curriculum and on faculty. It brought in visiting speakers, it facilitated discussions, but there was no senior international officer. There was no sort of person who had direct responsibility for that. And so this marked a big change for us and it emerged out of that two-year planning process.

Participant 7 (private not-for-profit HEI) also reported,

We set about centralizing all the international activities under this new office that we now call the [name of Office], which I'm the vice president of. Well, I think the main
thing [the president] did was articulate his desire for us to be comprehensively internationalized as an institution…. and throughout that 18-month period, the result was, we had a strategic plan, a five-year strategic plan for internationalization, which I now use, actually. We are now in the fourth year of that five-year plan that was developed back in 2014. So those were two big things. We centralized all the international activity on campus and units. So now, reporting to me are several offices that previously reported to other people. The [name of Office] formerly was a student affairs position or unit. Study Abroad reported somewhere else. We did not even have an English language learning unit, which we now have. We created an office of partnerships and global engagement.

Finally, participant 1 (public HEI) reported,

In terms of administrative leadership, structure, and staffing though, the very organization of the [name of Office] was created in about 2004. So we are 10, coming on 15 years old. We have our senior international officer. We have the responsibility for undergraduate international student missions, a director in that position. We have study abroad. We have the international students’ college services, and we have an unusual position called Curricular Internationalization, who is actually responsible for thinking about that across the campus in or off, and another unusual position we have is a Communications director to tell our story to the various media, print or visual. So I think that our structure and staffing and administrative leadership with our unit, where we're plugged into the provost, is very strong.

*Empowered staff working with internationalization.* This category emphasized the support given by the institution to staff members working with internationalization issues, and
how supportive of intercultural experiences on campus staff members became. Participant 1 (public HEI) expressed this category through the following words,

We have very active participation of the staff at NAFSA and the Association of International Education Administrators forum. So I think that as a result of some of the tensions that now exist on US campuses, we've seen our staff in terms of intercultural communication, providing an important leadership role to convene groups of people to talk about cultural difference in more than lots of ways. I think that is an empowering recognition of the staff. So, yes, I think that wholeheartedly, the staff is increasingly participating in leading the campus in the areas you mentioned [the six interconnected target areas presented at CIGE’s Model for Comprehensive Internalization].

Participant 4 (private not-for-profit HEI) also reported,

We have about every few years we've funded seminar which is open to faculty and staff, which oftentimes involves an intensive study of a particular region and its issues and then travel to that region during the course of the summer. So, we're seeing more of that kind of interest. We also have a big symposium typically, each year, looking at some sort of major international issue. It is very well attended from across the college by staff and faculty. We are providing more professional development funds to enable staff to go to conferences or to attend initiatives that are outside the U.S. as well.

*Increased students’ opportunities to learn about global issues.* Higher education institutions felt that it was important to offer as many chances they could to allow students to learn about global themes. Some of these opportunities include global learning courses, majors focusing on global themes, and discussions about global issues in classes. Participant 3 (public HEI) expressed,
On top of that general education requirements for all students, it's in the current strategic plan that by 2016 to 2021, all majors will have required courses on global learning …. we also have an intercultural training certificate program, uh, that is becoming quite popular with several hundred students enrolled in that program. And they get a certificate by taking intercultural communication courses and cultural immersion experience that can be done through study-abroad or through an internship in a diverse location.

Adding to that category, Participant 4 (private not-for-profit HEI) commented, I do think that the presence of a larger number of international students and these annual symposia that were happening is increasingly generating more discussion of and understanding of international and global issues. That has been one of the side effects that we are eager to promote, and try to deepen.

Participant 7 (private not-for-profit HEI) added, We started a new initiative …. and faculty submit proposals to either improve an existing course by adding more international dimensions to an existing course, or they can create a whole brand new course that has high international dimensions to it. We've run the program for three years. The faculty get a stipend. It's a low residency. It's a two-day workshop with me on things like backward course design, alignment of student learning outcome with activities. I usually would bring in a consultant to help make the case about internationalizing the conglomerate strategies for doing so. I also am their consultant all year long in terms of the particular course. A lot of our [global programs] have been developed through this experience and in three years, we've created 27 brand new courses.
Encouraged faculty to support internationalization activities. Higher education institutions created several instruments to help faculty to embrace the idea of internationalization such as encouraging them to incorporate global issues in their courses, training them in global issues workshops, tying tenure, promotion, assessment and performance to internationalization issues, creating campus-wide faculty internationalization awards, and motivating them to lead study programs abroad. As expressed by participant 4 (private not-for-profit HEI),

We've been sending faculty as well, to more conferences about pedagogy and about international issues, and I think we'll continue to do that to give them more opportunity to incorporate this into their teaching. We've expanded the sabbatical time that faculty have to conduct research as well. So I think those factors will probably be most decisive, but it's entirely possible that one of the benefits of this increased emphasis on global education is that you may see more faculty research coming out of it. So, our old policy was that faculty were eligible for a one-semester sabbatical every six years. Now faculty are eligible for a one-year sabbatical every six years, or one semester every three years, as they choose, as what makes most sense for them. So, basically we doubled the sabbatical leave time. So in fact, as we rolled out this expanded sabbatical opportunity, our faculty committed to providing every student at the college with a major research experience. And with more time, for example, if they have one year, they certainly can think of spending this year abroad.

Participant 7 (private not-for-profit HEI) also added to that category expressing,

The major thing that I was charged with was not only increasing the number of students studying abroad, but trying to figure out innovative ways to have faculty more engaged in the process of study abroad. And so the best way to engage the faculty was to charge
them, or to give them opportunities to lead education abroad programs within their own areas of expertise. So now, we have our faculty over the last couple of years-- um, it's mandatory that they go through, uh, these intercultural competence trainings and, and a whole other series of workshops, and so forth and so on. I think when you have internationalization and global engagement as an institutional priority, and you hold it out there as one of only five priorities, people see it every day, and, and, and they-- and they aspire towards it, especially when you're tying tenure, and promotion, and assessment, and performance around their ability, um, to be great in these areas. Um, they're gonna be very creative and innovative as to how they articulate to you that they're meeting these objectives in their teaching and in their research.

Participant 3 (public HEI) emphasized,

For faculty policies and practices there are three things that I can think of immediately. One is that we have a specific benefit for people leading study-abroad programs. We did a survey of other comprehensive public universities, and ours are the best benefits, the highest pay for faculty to lead study-abroad programs. I think that really is an incentive and encouragement to support faculty to lead study-abroad programs. Number two, we have a campus-wide faculty internationalization award. It is a cash award, it is competitive and prestigious, and it is part of our annual convocation. So, we celebrate in front of all the faculty, a faculty member this year who has made great contributions in internationalization. So, that's a specific thing, that's a faculty policy and practice. Thirdly, we have in the faculty handbook a very generous and supportive Fulbright policy to encourage faculty to apply for and do Fulbright grants research and teaching abroad. We have the grants, the internal grants for faculty and staff to go abroad, to get
As another example of that category, participant 8 (public HEI) explained,

We initiated several projects for faculty development. One of them was through an international faculty development seminar. So, on four different occasions, four different years, we took cohort of about ten faculty member each to a different destination around a thematic focus. We had excellent evaluations from the faculty who participated in that. That probably altogether impacted maybe forty faculty members. And we granted other internal awards to support faculty to develop study abroad programs or to do different kinds of course development, so I think there was a good bit of impact.

Motivated students to study abroad. Considered as an important internationalization activity, a well-coordinated study abroad program help students to open their horizons and start reflecting on global issues. In the future, this experience might lead them to become global citizens. Therefore, higher education institutions encourage their students to participate on that activity as stated by participant 2 (private not-for-profit HEI): “one way that we're trying to incentivize [talented students coming to our institution] is that we're going to make some scholarships available for honor students out of our honors budget to study abroad.”

Participant 7 (private not-for-profit HEI) also showed how they changed their policies to motivate their students to study abroad stating,

We had certain policies - I'm going to be honest. We had certain policies that were conflicting with our articulation that we want more students to study abroad. And by that, I mean, for instance, financial aid wasn’t portable. So how can you say you want more students to study abroad, more diverse students to study abroad, when you have a
financial aid policy that won't let the money travel with the student? Right? So, we had to have some really deep-seated discussions about that because there were some very differences of opinion on the part of my finance colleagues in that office, versus, you know, me trying to be really supportive of our president's ambition of more students studying abroad. The other thing was, if you want diversity - so here's another example of where the internationalization work integrates with our inclusive excellence work. You know?

Lastly, participant 1 (public HEI) stated that they make every effort to offer study abroad programs to all students, as they consider it a matter of equity and access and all students should have access to these programs. This was expressed by these words,

I think one of the significant things that we're working on now is thinking of student mobility not only as a quantitative goal in program terms or any student participation terms, but also the question of equity and access across. It interferes with the ability of many of our students who participate. We do give out about [amount of money] of support each year, but we do have a goal at the same time of trying to double or triple that amount of money and we're experimenting to do a collaboration with the foundation, university to raise additional money in support of student mobility.

_Took steps to combat parochialism._ This category refers to the struggle of institutions to break out of a mindset that is American-centric. This mindset interferes negatively in many internationalization activities so they have to make efforts to change this mentality. Participant 1 (public HEI) exposed this idea through the following words.

For the most part, I think we're struggling all the time with a terrific amount of parochialism. Our students are not very worldly. They have not traveled outside of the
state in many instances, much less outside the country. Our spirit is politically
conservative and so we're struggling all the time to break people out of a mindset that is
American-centric. So, I think the fact that we have a curricular internationalization
program is a really important effort to combat this parochialism. We have inaugurated in
the last year, as an example, a faculty fellow position. He is from the School of Business
and next year, it will be from a different school. We should look at more ways that we
can have international at home opportunities for students who can't participate in study
abroad. That includes an inventory of local for-profit, non-profit governmental
organizations as well as recommendations for how the curriculum can be embedded in
the School of Business with international themes. And we hope that model will
demonstrate to other schools on how they too can move in, in that direction. That is a
good example, I think, of something where we recognize we have a weakness and within
our capacity to respond to it, we are trying to address it through the faculty fellow
program and to efforts to increase participation to study abroad.

Participant 2 (private not-for-profit HEI) also mentioned how they are combating
parochialism by creating initiatives to integrate domestic and international students stating,

I'm seeing that international students and domestic students want to develop ways of
getting to know each other. And we are working on developing a global student
association that would include international and domestic students, and use that as kind
of our vehicle for putting on programs. We’ve had an international dinner night, and
we've done several things to try to bring students together. And I've noticed, for example-
- this is just anecdotal, but I've noticed, for example, in the cafeteria, students of different
racial and ethnic backgrounds and different international backgrounds tended to sit
together kind of in their own silos. And I'm seeing those silos break down. And so I think that is good. One thing that happened last year that really helped our Saudi students and helped our domestic students in getting to know our Saudi students was that our Saudi students decided to have an intramural soccer team. And they ended up winning the championship. So that really helped them to get to know others and others to get to know them.

