



THESIS

2

2009

56516491

LIBRARY  
Michigan State  
University

This is to certify that the  
dissertation entitled

FACULTY ENGAGED IN INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP:  
A STUDY OF WHEN, HOW, AND WHY

presented by

CHRISTOPHER J. VIERS

has been accepted towards fulfillment  
of the requirements for the

Doctoral

degree in

Higher, Adult, and Lifelong  
Education

Roger G. Baldwin  
Major Professor's Signature

November 20, 2003

Date

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.  
 TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.  
 MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
MAY 17 2008 0515		
APR 11 2009 0411		
91-25189		

**FACULTY ENGAGED IN INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP: A STUDY OF  
WHEN, HOW, AND WHY**

**By**

**Christopher J. Viers**

**A DISSERTATION**

**Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education (HALE)**

**2003**

## **ABSTRACT**

### **FACULTY ENGAGED IN INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP: A STUDY OF WHEN, HOW, AND WHY**

By

Christopher J. Viers

This is a qualitative study using interviews to explore faculty involvement in international scholarship in an Area Studies Program at Central State University (pseudonym). Seven faculty affiliated with the Area Studies Program, and actively engaged in international scholarship were interviewed, along with the Director of the Area Studies Program, and the Dean for International Programs. In addition to providing a summary of data gleaned from the faculty interviews, life story portraits of three of the faculty interviewed are presented to provide unique insights into the factors that contribute to and sustain their involvement in international scholarship.

The majority of faculty interviewed brought the commitment to international scholarship with them to the faculty role. While institutional factors helped facilitate and promote this form of scholarship, five of the seven faculty interviewed were committed to international scholarship prior to study at the graduate level. Faculty actively engaged in international scholarship became so engaged as a result of their childhood influences, undergraduate opportunities,

graduate school education and training, adult living and working abroad experiences, mentors and advisors, and intellectual development.

Faculty interviewed became involved in international scholarship because of their internal make-up, the intrinsic rewards and to a lesser extent extrinsic rewards this form of scholarship brings, and other external factors. Factors found that facilitate, encourage, and promote faculty engagement in international scholarship include an institutional ethos of internationalization, a diverse array of foreign students and scholars, like-minded colleagues, strong study abroad and institutional exchange programs, and supportive spouses.

Factors found that constrain faculty involvement in international scholarship include the faculty role as it is currently defined, personal and family demands, and institutional roadblocks. Finally, as a means of further promoting involvement in international scholarship, faculty recommend: more funding to support international scholarship as well as broader campus internationalization efforts, stronger networking and collaboration among the professoriate, and more resources for international education professional assistance and support at the school/department level.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

This project simply would not have been possible without the selfless love and support from my dear wife Keri Melynn, and daughters Laura and Emily. I also must express my deepest gratitude to my close friend and mentor, John E. Greisberger, Director of the Office of International Education at The Ohio State University; and to Professor Roger Baldwin, who stepped in as my committee chair at just the right moment, and has provided sage guidance and support ever since. Special thanks also to members of my committee: Ann E. Austin, Steven Weiland, and Jack Schwille whose astute advice and counsel helped guide and frame this study. Also, to Patrick O'Meara, Dean for International Programs at Indiana University, whose assistance and support kept me motivated during the crucial months of project completion. Finally, I would be remiss if I failed to mention my mentors, friends, and colleagues at Wheaton College, Ohio State University, Central Michigan University, Michigan State University, Wayne State University, and Indiana University; as well as the thousands of international students and visiting scholars I have had the pleasure of serving during my career in higher education.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	ix
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
CAMPUS INTERNATIONALIZATION AND THE ROLE OF FACULTY.....	1
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY .....	3
DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS.....	4
Internationalization .....	4
Scholarship .....	4
International scholarship .....	5
PERSPECTIVE AND NEED FOR THE STUDY.....	5
ASSUMPTIONS .....	7
RESEARCH QUESTIONS .....	7
<b>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	9
INTERNATIONALIZATION: A BRIEF HISTORY .....	9
THE MOTIVATION TO INTERNATIONALIZE TODAY .....	12
KEY COMPONENTS OF INTERNATIONALIZATION.....	14
Mission and Leadership .....	15
Curriculum.....	18
Faculty .....	21
Faculty Motivation .....	25
Study Abroad .....	27
International Students .....	29
Outreach and International Development.....	33
Models of Implementation .....	34
SUMMARY OF MAJOR COMPONENTS OF INTERNATIONALIZATION .....	37
IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	37