Then, after I asked how domestic student enriched their academic environment with the experiences they brought back to campus after the time they spent abroad, participant 2 (private not-for-profit HEI) answered,

I've particularly seen it in the area of religion because we're in a part of the country that's fairly conservative religiously. And through their travels abroad, our students have got to know people from religious backgrounds other than their own. And then we have a more diverse or more religiously diverse campus as well. And I think it has helped our students, many of whom grew up in fairly monolithic, white, [name of state] culture, to become more open-minded toward people of diverse backgrounds and particularly more open-minded toward people of other religions.

*Developed a new vision about partnerships.* Higher education institutions mentioned they are being strategic with their partnerships, choosing very carefully their partners in order to create meaningful and long-term relationships. Participant 7 (private not-for-profit HEI) made this idea very clear through these words,

Now I will say, the thing that's been the most exciting thing for me, since I lead our development of these types of partnerships, is being really creative and helping the college understand why a particular institution is an important one for us. Because we
have been very strategic about the types of partnerships that we have. You know, when I
got here, I literally was handed a box of memorandums of agreements with institutions I
couldn't - many people couldn't even remember who set that up. They didn't know we
had a partnership. When I started asking people about it, going from school to school,
like, ‘Oh, do you know that we have a partnership with such-and-such university in
China?’ ‘Uh, we do?’ And then I look, I say, ‘Well, your name is on it as the person who
was …’ ‘Oh, I don't think.’ You know? So, I spent my very first year very diplomatically
reaching out to these institutions, saying, you know, ‘Hey, you know, this is great,’ and,
you know, ‘Here's my new position,’ and, you know, ‘Do you still count us as one of
your partners?’ Because we're having some trouble really trying to figure out, you know,
who was the lead person here. And you know? And so we kind of gracefully bowed out
of the relationship. And now, we have about 16 partners that are very, very active
partnerships and that we're pursuing very deep and meaningful relationships with.
Participant 1 (public HEI) explained more about the strategy they created to build
partnerships in these statements,

We have a philosophy and a strategy to partnership. The philosophy is that all
partnerships must be mutually beneficial. The strategy is that we have few partnerships,
but with these partnerships, we have a very deep and broad relationship with
collaboration between the partner and ourselves. There is a famous example of this that is
now 25 years old, led by the medical school, but including the whole campus. It is a
healthcare delivery medical initiative in [name of country], servicing about 4 million
people. It has been recognized as one of the premiere examples of overseas direct
assistance by any country in the world, and it represents this philosophy and strategy of
partnership…. This has an impact in another country, so it is really important. That's one thing. I think the second thing is that there is a realization in that you can't have a strategic plan if you try and do everything. You have to prioritize. The same is true with this partnership initiative…. We don't embrace every proposal for partnerships. It has touched many points of our campus; it was not simply the initiative of one individual faculty member. And we review these agreements according to university policy on a five-year basis. And if they don't have outputs, they're sunset. They're terminated. They're not renewed. That's a quality control measure. I think there is a growing understanding that priority requires us to focus on few things, do them well, and have evidence to support that. I think that cultural understanding in the campus has changed for the better, although it's frustrating because, it's not saying you can't pursue a research project; it's just saying that in terms of prioritizing the university resources, we can't support everything.

Participant 3 (public HEI) also made it clear,

We have our portfolio of international partner institutions. And we really don't have a tremendous number. We're not after many. We want to have meaningful, genuine interaction, and mutually beneficial activity, which I think we do a very good job of. So, our partnerships tend to last decades… When we sign a partnership, we really want to and expect it to last a while because we want to put some investment in it…. We don't have many, but they last a long time and there's activity both ways… We have funding behind it. We have partnership development grants from our office to support activity. Most of our grants of faculty and staff are, in fact steered towards work with people from our core partner institutions. There's money available to bring a counterpart to [name of
participant 3 HEI]. So, we spend money to bring three people from three partnerships every year for a study-abroad fair. We pay the bill because we want them to be represented on our campus as well. So, we put our money behind what we say.

**Mentioned only by Private not-for-profit HEIs.**

Only private-not-for-profit HEIs mentioned those accomplished perceived outcomes.

**Turned internationalization into a common vision and purpose on campus.** This category expresses the effort higher education institutions made to spread out the concept of internationalization throughout campus and turn it into a common vision and purpose. This idea was well articulated by participant 5 (private not-for-profit HEI) who stated,

Yes. Like on the institutional level, we can say that now internationalization is a conscious and considered goal. So now we have steps that we want to take, and they're linked to sort of a common vision and purpose. As opposed to being, you know, some individual's idea of the day…. There was no umbrella before. I would say that these two years were very important, because it established internationalization as a university-wide topic, concern, and goal… everything over the last two years has sort of included internationalization. It's a core term in our current and emerging identity as an institution.

**Valued international student voice on campus.** International students are encouraged to bring their perspective to campus in academic and community activities. Moreover, higher education institutions are encouraging faculty to be more aware of international students in classes as a resource and to understand their particular struggles. According to participant 5 (private not-for-profit HEI),

There's always the big college town meeting with the president and the vice presidents hosted by the Student Government Association. It is sort of a big deal. With the [name of
office focused on international activities] and myself, we decided to do our own version of an international student forum. A student brought up this idea, and we thought, ‘We're getting so much good information here; we're going to make up a booklet.’ After a few of these meetings and collect some of flash points of misunderstanding or curiosity. Between this or that culture and this or that classroom. Some of it is amusing. Some of it is insightful. Some of it is maybe just disconcerting. We liked that that came out of a student-based discussion.

Then, when I asked if international students have the opportunity to share their experiences during classes, participant 5 (private not-for-profit HEI) answered,

That is one of our goals and recommendations on the task force, from the task force report. We want to try to make that more systematically available across the board. Making faculty more aware of the international students in their classes as a resource. Without, of course, putting them on the spot. Because you have to be sensitive to where to draw the line.

Participant 7 (private not-for-profit) added,

We've gotten more of our international students hired as RAs in the dorms so that they're in leadership positions. We created a new position on the student government association. They have senior student government status, just like the president, vice president, secretary and whatever, but they are the international student liaison. They serve on executive board of the student government. It's very key and we just created that position two years ago; it's been amazing.

*Enabled next generation to work in an interconnected world.* Internationalization efforts will provide students, who will represent the next generation in the global market, different
approaches on topics that affect the whole world; after all, we live in an interconnected world. This will make it easier for them to make more productive and rational decisions for the benefit of their own nations and the world in which we all live. As stated by participant 2 (private not-for-profit HEI),

Our internationalization area efforts mean that, for example, a nurse who graduates from [name of HEI] will be better capable of working with patients who are from different cultural and national backgrounds. Same with teachers. Same thing across the board, and so I think having an emphasis on internationalization will, in the long run, help our graduates to contribute to their part of the world at least in a more effective way.

Participant 4 (private not-for-profit HEI) complemented that idea saying,

I think the long-term benefits are really very clear. That our students have these experiences, it's gonna increase their capability. Our students who had these experiences will be working abroad, they’ll will be doing business for foreign companies, they’ll work for foreign companies. They’ll live parts of their lives outside the U.S. We have, I think, by educating large numbers of international students, some of whom return to their home countries, others who go on to pursue careers here in the U.S., I think those have also been important social benefits. I think we're also just educating a generation of students who is going to have a much better understanding of the connection between the United States and the rest of the world. And I'm hoping they'll be much more capable of making productive, rational, informed decisions in terms of their own careers but also broader sort of goals for the country as a whole.

*Mentioned only by Public HEIs.*

Only public HEIs mentioned those accomplished perceived outcomes.
Recognized internationalization as one of the priorities, systematically reviewing it. As part of the strategic plan of the institution, internationalization became a priority within the strategic plan of the HEI and they review how the schools are contributing to the priorities, including internationalization, on a regular basis. Participant 1 (public HEI) described it well through these comments,

Of this year and next, we're going to a refresh process of our strategic planning recommendations. So that process, I think, speaks to an outcome where it isn't simply a plan that sits on a shelf, but is actively monitored by the central administration. The first example of which is the refresh process. So I'm now receiving on annual basis reports from each of the schools on how they are or are not contributing to the internationalization priority of the strategic plan. Then I think, finally, this review process I mentioned for the strategic plan where each school has to comment on whether contributing or not to the 10 priorities really has a significant effect on the way in which the campus operates. And holds itself accountable to having evidence of support for priorities that had been established through the strategic planning process.

Provided real world projects for students. In addition to expose students to global themes, higher education institutions went further in their attempt to provide an international experience to their students and offered them the opportunity to work in real world projects. Some of these opportunities include internships in international organizations, and research projects abroad.

Participant 3 (public HEI) expressed, “there’s been an increase in students who’ve done independent study projects outside the U.S. because we do track that. So maybe 40 a year are doing a term-long research project, independent study or a semester, or a summer-long project.”
Participant 6 (public HEI) mentioned, “We now have an initiative .... where we link our students with students at our partner universities, linking them digitally through technology. They work on real-world projects.” Again participant 6 (public HEI) mentioned,

We started a program called [name of the program] in [name of the U.S. city], which means we place students in international organizations in [name of US city] in the spring semester and that program has been a runaway success. We have over 100 students on that program.

*Diversified the body of international students.* Having the opportunity to study in an institution with students from different countries, languages, ethnicities, religions and beliefs will allow the student to keep in contact with different types of people and to learn more about the world. The interaction with people with different backgrounds and ideas during the formative years will certainly have a positive impact in the student’s ability to work in a globalized market. Therefore, the more diversified the institution is, the better for the 21st century student. In this specific category, a diversified body of international students will bring the world to students that might not even have left their own cities. Participant 3 (public HEI) reported that they value having a diversified body of international students because it is also a way their faculty and staff could build intercultural competence. For them, the revenue generated by incoming international students is not the most important as stated in,

We only have 450 international students from 84 countries. On the plus side, here's where I see this as an advantage. We do not do it for the revenue. That's never been on one of our stated goals. So we don't have a high percentage, but we have a very healthy mix of students from 84 different countries and we do a good job of integrating them.

Our [name of program], I think, is a model across the country for how you get involved
with faculty and staff and build their intercultural competence by pairing full-time faculty and staff at the university with international students to get together every other week for coffee or at some other kind of meeting. I think that is a pretty cool program.

*Leveraged institutional strengths through partnerships.* In this category, higher education institutions view partnerships as a way to gain new skills and learn from each other. For instance, participant 1 (public HEI) mentioned that they were able to replicate their experience abroad to improve the conditions in certain areas in the U.S. stating,

> We patrified an idea from our work in [name of country] called [name of program]. We have recognized in [name of US state], of course, that our performance in terms of health indicators is very low and one of the most of this is infant mortality. That is an issue we studied and worked on very hard in [name of country] as part of an HIV/AIDS prevention program. One of the effective techniques in [name of country] was to send a healthcare worker to each village to share information about HIV/AIDS and to talk about how to carry the baby through term and then early to first year of care. We used mobile telephones to send text messages to reinforce the behavior and collect information, any response and we are now adopting that very idea to addressing the infant mortality rate here in one county, the county in [name of US city], which resides in or located in one rural county and receive foundation supporting. I think that's a nice example of a pilot project on the impact that grows out of a partnership that is global or international.

Participant 3 (public HEI) added,

[Our personnel] all have pointed to, in their reports specific ways that experience with a partner has helped them do their job whether they are an admissions person, whether they work in our students accounts office, whether the university arborist spent time talking
with arborists at our partner in [name of country]. They point to how that helped them do their job. Likewise, with faculty who then have those kinds of experiences. They are articulating the difference that it makes for their own work and especially their teaching.

**Recognized internationalization efforts.** This recognition comes in the form of awards given to people working for internationalization as expressed by participant 1 (public HEI),

We have an annual International Festival at which we give out awards for staff and faculty leadership with study abroad. Those awards are highly coveted. We also have a [name of award], which is given to a partner outside the United States who has assisted us in realizing our goals in study abroad. I think all of those public events have some effect on the campus. I also think that the campus newsletter that's put out by the [name of office] regularly has stories of successful international experiences. Then, last but not least, this [name of position on campus] that we have in our staff structure is everyday trying to send the message out through various media about why knowing more about the world is important, and that touches people. I don't know how to measure what it does when it touches people, but the fact that we're making that connection with our audience is noble.

Another way of recognizing internationalization efforts was mentioned by participant 3 (public HEI) when talking about faculty international work,

There's a fear by faculty that their international ed work is not valued in promotion and tenure. It's not written down but because the public statements and writings by president and provost, I think that people do say, ‘Yes, I do value my colleague's work in international ed’, and nobody's ever been denied tenure because they've done too much time doing international ed work and not enough research, for example. So, I do think it
matters. I think people point to what the provost and president are saying and writing about these things and say, ‘Yeah, these are institutional values.’ I hear it all the time that faculty say, ‘Oh, we should do this because it’s an institutional value that I do it’.

**Not-accomplished outcomes**

HEIs also reported the perceived outcomes they did not achieve. Some reported that they still plan to accomplish them in the future, others attested that those outcomes would be hard to accomplish due to lack of resources or interest.

**Common to both public and private not-for-profit HEIs.**

Both types of HEIs mentioned these not-accomplished outcomes.

*To improve data for assessment about internationalization outcomes.* Both HEIs attested that they needed to improve their system to gather more information about internationalization outcomes. Some questions that I posed about internationalization outcomes they simply replied that they did not know the answer because they did not have any assessment on that. When I asked if they were graduating globally competent students, Participant 2 (private not-for-profit HEI) replied, “We feel like we're graduating students who are well-prepared for the global world we live in. But, we don't have a good system in place to assess that yet.” Then, to the question, whether the research collaboration between faculty and students on international topics has increased or not, the answer was “I really don't know the answer to that.” To another question on whether the process of internationalization enhanced the quality of research and increased knowledge production at the institution, the answer was, “I don't have anything concrete to point to, to give an affirmative answer to that question.” Finally, for a question on whether graduated students from the institution were getting jobs abroad, the answer was, I really don’t know an
answer to that.” Also for that question, participant 3 (public HEI) added that they do not measure what kinds of jobs their students get after they graduate.

In reference to the impact of the process of internationalization on students learning outcomes, participant 4 (private-not-profit HEI) replied, “we're still trying to develop an assessment for that.” Then, when asked if the process of internationalization enhanced the international competence and experience of the HEI’s faculty, participant 3 (public HEI) replied, “That’s not something we have tested.”

Lastly, aiming to find out about the overall impact of internationalization, I asked if the institution was able to contribute to countrywide strategic goals such as economic growth, job creation, or social inclusiveness through internationalization. Participant 1 (public HEI) stated, “although universities have economic impact statements, they are rarely tied to international impact however that might be defined. That's the simplest no-we-don't-have-anything-like-that answer.” Participant 3 (public HEI) answered,

I don't know. I honestly…We don't know. I mean, I think it has and I think it has in significant ways … Our university has all kinds of things, the economic benefit of the institution, and jobs, and stuff. But because of internationalization there's no information or data on that.

To increase students’ interest in learning foreign languages. Both HEIs mentioned the lack of interest in learning foreign languages and many participants mentioned that this lack of interest occurs nationwide. Some participants mentioned that the reason for that was that learning a foreign language was not part of the requirement of the majority of programs. Participant 4 (private not-for-profit HEI) stated,
We don't have a requirement at the college that students study foreign languages… We don't have a set of fixed requirements that all students must complete… I'd like to see a deeper commitment there, to be honest. I think it is such a valuable skill.

Then, participant 7 (private not-for-profit HEI) added,

Well, we fall down a little bit on that… the language issue is a hard one, only because our curriculum is so tight anyway, that it's hard to add extra requirements for students, and our students here are not going to take something that is not going to count towards their degree. We've not made foreign language a requirement. We try but there is just very little room in our curriculum across the board to add something like a requirement.

Participant 1 (public HEI) stated,

I would say that there is a decreasing interest across the United States, and it looks like it on our campus. I would say, interest in foreign language, as a whole, is declining because of the commitment and time required to learn a foreign language… I don't think that our students are as interested in foreign language.

Participant 3 (public HEI) complemented,

It's not increased. In fact, language learning is going down slightly, and that is true nationally. You know, the students that do a Bachelor of Arts degree have to do languages, but the other students don't. So, you know, that is not going up. That was never one of our big intentions. To increase language learning. And we knew it's a value but it has not been any particular recommendation from our task force or any of that stuff. For better or worse, we made choices, and that was not one of our top priorities. Though, of course, it's important but we have not seen an increase. I'd be lying if I said we did.
Then, participant 6 (public HEI) answered, “No. I think that is a problem across the country. I mean, we have good strong language departments but they struggle. All of humanities departments across the country are struggling.”

Lastly, participant 8 (public HEI) confirmed, “No, I am afraid we have not seen increases in foreign language enrollment.”

_Mentioned only by Private not-for-profit HEIs._

Only private-not-for-profit HEIs mentioned these not-accomplished perceived outcomes.

_To capitalize in all the ways the relationship with partners._ In addition to establishing long-term relationships with partners, private not-for-profit HEIs also acknowledged the importance of making the most of this relationship in many areas but they did not reach this goal yet. Talking about partnerships, participant 4 (private not-for-profit HEI) stated, “We've been thinking about initiatives that faculty from both schools could work on but we haven't yet pursued that; that is one of the things we hope to accomplish in the future.”

Then, when I asked whether the partnership provided new skill sets to them, participant 5 (private not-for-profit HEI) replied,

Oh, well, in terms of the [name of university] one, I would say that will happen soon. I don't think it happened previously. It was set up, and every year the students were exchanged, and so, and the students had a good experience. But I don't think the university otherwise capitalized in all the ways it could have on the exchange.

_To diversify the body of international students._ Private not-for-profit HEIs also have acknowledged the importance of having a diversified body of international students and they are pursuing that goal as stated by participant 2 (private not-for-profit HEI): “We're trying to get more diversity [on incoming international students]. It is mostly Saudi Arabia and China right
now and we can't sustain that. That’s not going to continue forever, and so we're working on other areas.”

Participant 7 (private not-for-profit HEI) also showed that they need more diversity in their incoming international students,

So we had to have a lot of conversation about, first of all, who are we counting when we say we need to do better at diversity enrollment and recruitment? Then, let's look at the international student population from a farther diversity lens. While I was over the international student operation, when I looked at 80% of our international student population in 2014. They were all from Asia. China, basically. So, I was saying, there's a diversity conversation that needs to happen within the diversity conversation if you have 80% of your international student population from one region of the world - and that's no different than any other college across the country. But we can do better. We can be a little bit more intentional about what that looks like. And so, it was the kind of things where the policies and some of these conversations around practice and policies were uncomfortable… I think we need to do a better job of diversifying where our students are coming from. Now, I'm working a lot with our development office so that we can create more scholarships for international students, so that we can be more diverse, and we can look at Latin America, we can look at Africa we can look at the Caribbean, and throughout the diaspora. So, we have a better job to do in that regard, on the inbound. But this year with international admissions, we don't have a problem; the only problem is that we should be more diverse in terms of where they're coming from.

*Mentioned only by Public HEIs.*

Only public HEIs mentioned this not-accomplished perceived outcome.
To create stronger international collaborative research groups. As another benefit from partnerships, public HEIs mentioned they needed to create stronger international collaborative research groups as identified by Participant 1 (public HEI),

We're trying to pursue this through our partnerships. This is a priority right now on our Chinese partnerships that we are convening our groups of like-minded scholars, with a small grant, to talk about increasing the amount of collaborative research. So, it's a priority. It's growing. In fact, there is less evidence than I would like of research product coming from international collaboration.
**Third research question discussion**

In an effort to associate the accomplished outcomes with the phases of the internationalization cycle, I created Table 18.

Table 18

*Accomplished outcomes and the internationalization cycle*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internationalization cycle phases</th>
<th>Accomplished outcomes</th>
<th>Private NFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>. Centralized</td>
<td>. Turned internationalization into a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>internationalization</td>
<td>common vision and purpose on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. Empowered staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>working with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>internationalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. Encouraged faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>internationalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activities</td>
<td>. Provided real world projects for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>. Developed a new</td>
<td>. Diversified the body of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vision about</td>
<td>international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>partnerships</td>
<td>. Leveraged institutional strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>through partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operationalize</td>
<td>. Increased students’</td>
<td>. Valued international student voice on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opportunities to learn</td>
<td>campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>about global issues</td>
<td>. Enabled next generation to work in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an interconnected world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. Motivated students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to study abroad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. Took steps to combat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parochialism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>. Recognized internationalization as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>one of the priorities, systematically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reviewing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcement</td>
<td>. Recognized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>internationalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considering the accomplished outcomes perceived by the participants, it was clear that public HEIs were more advanced in the cycle of the process of internationalization than private not-for-profit HEIs. Public HEIs mentioned accomplished outcomes that could be associated with phases five (review) and six (reinforcement) of the internationalization cycle, while private not-for-profit HEIs mentioned accomplished outcomes associated only until phase four (operationalization). For instance, public HEIs reported that since internationalization has become a priority within the strategic plan of the institution, they review how the schools are contributing to internationalization on a regular basis. This systematic review is part of phase 5 of the internationalization cycle. In addition, public HEIs reported that they recognize internationalization efforts through awards given to people working for internationalization, which is the reinforcement phase in the internationalization cycle.

Taking into account the four levels of analysis to assess outcomes of internationalization explained by Hudzik (2015), the outcomes reported by participants belong to levels one or two of analysis. They focused on the outcomes for students and other institutional stakeholders (level one) such as increasing students’ opportunities to learn about global issues, empowering staff working with internationalization, and encouraging faculty to support internationalization activities. In addition, they focused on the individual higher education institution outcomes (level two) such as developing a new vision about partnerships, and leveraging institutional strengths through partnerships. Levels three (national level) and four (global and supra-national) outcomes were not mentioned. A reflection on level three or four outcomes would have added strength to the value of internationalization for the institution and would have allowed stakeholders to make a better assessment whether they should continue investing in the process.
However, some participants expressed that to evaluate level three or four outcomes they would need to improve their assessment tools.

Examining the results, public HEIs mentioned more accomplished perceived outcomes than private not-for-profit HEIs.

Both types of HEIs mentioned seven common accomplished perceived outcomes then, another three were mentioned only by private not-for-profit HEIs, and another five were mentioned only by public HEIs. Still there are some interesting remarks made by the participants about those outcomes.