<b>CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY</b> .....	39
GENERAL APPROACH.....	39
Exploration of my Beliefs Regarding Qualitative Forms of Inquiry .....	39
Assumptions of Qualitative Modes of Inquiry .....	43
Life History.....	45
TYPE OF DESIGN.....	46
Site Selection .....	47
Selecting Interviewees .....	48
Interviews .....	51
Public Document Analysis.....	52
Data Analysis .....	52
Confidentiality.....	54
Ethical Considerations .....	55
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY .....	56
Researcher Bias.....	56
Issues of Validity and Reliability .....	58
<b>CHAPTER 4: THE INTERNATIONAL EFFORT AT CSU</b> .....	61
An Overview of CSU and International Programs.....	61
Area Studies Program.....	63
Challenges to International Scholarship at CSU.....	64
<b>CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY FINDINGS</b> .....	70
WHEN.....	70
HOW.....	74
Childhood	
Influences.....	75
Undergraduate Opportunities.....	78
Graduate School Education and Training.....	78
Adult Living and Working Abroad Experiences.....	79
Mentors and Advisors.....	80
Adult Intellectual Development.....	81
WHY.....	82
Internal Make-Up of the Individual.....	82

Intrinsic Rewards.....	83
Extrinsic Rewards.....	84
External Factors.....	85
<b>FACILITATORS.....</b>	<b>86</b>
Institutional Ethos of Internationalization.....	86
Diverse Array of Foreign Students and Scholars.....	91
Like-Minded Colleagues.....	92
Strong Study Abroad and Institutional Exchange Programs.....	92
Supportive Spouses.....	93
<b>CONSTRAINTS.....</b>	<b>93</b>
Faculty Role as Currently Defined.....	94
Personal/Family Demands.....	96
Institutional Roadblocks.....	96
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM FACULTY INTERVIEWED.....</b>	<b>98</b>
More Funding.....	98
Networking and Collaboration.....	100
International Education Professional Expertise at School/Department Level...	102
<b>SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>CHAPTER 6: THREE FACULTY PORTRAITS .....</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>HAROLD SLESSENGER.....</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>RUTH ADAMSON.....</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>EVELYN FREEDMONT.....</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>130</b>
<b>WHEN.....</b>	<b>130</b>
<b>HOW.....</b>	<b>131</b>
<b>WHY.....</b>	<b>133</b>
<b>FACILITATORS.....</b>	<b>134</b>
<b>CONSTRAINTS.....</b>	<b>135</b>

IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY AND PRACTICE.....	135
Create a Campus Ethos of Internationalization.....	136
Provide Tangible Support for International Scholarship.....	137
Foster Faculty Development in International Scholarship.....	138
IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	139
<b>APPENDIX A</b>	
Contact Letter to Director of Area Studies Program .....	143
<b>APPENDIX B</b>	
Contact Letter to Faculty .....	145
<b>APPENDIX C</b>	
Consent Form: Faculty Involvement in International Scholarship.....	147
<b>APPENDIX D</b>	
Interview Protocol: International Scholarship .....	148
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	153

## **LIST OF TABLES**

### **Table 1**

How Faculty Engaged in International Scholarship Became so Engaged.....74

### **Table 2**

Why Faculty Became Involved in International Scholarship.....82

### **Table 3**

Factors that Contribute to Faculty Involvement in International Scholarship.....86

### **Table 4**

Factors that Constrain Faculty Involvement in International Scholarship .....94

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

### **CAMPUS INTERNATIONALIZATION AND THE ROLE OF FACULTY**

The call to internationalize American higher education is proclaimed on college and university campuses throughout the United States. Driven by dramatic developments in technology, profound changes in global economic, social, and political sectors have created a climate in which the international dimension of American higher education is no longer a luxury but a necessity (Davis, 1995). These changes require that individuals have a better understanding of the world and world affairs (Barker and Hoemeke, 1995). As Ping states, “in our times, the right reading of the environment clearly directs the internationalization of higher education (1995, p. 68).”

Yet, American higher education continues to be criticized for not helping to meet the challenges faced by individuals participating in today’s global environment. For example, the American Council on Education (ACE) calls for major changes in how colleges and universities educate students about the world. The ACE’s Commission on International Education’s 1996 report notes, “Unless today’s students develop the competence to function effectively in a global environment, they are unlikely to succeed in the 21st century (American Council on Education, 1996, p. 1).” The report goes on to state, “...if our nation and its people are to prosper in the new environment of the 21st century, our colleges and universities must truly become institutions without boundaries. Their leaders must rethink what is taught, how it is taught, where it is taught, and who teaches it (American Council on Education, 1996, p. 4).”