Centralization of internationalization activities in an office was considered very important for the progress of the process, but beyond that, some participants emphasized that the position of the person coordinating all those activities, the senior international officer, must be subordinated to the Provost or to the President and not to a Dean of a specific school. That organizational structure will signal to the entire campus how committed to internationalization the institution is and will provide support to the senior international officer in organizing the entire process of internationalization around campus. This is important to promote “an integrating structure to hold everything together and make it work” as stated by participant 4 (private not-for-profit HEI).

In addition to motivating students to study abroad, participant 5 (private not-for-profit HEI) stated that the institution needs to establish learning goals for international engagement in the classroom, outside the classroom and for study abroad programs. As stated by participant 5, it must be clear “what students should be getting out if it.”
Combating parochialism is so important that two universities (one public and one private not-for-profit) cited that they declared the following academic year (2018-19) as the year of the immigrant and intend to promote various events around it.

Both types of HEIs reported they were being strategic with their partnerships, choosing them very carefully. However, while private not-for-profit HEIs referred to that strategy when they talked about the new partnerships they were planning to create, public HEIs referred to that strategy when they talked about their process of reviewing partnerships, making clear that they were only selecting the meaningful ones and excluding the not so meaningful ones.

In addition to turning internationalization into a common vision and purpose on campus, participant 5 (private not-for-profit HEI) mentioned that the institution must think more systematically about internationalization, creating, for example, a space, such as a website, where everybody could see what is being done in terms of internationalization around campus.

Participant 4 (private not-for-profit HEI) also added to the mentioned outcome of valuing international student voice on campus, stating that institutions should take advantage of international students on campus, allowing them to share their cultures, and should take advantage of domestic students who come back from a study abroad, allowing them to share their experiences.

As part of the reviewing process of internationalization, participant 8 (public HEI) mentioned that the revenue generated by international students goes into the general revenue pile, so it is not ear-marked specifically for internationalization activities on campus and it would be a good idea if that could change.
Both types of HEIs mentioned two common not-accomplished perceived outcomes, then another two were mentioned only by private not-for-profit HEIs, and another one was mentioned only by public HEIs.

Reflecting on the lack of interest in learning foreign languages verified at both types and examining the data about the duration of study abroad programs for academic credits for U.S students presented by Open Doors (Institute of International Education (IIE), 2017); the need to implement internationalization on American campuses becomes even more urgent. Since the academic year 2005/06, among the U.S. students who went abroad every year for academic credits, approximately 97 percent stayed short-term (summer or eight weeks or less), or mid-length (one semester, or one or two quarters), and only approximately 3 percent stayed long-term (academic or calendar year). The longer the exposure to other cultures, the better the students learn how to become global citizens, an essential skill in this century. Therefore, if U.S. students are not getting that exposure abroad, they need to be in contact with other cultures at least inside their own institutions, otherwise they will end up unprepared to face this century’s challenges. It was very encouraging to know that this lack of exposure is being somewhat offset by an increase in students’ opportunities to learn about global issues on campus such as global learning courses, majors focusing on global themes, and discussions about global issues in classes.

The lack of data to assess more internationalization outcomes mentioned by both types of HEIs was also disturbing, as this will affect the progress of the internationalization process on campus. Assessing outcomes would allow stakeholders to evaluate if it is worthwhile investing resources in internationalization. Some HEIs mentioned that although they thought it was important to assess the outcomes, they did not know how to do that, especially assessing level
three or four outcomes. Therefore, a good area for future research would be to develop a measurement to help HEIs assessing all levels of outcomes.

While public HEIs mentioned that their partnerships leveraged their institutional strengths, and at that moment, they were trying to create stronger international collaborative research groups, private not-for-profit HEIs mentioned that they still needed to capitalize in all the ways the relationship with partners. Private not-for-profit HEIs mentioned that through those partnerships they could exchange experiences and improve the skill sets of both institutions personnel, involve more faculty in research and allow more students to work in research. Participant 5 (private not-for-profit) revealed that many universities from several countries contacted them to build new partnerships but they did not have the wherewithal to convert that interest into some type of formal affiliation. In the future, they are planning to do that and to build meaningful partnerships for both sides. American HEIs could also create partnerships aiming to increase their reputation, visibility, and ranking.

Moreover, while public HEIs mentioned that they have already diversified their body of international students, private not-for-profit HEIs are still pursuing that goal. Both recognized the importance of diversifying the body of international students. This would be another opportunity that U.S students would have to be in contact with other cultures and to learn more about the world to become global citizens in the future. Nevertheless, this opportunity has to be valued. Students from different cultures cannot stay in their own niches avoiding the interaction with each other. Combating parochialism is a good way pointed out by both HEIs to break out of the American-centric mindset and to promote activities on campus and around the community to promote the integration between international and domestic students as well as between international students and the community. Another way pointed out by private not-for-profit
HEIs was to value international student voice on campus. Encouraging international students to speak up and to show their perspectives in academic and community activities will also allow U.S students to learn more about the world.

In the beginning of each interview, I asked participants to what extent (on a scale of 1 to 5) each one of the six areas of CIGE’s model for comprehensive internationalization had been a focus of their institution’s internationalization efforts, and what their institution’s internationalization efforts in each area were. The purpose of these questions was to remind them about the CIGE’s model and to build rapport with them, letting them talk a bit about each area. On average, public and private not-for-profit HEIs evaluated each area of CIGE’s model as follows:

Table 19

| Focus of public and private-not-for-profit HEIs on each area of CIGE’s model |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                  | Articulated institutional commitment | Adm. structure and staffing | Curriculum, co-curriculum and learning outcomes | Faculty policies and practices | Student mobility | Collaboration and partnerships |
| Public                           | 3.5             | 3.75            | 3               | 3               | 3.5             | 4.25            |
| Private not-for-profit           | 5               | 3.25            | 4               | 3.75            | 4.38            | 3.63            |

It was clear that public HEIs felt that their strongest area at that moment was “collaboration and partnerships”, while private not-for-profit HEIs felt that “articulated institutional commitment” was the strongest one.

Finally, examining all of the accomplished and not-accomplished outcomes presented by the participants, I noticed that some themes were more stressed by participants when they were reporting their experiences with internationalization. Among the accomplished outcomes, the
most stressed theme was “encouraged faculty to support internationalization activities”.
Participants from both types of HEIs were very enthusiastic in reporting how their institutions were able to help faculty to embrace the idea of internationalization and how important that was for the progress of the process of internationalization. In fact, Knight (1994a) pointed out that the support of faculty is among the most critical factors to keep the internationalization cycle spinning, and conscious of that, participants emphasized that theme and were eager to report how they have accomplished it. Among the not-accomplished outcomes, the most stressed one was “to improve data for assessment about internationalization outcomes”. All participants were conscious that they needed to improve data in that area, but emphasized that they did not have the tools or the resources for it. After all, to enhance the process of internationalization, higher education institutions need to gather more information about the outcomes in order to justify the investment in the process.

These results are the perspectives of those I could interview for about one hour. Maybe they could have mentioned more accomplished or not-accomplished outcomes if I had interviewed them for more time or more than once, but that was not feasible. Lastly, I think they have provided precious insights about internationalization outcomes in American HEIs.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

Examining the research questions

In the first research question, I wanted to investigate the main distinctions between public and private not-for-profit HEIs according to the outputs of internationalization in 2011 and 2016. Examining the six categories of CIGE’s Model for Comprehensive Internalization, I found several distinctions between not only the two types of HEIs but also across 2011 and 2016 using descriptive analysis.

In the second research question, I wanted to find out the categories of CIGE’s Model for Comprehensive Internationalization that exerted the most influence on the perceived level of internationalization in public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016. I used two procedures to examine that question. In the first one, I created standardized composite variables (or indexes) adding all variables that belonged to the same category and then I ran ordered logistic regressions separately for public and private-not-for-profits in 2011 and 2016. For the second procedure, I decided to perform a principal component analysis to reduce the risk of multicollinearity among the 119 independent variables, and then I ran a principal component analysis for each category separately and for each public or private not-for-profit datasets in 2011 and 2016. I created a single index for each category by estimating a factor score and this factor score was the standardized weighted average of all the items in each category, which I used as an index to represent each category. In the end, I ran ordered logistic regressions with just these factor scores separately for public and private-not-for-profits in 2011 and 2016. I found different results for public and private not-for-profit HEIs in both 2011 and 2016 in each procedure. Also, the procedures presented some differences in the results.
Considering the most stringent alpha level of .001, in the first procedure, “articulated institutional commitment”, “faculty policies and practices”, and “student mobility” indexes exerted the most influence on the perceived level of internationalization in public HEIs in 2011, but only “articulated institutional commitment” exerted that influence in 2016. For private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011, “administrative structure and staffing”, and “student mobility” indexes exerted the most influence on the perceived level of internationalization, while in 2016 only student mobility exerted that influence. This result for private-not-profit HEIs was unexpected because Knight (1994a) considered “articulated institutional commitment” as one of the most critical factors to keep the internationalization cycle spinning.

However, in the second procedure, “articulated institutional commitment” emerged as one of the indexes that exerted the most influence on the perceived level of internationalization in both public and private-not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016 at the .01 level and at the .001 level, except in one case (private not-for-profit HEIs in 2016 at .001 level). Once again, considering the most stringent alpha level of .001, in the second procedure, “articulated institutional commitment”, “faculty policies and practices”, and “student mobility” indexes exerted the most influence on the perceived level of internationalization in public HEIs in 2011, but only “articulated institutional commitment” and “student mobility” exerted that influence in 2016. For private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011, “articulated institutional commitment” and “administrative structure and staffing” indexes exerted the most influence on the perceived level of internationalization, while in 2016 only “student mobility” exerted that influence.

It is interesting to note that “student mobility” also emerged as one of the indexes that exerted the most influence on the perceived level of internationalization in both public and private-not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016 at the .01 level and at the .001 level. That was not
the case only in two situations: public HEIs in 2016 at .001 level (first procedure) and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 at .001 level (second procedure). Another noteworthy point is that the “collaboration and partnerships” index emerged only once at public HEIs in 2016 at .01 level. In 2016 Mapping survey, this category had several new questions that I could not use because they were not present in 2011 Mapping survey. So, maybe with the inclusion of more common variables in the “collaboration and partnerships” index between 2016 and 2021 Mapping surveys, that index will be statistically highly significant and a positive predictor of the perceived level of internationalization in both public and private-not-for-profit HEIs.

Lastly, it was encouraging to find that both of the 2011 and 2016 Mapping surveys showed that several indexes exerted influence on the perceived level of internationalization in both public and private-not-for-profit HEIs, and “student mobility” was not the only index highlighted when respondents thought of internationalization.

In the third research question, I interviewed eight key campus officers to find out the perceived outcomes of internationalization for public and private not-for-profit HEIs. Just as many years ago, efforts have been made to move from the rhetoric of internationalization to the actual implementation of these ideas on campuses around the world (Rodenberg, 2010), I made an effort to move from the rhetoric of outcomes of internationalization to the actual identification of those outcomes on campuses in the U.S. This was an attempt to find real data and no longer rely on anecdotal evidence to make assumptions about outcomes of internationalization as mentioned by Hudzik (2015). In addition, Beerkens (2010) stated that the reason ACE undertook the surveys about internationalization on U.S. HEIs was that “there were no national data available on campus internationalization strategies. There was ‘proof by anecdote’ and many
calls to action, but no data about the extent to which campuses were engaged in different internationalization practices and strategies” (p. 33).