Scholars agree that successful internationalization efforts require intensive involvement from a committed and knowledgeable faculty. Many believe faculty are the key factor in campus internationalization efforts (Aigner, Stimpfl & Nelson, 1992; Blodgett, 1995; Lim, 1995; and Liverpool, 1995). However, a National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges study found that faculty perceive international engagements as damaging to their careers (NASULGC, 1993). The report states, "...the vast majority of university promotion criteria, while not intentionally hostile to international service and research, were very definitely focused on the domestic milieu (p. 3)."

As Lim (1995) notes, the importance of rules and requirements to foster a level of global activity for tenure and promotion purposes, as well as specific assignments to develop and teach courses addressing global issues, are critical to the campus internationalization effort. However, institutional leaders generally do not create incentives to encourage and reward greater internationalism among faculty (Altbach & Peterson, 1998).

While it seems logical that requirements and incentives to incorporate an international dimension in faculty scholarship would foster a certain level and type of such activity, an understanding of when, how, and why faculty who are actively involved in international initiatives became so involved may help campus administrators develop opportunities for other faculty which would result in meaningful growth and development. As opposed to including requirements to internationalize among the already demanding list towards promotion and tenure, administrators may better impact campus internationalization efforts by first

understanding when, how, and why faculty actively involved in a certain facet of internationalization became so involved.

Even still, one wonders whether such attempts on the part of academic administrators to impact international scholarship will have measurable effects on faculty involvement in this regard. As Tenant (1997) indicates, most theories of adult development either explain learning and development in terms of the internal make-up of the person or the external forces impinging on the person. If involvement in international scholarship is primarily a result of the internal make-up of a given faculty member, then efforts on the part of academic administration may have little impact on learning or involvement in this domain.

### **PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

What factors contribute to and sustain faculty involvement in international scholarship? This is a key question for college and university administrators interested in advancing faculty involvement in international scholarship. Knowing when, how, and why faculty become involved in international scholarship will help determine the extent to which faculty involvement in such efforts is initiated and sustained more by intrinsic, or extrinsic factors. If extrinsic factors are found to play a key role in determining faculty involvement in international scholarship, then administrative intervention (such as rewards and incentives for such activity) may significantly enhance these efforts.

## **DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS**

### **Internationalization**

Internationalization is defined “as the process of integrating an international perspective into a college or university system. It is an ongoing, future-oriented, multidimensional, interdisciplinary, leadership-driven vision that involves many stakeholders working to change the internal dynamics of an institution to respond and adapt appropriately to an increasingly diverse, globally focused, ever-changing external environment (Ellingboe, 1998, p. 199).”

Similarly, English (1995) defined internationalization within the context of American higher education as, “...institutional strategies for the purpose of educating students to live responsibly and work effectively in an increasingly diverse society and global world (p. 2).”

### **Scholarship**

The work of the professorate includes four separate, yet overlapping, functions (Boyer, 1990). These are: the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching. The scholarship of discovery, “comes closest to what is meant when academics speak of ‘research’ (Boyer, 1990, p. 17).” The scholarship of integration involves giving meaning to isolated facts and putting them in perspective. Such work makes connections across the disciplines, and places specialties within a larger context. Scholarship of application moves toward engagement as the scholar applies knowledge to consequential problems. And finally, the scholarship of teaching “both educates and entices future scholars (Boyer, 1990, p. 23).” Thus,

as Boyer (1990) notes, “a recognition that knowledge is acquired through research, through synthesis, through practice, and through teaching (p. 24),” provides an inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar.

### **International scholarship**

For the purpose of this study, then, “international scholarship” will be defined as the integration of an international perspective into the work of the professorate including the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching in order to equip students for responsible citizenship in an increasingly diverse society and global world. Faculty actively involved in international scholarship will likely be in regular contact with colleagues in other countries. They are likely to present papers at conferences abroad, be actively involved as advisors and mentors to international students, and lead groups of domestic students on study, research, and service projects abroad. After all, “...great teachers...stimulate active, not passive, learning and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers, with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over (Boyer, 1990, p. 24).” In addition, they will consistently incorporate perspectives of other countries and cultures in classroom instruction, and encourage students to do the same in projects and assignments.