Therefore, paraphrasing Green as quoted in Fischer (2008, p. A24), this investigation about the outcomes of internationalization “isn’t about the talk, it is about the walk” in an underexplored area of internationalization. I counted on the expertise of my participants to start this new exploratory research in the field of internationalization.

Participants reported what their institutions accomplished or not in terms of outcomes. Public HEIs mentioned more accomplished perceived outcomes than private not-for-profit HEIs. Both types of HEIs mentioned seven common accomplished perceived outcomes: “centralized internationalization activities”; “empowered staff working with internationalization”; “increased students’ opportunities to learn about global issues”; “encouraged faculty to support internationalization activities”; “motivated students to study abroad”; “took steps to combat parochialism”; and “developed a new vision about partnerships.”

Three accomplished perceived outcomes were mentioned only by private not-for-profit HEIs: “turned internationalization into a common vision and purpose on campus”; “valued international student voice on campus”; and “enabled next generation to work in an interconnected world.” Another five were mentioned only by public HEIs: “recognized internationalization as one of the priorities, systematically reviewing it”; “provided real world projects for students”, “diversified the body of international students”; “leveraged institutional strengths through partnerships”; and “recognized internationalization efforts.”

On the other hand, both types of HEIs mentioned two common not-accomplished perceived outcomes: “to improve data for assessment about internationalization outcomes”, and “to increase students’ interest in learning foreign languages.” Two not-accomplished perceived
outcomes were mentioned only by private not-for-profit HEIs: “to capitalize in all the ways the relationship with partners”, and “to diversify the body of international students”. Finally, only one not-accomplished perceived outcome was mentioned by public HEIs: “to create stronger international collaborative research groups.”

Furthermore, looking at the perceived accomplished outcomes from the perspective of the phases of the internationalization cycle (Knight, 1994a); public HEIs were more advanced in the cycle of the process of internationalization than private not-for-profit HEIs. Public HEIs mentioned accomplished outcomes that could be associated with phases five (review) and six (reinforcement) of the internationalization cycle, while private not-for-profit HEIs mentioned accomplished outcomes associated only until phase four (operationalization).

Finally, examining the four levels of analysis to assess outcomes of internationalization explained by Hudzik (2015), participants reported outcomes from levels one (students and other institutional stakeholders) and two (individual higher education institution) of analysis. None of the participants mentioned levels three (national level) and four (global and supra-national) outcomes.

**Inputs and outcomes**

As mentioned earlier in this study, social and economic differences between private and public American HEIs produce different inputs for internationalization. I assumed that different inputs would lead to different outcomes. However, it is worth noting that outcomes are related to overall achievements and cannot be directly linked to one activity or action, as it is not clear which one caused it (Deardorff, 2005). Therefore, there is not a direct link between an input and an outcome.
Considering the differences in the four areas presented by White (2003), I will examine below whether those different inputs led to different outcomes for private and public American HEIs.

**Governance**

In terms of governance, I have assumed that as governors or the governor and legislative leaders select board members of public HEIs, board members of public HEIs would be more susceptible to changes in government and political scenario and to changes that might occur every time a new gubernatorial term begins than board members of private HEIs. Therefore, these changes in the leadership might cause changes in the process of internationalization or even the interruption of the process if the new leadership decides to focus on other issues, and public HEIs would be more susceptible to these changes than private HEIs.

That still might be the case, but in my study, I found only one case where a drastic change in the process of internationalization occurred after a change in the leadership of the HEI. The process was advancing well but when the new leadership took over, they decided that internationalization would not be a priority anymore and cut the budget for several activities. The political scenario of the U.S. has changed and that change in the process of internationalization happened in a public HEI, but with just one case, I cannot affirm that public HEIs in general would be more susceptible to changes in government and political scenario than private HEIs. It would be interesting to examine in the future more public and private American HEIs before and after this change in the political scenario to find out how the political scenario affected the process of internationalization and whether public HEIs were more affected than private HEIs.
Legal Distinction

In terms of legal distinction, I assumed that public HEIs would find it harder to create new administrative structures and to hire new personnel specialized to fulfill the needs of internationalization activities than private HEIs, because public HEIs must hire and fire employees according to specific procedures of the state personnel laws. Therefore, public HEIs would have less flexibility than private HEIs and would have to work with the personnel they already had which sometimes could be underprepared to deal with internationalization issues. On the other hand, if they already created a well-equipped structure focused on internationalization issues, it would be harder to dismantle it. During my interviews, I found that private-not-for-profit HEIs were less advanced in the internationalization cycle than public HEIs, and those private-not-for-profit HEIs were still creating new administrative structures and hiring new personnel to fulfill the needs of internationalization activities, while the interviewed public HEIs already had created that structure. In the results of my first question, I also found that a higher percentage of public HEIs than the percentage of private-not-for-profit HEIs reported having a committee or task force working to promote internationalization on campus in both 2011 and 2016. Moreover, in 2016 a higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs reported that they were conducting their international activities without a leading office compared to the percentage of public HEIs that reported the same. Lastly, the percentage of public HEIs having a full-time administrator overseeing or coordinating multiple international activities and programs was higher than the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs having this full-time administrator in both 2011 and 2016.

In sum, a higher percentage of public HEIs reported having administrative structures with specialized personnel to take care of the internationalization activities than the percentage of
private not-for-profit HEIs, so it seems public HEIs were able to deal well with the specific procedures of the state personnel laws. But I could not find out if it was harder for public HEIs to create those administrative structures and to hire specialized personnel in internationalization activities than it was for private HEIs, and if it would be harder for public HEIs to dismantle their structure, if needed.

**Size**

In terms of size, I assumed that small class sizes found in private institutions could facilitate the integration of international students, but also might be composed of a homogeneous group of students who never had contact with people from different backgrounds and ideas. On the other hand, huge class sizes found in public institutions could present more heterogeneity among its students, which could give international students a better chance to be welcomed and well integrated. In my interviews, public HEIs mentioned that they have already diversified their body of international students, while private not-for-profit HEIs are still pursuing that goal. With huge class sizes and a diversified body of international students, public HEIs could have more heterogeneity among their students, giving international students a better chance to be welcomed and well integrated. On the hand, in the results of my first question, I found that a higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs compared with the percentage of public HEIs offered program or support services to international students in both 2011 and 2016. Those services included individualized academic support, orientation to the United States and the local community, orientation to the institution and/or the U.S. classroom, institutional advisory committee of international students, international alumni services and/or chapters, and host-family programs for international students.
Therefore, it seems that, even with small classes that might have a homogeneous group of students, a higher percentage of private-for-profit HEIs compared with the percentage of public HEIs are also making every effort to integrate international students into the community by offering them several program or support services.

**Revenue base**

Finally, in terms of revenue base, student tuition and fees constituted the largest percentage of total revenues at private not-for-profit HEIs (39.5 percent) in the academic year 2015-16, and private-not-for-profit HEIs became more dependent on tuitions and fees in 2015-16 comparing with the academic year 2010-11 (29 percent). Therefore, I assumed that this increase in dependency of tuition and fees could have motivated private for-profit HEIs to engage in more internationalization activities and to recruit more international students to their institutions than public HEIs, as the majority of international students pays full tuition. In fact, comparing 2016 with 2011 in several areas, private-not-for-profit HEIs engaged in more internationalization activities than public HEIs. For instance, a higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs than the percentage of public HEIs provided funding to faculty and staff for activities related to internationalization and to recruit full-time degree-seeking international undergraduate and graduate students, provided programs or support services to international students, and initiated partnerships for the first time or expanded their partnerships. In addition, a higher percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs than the percentage of public HEIs, reported that international or global education was among their top five priorities, and that they had a strategic international student plan with enrollment targets. On the other hand, it is important to notice that although the percentage of student tuition and fees contributing to the total revenue at public HEIs did not increase much in 2015-16 compared to 2010-11 (19 percent to 21 percent), the total
amount of student tuition and fees increased from $61.56 billion to $118.23 billion. As international students make significant contributions to tuitions and fees, definitely public HEIs interest in engaging in more internationalization activities and in recruiting more international students did not decrease.

**Quantitative strand versus qualitative strand**

Comparing the results of the quantitative strand with the qualitative strand, I found some interesting points.

**Lack of data**

Cited as a not-accomplished outcome by both types of HEIs in the qualitative strand, “the lack of data to assess more internationalization outcomes” was confirmed by the results of the first question when a lower percentage in both types of HEIs reported formally assessing the impact of internationalization efforts from 2011 to 2016. Not assessing the outcomes of internationalization will produce serious consequences for the progress of the internationalization process on campus. On the other hand, public and private not-for-profit HEIs expressed how important commitment to internationalization was in the results of both procedures of the second research question. Both types of HEIs showed that the “articulated institutional commitment” index was a very important driver of overall perceived internationalization level in 2011 and 2016.

**Centralization**

Both types of HEIs reported in the qualitative strand that they managed to centralize all internationalization activities on campus, and examining the results of the first question, in 2016, 64.89 percent of public HEIs and 59.96 percent of private not-for-profit HEIs had a full-time administrator overseeing or coordinating multiple international activities and programs.
However, also in 2016, 31.83 percent of public HEIs and 40.40 percent of private not-for-profit HEIs reported that were conducting their international activities without a leading office. Knight (1994a) considered the existence of an international office or position with experienced personnel one of the most critical factors for the progress of the process of internationalization, so it was a good sign that the majority of both types of HEIs had a full-time administrator overseeing or coordinating multiple international activities and programs in 2016. In fact, creating an administrative structure to coordinate the internationalization activities on campus facilitates the progress of the process. This was expressed, in particular, by private not-profit HEIs in 2011 when the first and second procedure results of the second research question showed that the “administrative structure and staffing” index was considered a major driver for the overall perceived internationalization level.

**Support to staff**

Both types of HEIs celebrated as an accomplished outcome the support given to staff members working with internationalization issues. The results of the first question corroborated that finding, showing that a larger percentage of both types of HEIs provided specific funding for activities related to internationalization to their staff members from 2011 to 2016.

**Opportunities for students to learn about global issues**

“Increasing students’ opportunities to learn about global issues” was also an accomplished outcome mentioned in the interviews by both types of HEIs. In fact, the results of the first question showed that both types of HEIs offered those opportunities through globally-oriented co-curriculum programs or activities for undergraduates such as meeting places for students interested in international topics. The percentage of public HEIs offering meeting places for students interested in international topics for undergraduates increased from 41.70 percent in
2011 to 58.27 percent in 2016, while the percentage of private not-for-profit HEIs offering the same activity increased from 40.83 percent in 2011 to 55.85 percent in 2016. On the other hand, examining the results of the second research question, public and private not-for-profit HEIs did not express that the “curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes” index was a driver of overall perceived internationalization level in any of the cases.

Parochialism combat

Both types of HEIs mentioned in the interviews how they had been struggling to break out of an American-centric mindset on their campuses and how they accomplished to combat parochialism. The results of the first question showed that the percentage of both types of HEIs offering programs to integrate U.S. and international undergraduates increased from 2011 to 2016. Examples of those programs were buddy programs that paired U.S. and international students to help integrate students socially, language partner programs that paired U.S. and international students, and residence halls with special programs designed to facilitate the integration of U.S. and international students.

Lack of interest in learning foreign languages

Both HEIs in the qualitative strand mentioned that there was a lack of interest in learning foreign languages in their institutions and some HEIs felt that the reason for this non-accomplished outcome was that learning a foreign language was not part of the requirement of the majority of programs. Curiously, the results of the first question showed a different scenario. In 2016, 62.36 percent of public HEIs and 69.25 percent of private-not-for-profit reported having a foreign language graduate requirement for undergraduates. The quantitative strand showed that a large number of HEIs have a foreign language graduate requirement for undergraduates, but that cannot be translated into interest. Most participants I interviewed affirmed that students did
not show interest in learning foreign languages. Thus, perhaps, they would fulfill the requirement but would not show a real interest in the matter by continuing to study the language to reach proficiency level.

**Support to faculty**

Encouraging faculty to incorporate global issues in their courses, training faculty in global issues workshops, tying tenure, promotion, assessment and performance to internationalization issues, creating campus-wide faculty internationalization awards, and motivating them to lead study programs abroad were some examples mentioned in the interviews by both types of HEIs of how they managed to encourage faculty to support internationalization activities. In fact, according to the results of my first question, a higher percentage of both types of HEIs provided funding to faculty for internationalization activities such as teaching at institutions abroad, leading students on study abroad programs, and studying and conducting research abroad in 2016 compared with 2011. In addition, a higher percentage of both types of HEIs provided to faculty workshops on global learning and opportunities to improve their foreign languages skills in 2016 compared with 2011.

Lastly, a very small percentage of both types of HEIs public and private not-for-profit HEIs reported having guidelines specifying international work or experience for faculty promotion and tenure in 2011 and 2016 as mentioned in the interviews.

Although only public HEIs mentioned that they recognized internationalization efforts in the interviews, 20.49 percent of public HEIs and 10.93 percent of private not-for-profit HEIs provided recognition awards to faculty for international activity in 2016.

In fact, examining the results of the first procedure (at the .01 level) of the second research question, the “faculty policies and practices” index was a consistent driver of the overall
perceived internationalization level for public and private not-for-profit HEIs in 2011 and 2016. Again, in the second procedure of the second research question, public and private-not-for-profit HEIs considered the “faculty policies and practices” index an important driver of the overall perceived internationalization level in 2011.

**International student voice**

Only private not-for-profit HEIs in the interviews mentioned that they valued international student voice on campus by encouraging them to bring their perspective to campus in academic and community activities. Examining the results of my first question in 2016, 81.51 percent of public HEIs and 86.79 percent of private not-for-profit HEIs promoted regular and ongoing international festivals or events on campus, which are an excellent opportunity for international students to express their cultures. In addition, 25.67 percent of public HEIs and 28.74 percent of private not-for-profit HEIs created institutional advisory committees of international students, which allow international students to discuss their problems and to propose solutions. Examining the results of the second research question, the “student mobility” index was the most consistent driver of the overall perceived internationalization level among all other indexes for both types of HEIs in 2011 and 2016.

**Selection of partnerships**

Finally, both types of HEIs reported in their interviews that they were being strategic with their partnerships, choosing very carefully them. In fact, in 2016, only 10.32 percent of public HEIs and 10.24 percent of private not-for-profit HEIs started partnerships for the first time. However, in 2016, 45.37 percent of public HEIs and 49.80 percent of private not-for-profit HEIs expanded the number of their partnerships. The expansion of collaboration and partnerships at American HEIs will certainly turn it into an important driver of the overall
perceived internationalization level in the future. So far, examining the results of the second research question, the “collaboration and partnerships” index was relevant only for public HEIs in 2016 (second procedure at .01 level).

The next Mapping Internationalization survey in 2021 and Mapping Internationalization survey 2016 might present a higher number of common variables, so future research could use more variables for a richer analysis, in particular, in the category Collaboration and Partnerships.

**Strengths and Limitations**

This study has its strengths and limitations. Examining the large amount of data collected in Mapping Internationalization surveys through a quantitative approach allowed me to summarize and compare data from different years. On the other hand, findings using a quantitative strand did not provide an in-depth and detailed perception of the problem, so I also chose to use a qualitative strand. In fact, quantitative methods are intended to achieve breadth of understanding and they place major emphasis on generalizability (ensuring that the knowledge gained is representative of the population from which the sample was drawn), while qualitative methods are, for the most part, intended to achieve depth of understanding (Morse & Niehaus, 2009).

My quantitative strand analysis was limited to the common variables I found between Mapping Internationalization 2011 and 2016 surveys. Although I could use 120 variables (one dependent and 119 independent), both surveys had more variables that I did not analyze. In particular, I could not use several new questions that were added in the category Collaboration and Partnerships in 2016 because they were not present in 2011 and my goal was to perform a comparison between both years. In addition, the exact definition of partnerships was not provided in 2011 and 2016 Mapping surveys and respondents answered based on their own
perceptions. Participants on both surveys were presidents, chief academic officers, chief international officers, and institutional research directors of U.S. postsecondary institutions. This means that all participants could provide updated information about all aspects of internationalization throughout their campuses, but for some a few memorandum of understanding (MOU) might be a sign of partnerships and for others only meaningful and long-term relationships would count.

As all my independent variables were dichotomous, if more than 10 percent of the values were missing in a variable, I decided to use the mode to fill in the otherwise missing values. Whilst this is a simple and computationally quick approach, it can lead to poor performance from the resulting models.

Choosing a purposive sample based on the participation in the ACE’s previous internationalization laboratories for the qualitative analysis had several advantages but also disadvantages. The main advantage was that I could reach the targeted sample faster, allowing me to choose participants based on specific characteristics defined by my study’s purpose. I wanted to study HEIs in the U.S. with experience in the process of internationalization. In addition, I needed to interview a person with a comprehensive vision of this process of internationalization in each institution, so limiting my sample to key campus officers saved me time, money and effort, and produced a sample representative of the particular population I was studying. On the other hand, the results depended on the judgement of the chosen key campus officers and might have included high levels of bias.

It is valid to note that I interviewed only key campus officers from public and private not-for-profit HEIs that participated in the internationalization laboratory since 2012. All of them have been working for several years - some for more than 30 years - in the field of
internationalization in prominent positions, and they were all enthusiastic about the topic.

Therefore, that might have prompted them to report only the positive outcomes of internationalization. In order to reduce that bias I focused my attention to what their institutions have or have not accomplished and not simply to what the outcomes were. As in every process, the institution needs to face challenges and risks in order to implement the process of internationalization and it is normal that when someone is working so enthusiastically to implement that process with success, he/she ends up seeing only the benefits and the opportunities that comes with it. On the other hand, with so many years in the field, those key campus officers were well aware of those challenges and risks and did not refuse to report what their institutions have not accomplished. They also listed some reasons for why their institutions have not accomplished certain points such a lack of assessment in that area, a cut in the budget, a change in the senior administration priority, or a lack of time. In sum, I did not ask what the positive or negative outcomes were because probably I would have a bias, but I focused on what the accomplished or not-accomplished outcomes were to reduce that bias.

Finally, although the qualitative strand of this study had a limited number of participants, they were all experts in the field of internationalization who were able to make a great contribution for my research. Moreover, participants reported only level one (students and other institutional stakeholders) and level two (individual higher education institution) outcomes. They did not mention any level three (national level) or level four (global and supra-national) outcomes, which limited the results. Time constraints for this research process also limited the analysis.
Implications for practice, research and policy

In examining the outputs and outcomes of the process of internationalization, this study has implications for practice, research and policy. In terms of practice, this research will allow senior administrators of different types of HEIs to understand better why they should commit to internationalization based on what other institutions have accomplished. Sometimes practitioners might get overwhelmed with day-to-day internationalization activities and do not pay attention to the final results of their work. But if they want to see the progress of internationalization on campus, they must present clear and higher level reasons to justify the continued investment on the process of internationalization. Therefore, I hope that this study makes all types of American HEIs aware that they need to reflect on outcomes and to collect more data about them, especially level three and four ones in a systematic way.

In terms of research, this study helped to advance the field of internationalization by focusing on institutional level outcomes, which are less studied, and not on individual level outcomes, which are more studied. Moreover, data about outcomes collected during this study could be part of a systematic data to verify the number of outcomes of this process mentioned by Hudzik (2015). In addition, examining outputs of internationalization disaggregated by type of institutional control (public and private not-for-profit) brought a new perspective to the study of outcomes.

According to IIE (2017), fewer international students are coming to the U.S. due to changes in the immigration policies, increases in higher education costs, and competition from countries like Canada, United Kingdom and Australia. In addition, as stated by participant 6 (public HEI) “there is a chilling effect because of the Homeland Security and the whole changes in the visa” that is affecting the interest of international students to come to the U.S. In fact, the
number of international students enrolling for the first time at an American HEI began to flatten in fall 2015. Starting in fall 2015, new international student enrollment slowed to 2.4 percent growth, and in fall 2016 declined for the first time since Open Doors began reporting this data in 2004/05. Then, in fall 2017, institutions reported a decline in new enrollment by 6.9 percent. At the same time, NAFSA (2017) reported that the 1,078,822 international students studying at American HEIs contributed $36.9 billion and supported more than 450,000 jobs to the U.S. economy during the 2016-2017 academic year in addition to the immeasurable academic and cultural value these students brought to American campuses and local communities.

International student recruitment is an important part of the process of internationalization, but comprehensive internationalization covers many more areas that also contribute to the enhancement of the U.S. educational system and economy. Therefore, in terms of policy, this study could encourage government to create policies open to internationalization that will benefit the entire academic community thereby preparing them for global demands.

Future research and recommendations

The next Mapping Internationalization survey in 2021 and Mapping Internationalization survey 2016 might present a higher number of common variables, so future research could use more variables for a richer analysis, in particular, in the category Collaboration and Partnerships.

Mapping Internationalization 2011 and 2016 surveys were interested in the opinion of presidents, chief academic officers, chief international officers, and institutional research directors of U.S. postsecondary institutions. Other surveys could evaluate the opinion of students, staff, and faculty about the same topics at the same institutions and then compare the results.
Moreover, future surveys about internationalization could include Likert scale response options to capture the intensity of participants’ feelings for a given item. Not requiring the participant to answer yes or no, would not force her/him to take a stand in a particular topic and would accommodate her/her neutral or undecided feelings. In addition, the responses would be easily quantifiable and available to more statistical analysis compared to responses using dichotomous variables. Those future surveys could also include questions about all levels of outcomes of internationalization, allowing participants to start reflecting on them.

I have chosen to analyze HEIs public and private not-for-profit HEIs that participated in the internationalization laboratory since 2012, but future researchers could also examine HEIs that participated in the internationalization laboratory a long time ago (the first cohort was in 2003-2004) to find out in what stage their internationalization process is at the present time and how they progressed. Then, they could compare the results with HEIs that participated in the internationalization laboratory more recently.

In both 2011 and 2016 Mapping Internationalization reports data analysis was conducted by institutional type following the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (Doctoral, Master’s, Baccalaureate, Associate, and Special Focus). Future research could examine the differences in the outputs and outcomes between large and small HEIs or between 2-year and 4-year HEIs, or differences within public HEIs or within private not-for-profit HEIs such as private not-for-profit R1 HEIs (Doctoral University – Highest research activity) versus private not-for-profit R3 HEIs (Doctoral University – Moderate research activity). Furthermore, it would be interesting to observe if there are any geographic differences in the outcomes of American HEIs, as some states in the U.S. are more conservative than other states and this might influence the commitment to internationalization.
Further studies with more participants and more in-depth interviews could be done to give researchers a broader understanding of the research problem.

Considering the change in the American political scenario, it would be valuable to study how the process of internationalization was affected by this specific change at several American HEIs and, in general, how the political mindset of senior administrators affects this process.

I have opted to focus my results on the accomplished and not-accomplished outcomes of internationalization, but other studies could opt to focus on the positive and negative outcomes of the process of internationalization in American campuses.

Finally, future research could create tools to help key campus officers to find levels three (national level) and four (global and supra-national) outcomes. Questions about how internationalization at their institutions contributed to countrywide strategic goals, such as economic growth, job creation, and social inclusiveness remained unanswered.

As a final remark I would like to point out that when I decided to interview only American HEIs that participated in the internationalization laboratory since 2012, I thought that all of them would be progressing in their internationalization processes. Some HEIs would be more advanced in the internationalization cycle and some less advanced. I thought that once the process of internationalization had begun and had been in force for some years, it would not go back. However, I found one institution where that happened. For some time after the institution went through the laboratory, the process was progressing well, but as soon as the leadership changed, the institution’s commitment to internationalization receded and the new leadership decided to cut the budget in several vital areas for the process. Undoubtedly, institutional commitment is essential to the process of internationalization, as I have verified once again in the results of my study. But if internationalization had been embedded in the culture of the
higher education institution, it would have been much less vulnerable to the oscillations of leadership. As part of the culture, internationalization would lift the institution to new heights by enabling its students, teachers and staff to be prepared to face 21st century challenges and to contribute greatly to the knowledge society. However, what I noticed is that many higher education institutions treat internationalization as a temporary program that could be changed any time senior administrators wants, even if it was considered a priority before. In fact, internationalization requires a change in the mentality of the higher education institution and must be embedded in the culture to guide the paths of the institution in a globalized economy. In short, internationalization is a bridge that connects American higher education with the world and towards the future.
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### Appendix C

**List of common variables from Mapping Surveys 2011 and 2016 in this study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perclevelintl</td>
<td>Three perceived levels of internationalization: High, Moderate, Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables (all of them are dichotomous No=0, Yes=1)</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Commitment</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Institution's mission statement specifically refer to international or global education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td>International or global education is among the top five priorities in the institution's current strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>The institution has a separate plan that specifically addresses institution-wide internationalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>The institution has a campus-wide committee or task force that works solely on advancing internationalization efforts on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td>One of the THREE most compelling reasons that the institution is focusing on internationalization: to improve student preparedness for a global era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversify</td>
<td>One of the THREE most compelling reasons that the institution is focusing on internationalization: to diversify students, faculty, and staff at home campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>One of the THREE most compelling reasons that the institution is focusing on internationalization: to become more attractive to prospective students at home and overseas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>One of the THREE most compelling reasons that the institution is focusing on internationalization: to raise international reputation and rankings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the THREE most compelling reasons that the institution is focusing on internationalization: to respond to the growing public demand for global competitiveness in knowledge creation/innovation and talent development.

One of the THREE most compelling reasons that the institution is focusing on internationalization: to increase the impact and outreach of the institution through international development.

One of the THREE most compelling reasons that the institution is focusing on internationalization: to pursue new revenue streams.

One of the THREE most compelling reasons that the institution is focusing on internationalization: to participate in U.S. diplomacy efforts.

The institution has formally assessed the impact or progress of its internationalization efforts in the last 5 years.

There are specified international or global student learning outcomes at the institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Independent Variables (all of them are dichotomous No=0, Yes=1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative structure and staffing</td>
<td>Name: Structure A single office or multiple offices leads the internationalization activities and programs at the institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President: To whom the individual or the office/unit primarily responsible for internationalization efforts on campus report: President/CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAO: To whom the individual or the office/unit primarily responsible for internationalization efforts on campus report: Chief Academic Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OAcademic: To whom the individual or the office/unit primarily responsible for internationalization efforts on campus report: Other administrator in academic affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>StudentAffairs: To whom the individual or the office/unit primarily responsible for internationalization efforts on campus report: Chief student affairs officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ostudentaffairs</td>
<td>To whom the individual or the office/unit primarily responsible for internationalization efforts on campus report: Other administrator in student affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulltime</td>
<td>There is a full-time administrator who oversees or coordinates multiple internationalization activities or programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedgov</td>
<td>From whom the institution has received external funding specifically for internationalization programs or activities in the last three years: Federal Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stategov</td>
<td>From whom the institution has received external funding specifically for internationalization programs or activities in the last three years: State Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>From whom the institution has received external funding specifically for internationalization programs or activities in the last three years: Alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>From whom the institution has received external funding specifically for internationalization programs or activities in the last three years: Private donors other than alumni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>From whom the institution has received external funding specifically for internationalization programs or activities in the last three years: Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>From whom the institution has received external funding specifically for internationalization programs or activities in the last three years: Corporations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffleading</td>
<td>The institution provided specific funding for the following aspect of internationalization last year: Staff leading students on study abroad programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafftravel</td>
<td>The institution provided specific funding for the following aspect of internationalization last year: Staff travel to meetings or conferences abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffresearch</td>
<td>The institution provided specific funding for the following aspect of internationalization last year: Staff studying or conducting research abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffdevelop</td>
<td>The institution provided specific funding for the following aspect of internationalization last year: Staff development seminars abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum, Co-curriculum, and Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undercurriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutionwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreigngrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onesem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oneyear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moreoneyear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twoyear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moretwoyear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
International

The institution offers international/global tracks, concentrations, or certificate options for undergraduate students in the following field: International/global certificate for all students, regardless of major.

Business

The institution offers international/global tracks, concentrations, or certificate options for undergraduate students in the following field: Business/Management.

Education

The institution offers international/global tracks, concentrations, or certificate options for undergraduate students in the following field: Education.

Health

The institution offers international/global tracks, concentrations, or certificate options for undergraduate students in: Health/Medicine.

Humanities

The institution offers international/global tracks, concentrations, or certificate options for undergraduate students in: Humanities/Liberal Arts.

Social

The institution offers international/global tracks, concentrations, or certificate options for undergraduate students in: Social/Behavioral Sciences/Economics.

Science

The institution offers international/global tracks, concentrations, or certificate options for undergraduate students in: Science/Technology/Engineering/Mathematics (STEM).

Buddy

The institution offered the following program or activity for undergraduate students last year: Buddy program that pairs U.S. and international students to help integrate students socially.

Language

The institution offered the following program or activity for undergraduate students last year: Language partner program that pairs U.S. and international students.

Residence

The institution offered the following program or activity for undergraduate students last year: Residence hall with special programs designed to facilitate the integration of U.S. and international students (language house, roommate program, or international house).

Meeting

The institution offered the following program or activity for undergraduate students last year: Meeting place for students interested in international topics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Festival</td>
<td>The institution offered the following program or activity for undergraduate students last year: Regular and ongoing international festivals or events on campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnees</td>
<td>The institution offered the following program or activity for undergraduate students last year: Programs to link study abroad returnees or international students with students in K-12 schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intcurricu</td>
<td>Aspect of internationalization effectively served by technology at the institution: Internationalizing curriculum and instruction at home campus (guest lectures via video, conferencing, e-portfolios, to assess international learning outcomes, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduabroad</td>
<td>Aspect of internationalization effectively served by technology at the institution: Education abroad (virtual orientation sessions, online advising, institutionally sponsored study abroad student blogs, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jointprogram</td>
<td>Aspect of internationalization effectively served by technology at the institution: Joint/dual/double degree programs offered with a partner institution overseas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intlrecruit</td>
<td>Aspect of internationalization effectively served by technology at the institution: International student and/or scholar recruitment (virtual college fair, information updates via social media, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty policies and practices</td>
<td>Facintlcourses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fachost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facteach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facleading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facttravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facresearch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facdevelop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FacGuidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fachiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facintlcirricu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factechnology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facgloballearn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The institution offered the following opportunities to faculty members in the last three years:

### Facimprove
- Opportunities to improve their foreign language skills

### Facawards
- Recognition awards specifically for international activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Mobility</td>
<td>Undership</td>
<td>The institution provided funding for the following last year to recruit full-time degree-seeking international undergraduate students: Scholarships or other financial aid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undertravel</td>
<td>The institution provided funding for the following last year to recruit full-time degree-seeking international undergraduate students: Travel for recruitment officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Underrecruit</td>
<td>The institution provided funding for the following last year to recruit full-time degree-seeking international undergraduate students: Hired overseas student recruiters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradship</td>
<td>Gradship</td>
<td>The institution provided specific funding for the following last year to recruit full-time degree-seeking international graduate students: Scholarships/fellowships/stipends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradtravel</td>
<td>Gradtravel</td>
<td>The institution provided specific funding for the following last year to recruit full-time degree-seeking international graduate students: Travel for recruitment officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradrecruit</td>
<td>Gradrecruit</td>
<td>The institution provided specific funding for the following last year to recruit full-time degree-seeking international graduate students: Hired overseas student recruiters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundstuabroad</td>
<td>Fundstuabroad</td>
<td>The institution (or any schools or departments) provide institutional funds as student scholarships for &quot;education abroad&quot;, in addition to traditional institutional aid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrolltarget | The institution has a strategic international student recruitment plan that includes specific enrollment targets
---|---
TargetChina | Target country: China
TargetHKong | Target country: Hong Kong
TargetIndia | Target country: India
TargetSinga | Target country: Singapore
TargetTurkey | Target country: Turkey
TargetCanada | Target country: Canada
TargetMexico | Target country: Mexico
TargetBrazil | Target country: Brazil
TargetSAfrica | Target country: South Africa
TargetIsrael | Target country: Israel
TargetQatar | Target country: Qatar
TargetUAE | Target country: United Arab Emirates

Acasupport | The institution offers the following program or support service for international students: Individualized academic support services
---|---

Orientlocal | The institution offers the following program or support service for international students: Orientation to the United States and the local community
---|---

Orientinstitu | The institution offers the following program or support service for international students: Orientation to the institution and/or the U.S. classroom
---|---

Housing | The institution offers the following program or support service for international students: Assistance in finding housing
---|---

Instcommitee | The institution offers the following program or support service for international students: Institutional advisory committee of international students
---|---

Intlalumni | The institution offers the following program or support service for international students: International alumni services and/or chapters
Dependents: The institution offers the following program or support service for international students: Support services for dependents of international students.

Hostfamily: The institution offers the following program or support service for international students: Hostfamily program for international students.

ESL: The institution offers the following program or support service for international students: English as a Second Language (ESL) program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration and Partnerships</td>
<td>Jointdegree</td>
<td>Institution offers the following international collaborative programs arranged with non-U.S. institutions overseas to &quot;home campus&quot; students: Joint-degree programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doubledegree</td>
<td>Institution offers the following international collaborative programs arranged with non-U.S. institutions overseas to &quot;home campus&quot; students: Double or dual degree programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerChina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country where the institution is active in terms of its existing partnerships: China.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerHKong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country where the institution is active in terms of its existing partnerships: Hong Kong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerIndia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country where the institution is active in terms of its existing partnerships: India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerSinga</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country where the institution is active in terms of its existing partnerships: Singapore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerTurkey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country where the institution is active in terms of its existing partnerships: Turkey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerCanada</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country where the institution is active in terms of its existing partnerships: Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerMexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country where the institution is active in terms of its existing partnerships: Mexico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerBrazil</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country where the institution is active in terms of its existing partnerships: Brazil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerSAfrica</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country where the institution is active in terms of its existing partnerships: South Africa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerIsrael</td>
<td>Country where the institution is active in terms of its existing partnerships: Israel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnertQatar</td>
<td>Country where the institution is active in terms of its existing partnerships: Qatar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerUAE</td>
<td>Country where the institution is active in terms of its existing partnerships: United Arab Emirates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partfirst</td>
<td>Best describes the institution's approach to international partnerships in the last three years: we have begun international partnerships for the first time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partexpand</td>
<td>Best describes the institution's approach to international partnerships in the last three years: we have expanded the partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partfewer</td>
<td>Best describes the institution's approach to international partnerships in the last three years: we have moved toward fewer partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite Variables</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zcommitindex</td>
<td>A standardized composite variable of institution commitment (the sum of institutional commitment independent variables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zadminindex</td>
<td>A standardized composite variable of administrative leadership, structure, and staffing (the sum of administrative leadership, structure, and staffing independent variables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zcurricuindex</td>
<td>A standardized composite variable of curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes (the sum of curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes independent variables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zfacultyindex</td>
<td>A standardized composite variable of faculty policies and practices (the sum of faculty policies and practices independent variables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zstudentindex</td>
<td>A standardized composite variable of student mobility (the sum of student mobility independent variables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zcollaboindex</td>
<td>A standardized composite variable of collaboration and partnerships (the sum of collaboration and partnerships independent variables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comindex</td>
<td>The standardized weighted average of all the independent variables in the category articulated institutional commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adindex</td>
<td>The standardized weighted average of all the independent variables in the category administrative structure and staffing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>currindex</td>
<td>The standardized weighted average of all the independent variables in the category curriculum, co-curriculum and learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facindex</td>
<td>The standardized weighted average of all the independent variables in the category faculty policies and practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>studindex</td>
<td>The standardized weighted average of all the independent variables in the category student mobility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colindex</td>
<td>The standardized weighted average of all the independent variables in the category collaboration and partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
Informed Consent Form

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN “GOING FURTHER ON THAT WALK: EXAMINING THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE NOT-FOR-PROFIT AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS”

STUDY LEADERSHIP: I am Lucia Maria Greve, an international PhD student in the School of Educational Studies at Claremont Graduate University (CGU). I am asking you to take part in my PhD dissertation research project that is supervised by Dr. Thomas Luschei, an Associate Professor of Education at CGU.

PURPOSE: The overall purpose of my research is to identify the differences in the activities and results of the internationalization process between public and private not-for-profit higher education institutions.

ELIGIBILITY: To take part in this study, you must be familiar with the process of internationalization and your institution must have participated in the American Council of Education Internationalization Laboratory Program.

PARTICIPATION: During the study, you will be interviewed via Skype or Webex on a day and time of your choosing. The interview will take about 60 minutes and will be recorded and transcribed for data accuracy. I will not ask you any personal information.

RISKS OF PARTICIPATION: The risks you run by taking part in this study are minimal, and not higher than those faced in everyday life. You are free to skip any question that makes you uncomfortable, or stop the interview at any time.

BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATION: I do not expect the study to benefit you personally. This study will benefit me by helping me to finish my PhD. This study is also intended to benefit the study of internationalization in higher education by helping to find out the differences in the activities and results of this process in public and private not-for-profit American higher education institutions.

COMPENSATION: There is no direct compensation to you for participating in this study.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may stop or withdraw from the study at any time, or refuse to answer any particular question for any reason without it being held against you. Your decision on whether or not to participate will have no effect on your current or future connection with anyone at Claremont Graduate University.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Your individual information will be confidential in all papers, books, talks, posts, or stories resulting from this study. I may share the data I collect with other researchers, but I will not reveal your personal identity with it. In order to protect the confidentiality of your responses, no IP addresses, email addresses, or personal identifying
information will be used or reported in this study. The Skype or Webex interview will be recorded on a password-protected Iphone that only I have access to. Interview data will be stored only on a password-protected computer. Transcripts of interviews will be kept in a locked safe. All individual answers will be presented anonymously in any papers, books, talks, posts, or stories resulting from this study. All emails exchanged about this research will be copied without any personal identifying information and the original ones will be permanently deleted when the research finishes.

FURTHER INFORMATION: If you have any questions, or would like additional information about this study, please contact Lucia Greve at lucia.greve@cgu.edu or (909) 544-1019. You may also contact my faculty advisor at thomas.luschei@cgu.edu or (909) 607-3325. The CGU Institutional Review Board has approved this project. You may print and keep a copy of this consent form.

CONSENT: Your signature below means that you understand the information on this form, that someone has answered any and all questions you may have about this study, and you voluntarily agree to participate in it.

Signature of Participant __________________________ Date ________________

Printed Name of Participant __________________________
Appendix E
Interview Protocol

Date:

Time:

Public or Private not-for-profit:

1. Thinking about each of the six areas of CIGE’s model for comprehensive internationalization, to what extent (on a scale of 1 to 5) has each one been a focus of your institution’s internationalization efforts?
2. What have your institution’s efforts in each area entailed?
3. What would you say has been the impact of these activities/initiatives?

Probing questions

Articulated institutional commitment

Activities:
   a. How did senior administration of your institution express commitment with internationalization?
   b. How strategic plans and formal assessments of institution’s goals changed along the process of internationalization?

Impact:
   a. How did your institution’s senior administration commitment influence the development of the internationalization process at your institution?

Administrative structure and staffing

Activities:
   a. In the course of this process of internationalization, to what extent do you think your administrative and staff members have become more supportive of intercultural/international experiences on campus?
   b. In the course of this process of internationalization, to what extent do you think your administrative and staff members have become more interested in international activities such as travelling to conferences abroad, attending professional development opportunities abroad for example?
   c. In the course of this process of internationalization, to what extent do you think your staff is feeling more competent to deal with international students/faculty?

Impact:
   a. How did this internationalization process affect the organization climate and culture at your institution?
Curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes

Activities:

a. In the course of this process of internationalization, to what extent do you think that discussions in classes about global issues have increased?
b. In the course of this process of internationalization, to what extent do you think that students have increased their interest in international programs and activities (by course enrollment patterns or choice of majors)?
c. In the course of this process of internationalization, to what extent do you think that students have increased their interest in learning foreign languages?
d. In the course of this process of internationalization, to what extent do you think that students are reporting they are feeling more global competent to face world challenges?
e. In the course of this process of internationalization, to what extent do you think that your faculty is more motivated to include international topics in the curriculum?
f. In the course of this process of internationalization, to what extent do you think that research collaboration between faculty and students has increased?

Impact:

a. What was the impact of this process of internationalization on students’ learning outcomes?

Faculty policies and practices

Activities:

a. In the course of this process of internationalization, to what extent do you think faculty has become more capable to deal with global issues in classes?
b. In the course of this process of internationalization, to what extent do you think faculty has become more interested in international topics?
c. In the course of this process of internationalization, to what extent do you think that the institution income has grown from commercial applications resulting from faculty research?

Impact:

a. How did this process enhance the international competence and experience of faculty at your institution?
b. To what extent this process of internationalization enhanced the quality of research and increased knowledge production at your institution?

Student mobility

Activities:

a. In the course of this process of internationalization, to what extent do you think domestic and international students have become more integrated?
b. In the course of this process of internationalization, how did experiences from domestic students who spent some time abroad and international students have enriched your academic environment?
c. In the course of this process of internationalization, to what extent do you think domestic students who spent some time abroad and international students had the opportunity to share their experiences during classes?

d. To what extent did the revenue generated by incoming international students prove to be a good source of income?

**Impact:**

a. How this process affected the dynamic between domestic and international students at your institution?

b. To what extent did the revenue generated by incoming international students and by student abroad programs for domestic students promote financial stability to your institution?

**Collaboration and partnerships**

**Activities:**

a. How did those partnerships foster your institutional capacity building?

b. To what extent do you think those partnerships have improved some skills sets of your personnel?

c. To what extent do you think those partnerships have promoted the creation of new and stronger research groups?

**Impact:**

a. To what extent did the partnerships created during this process affect the reputation of your institution?

b. To what extent do you think the partnerships affected your institution visibility?

c. To what extent do you think the partnerships have fostered your brand building?

d. To what extent do you think the partnerships have affected your institution ranking?

e. To what extent do you think more talented students (domestic or international) have been attracted to your institution due to your the partnerships?

**Overall impact**

Through internationalization, to what extent do you think your institution have been able to contribute to countrywide strategic goals, such as economic growth, job creation, and social inclusiveness? How?

**Final thoughts**

Is there anything you want to add about the results of this process of internationalization at your institution?
## Appendix F

### Missing values in 2011 and 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>2011 Missing</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Missing</th>
<th>2016 Missing</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversify</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomacy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>4.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAcademic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studentaffairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osudentaffairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulltime</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedgov</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>10.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stategov</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>13.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>10.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>10.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>14.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffleading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>5.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafftravel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffresearch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>5.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffdevelop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>5.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undercurricu</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>10.66%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>10.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionwide</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigngrad</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>10.66%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>10.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onesem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneyear</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missin</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Missing</td>
<td>Missin</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreoneyear</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twoyear</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moretwoyear</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>12.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>12.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>12.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>12.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festival</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>12.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>12.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intcurricu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>12.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduabroad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>12.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jointprogram</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>12.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intlrecruit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>11.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facintlcourses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>5.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fachost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facteach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>6.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facleading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factravel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facresearch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>5.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facdevelop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>6.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FacGuidelines</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fachiring</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>3.46%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>6.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facintcurricu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>5.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factechnology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facgloballeam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>6.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facimproveolan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facawards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>6.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertravel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrecruit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradtravel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>8.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradrecruit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>8.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundstuabroad</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolltarget</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>2011 Miss</th>
<th>2011 Total</th>
<th>% Missing</th>
<th>2016 Miss</th>
<th>2016 Total</th>
<th>% Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TargetChina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TargetHKong</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TargetIndia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TargetSinga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TargetTurkey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TargetCanada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TargetMexico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TargetBrazil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TargetSAfrica</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TargetIsrael</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TargetQatar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TargetUAE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acasupport</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientlocal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OrientInstitute</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>6.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instcommitee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intlalumni</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostfamily</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jointdegree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubledegree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerChina</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerHKong</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerIndia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerSinga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerTurkey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerCanada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerMexico</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerBrazil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerSAfrica</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerIsrael</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerQatar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PartnerUAE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partfirst</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>24.50%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partexpand</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>24.50%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partfewer</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>24.50%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>7.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perclevelintl</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>