### **PERSPECTIVE AND NEED FOR THE STUDY**

This study is primarily directed at three audiences. The first audience includes administrative practitioners, particularly those charged with responsibility for overseeing key academic functions (provosts and vice presidents for academic affairs, college deans, and department chairs) and international affairs

(vice presidents and deans for international affairs, and directors of international education). While these administrators are often charged with facilitating, promoting, and encouraging various forms of international scholarship, they often have little to no resources to do so. And perhaps more importantly, these campus leaders have little data to help guide and direct the allocation of limited resources. This study may identify specific administrative strategies that help spark the initial impetus towards faculty involvement in international scholarship.

Faculty members comprise a second audience for this study. During my career in higher education I have worked with a number of faculty who feel compelled to become more actively involved in international scholarship, but have no idea where or how to begin. Many faculty work at institutions that either do not value involvement in international scholarship, or have few faculty role models to serve as mentors. Learning when, how, and why faculty actively involved in international scholarship became involved may help other faculty who are interested in pursuing similar forms of scholarship. In addition, as a result of participating in this study, faculty participants may better understand the factors that have contributed to and/or constrained their involvement in international scholarship. As a result, they may be better prepared to serve as advocates for this facet of scholarship, and as a resource for others.

Finally, scholars interested in campus internationalization efforts, as well as those interested in faculty motivation and professional development are a third audience for this study. This study will contribute to our understanding of the key processes and components of internationalization by revealing factors outside of

the control of the administration that have contributed to faculty involvement in international scholarship. In addition, the study will likely highlight the role administrators can play in advancing internationalization efforts through administrative intervention.

### **ASSUMPTIONS**

Three key assumptions have been made in thinking about and designing this study. First, I have assumed that individual faculty members are an appropriate unit of analysis for the purpose of better understanding factors that initiate and sustain their involvement in international scholarship. A second, related assumption is that drawing a sample of faculty from within an area studies center known for its successful internationalization efforts is appropriate. The third, and perhaps most important assumption, is that faculty involvement in international scholarship is an important topic of study.

### **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

Noncognitive and cognitive theories of motivation provide a general conceptual framework for this project and have helped shape the research questions in this study. However, this study does not seek to test a specific theory of motivation. As Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) note, characteristics of individuals and their employing institutions combine and lead to variations in faculty motivation, behavior, and productivity. This complex interaction of multiple variables has not been studied in the context of international scholarship.

This study seeks then to understand the context in which faculty engage in forms of international scholarship. More specifically, when, how, and why do

faculty become involved in efforts to incorporate a global perspective in their teaching? The following key questions will be addressed:

- ◆ When do (did) faculty actively involved in international scholarship become so involved?
- ◆ How do (did) faculty actively involved in international scholarship become so involved?
- ◆ Why do (did) faculty actively involved in international scholarship become so involved?
- ◆ What factors contribute to faculty involvement in international scholarship?
- ◆ What factors constrain faculty involvement in international scholarship?
- ◆ What recommendations do faculty actively engaged in international scholarship have to further encourage and promote international scholarship among other faculty?

## **Chapter 2: Literature Review**

In this chapter, I review the literature used to frame my study and to develop my research questions. In order to better understand what is currently known regarding the process and components of internationalization, I begin with a brief historical review of the internationalization of American higher education. Various motivations to internationalize higher education are then addressed, followed by an analysis of seven key areas, including the role of faculty, important to the internationalization process as defined by the literature. Immediately following the review of literature pertaining to faculty involvement in internationalization, theories of faculty motivation are explored. The chapter concludes with a discussion regarding the need for additional research.

### **INTERNATIONALIZATION: A BRIEF HISTORY**

English (1995) defined "internationalization" as, "...institutional strategies for the purpose of educating students to live responsibly and work effectively in an increasingly diverse society and global world (p. 2)." Such activity first appeared on college and university campuses in the United States after World War II in response to arguments of national security and political advantage from the country's new role as "leader of the free world." The United State's history of isolationism and suspicion of foreign influences fueled this drive (Gardner, 1990). During the first twenty years following World War II, major funding for initiatives such as area studies centers and language programs came from agencies like the United States Agency for International Development (AID), the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), the Fulbright Scholar Program, and private

foundations. "Highly effective over the years, these programs still remain the federal government's primary mechanism for supporting the development and maintenance of a higher education infrastructure that produces the nation's expertise in foreign languages, area and other international studies, including international business (O'Meara, 1997)." However, "Although impressive, this activity was oriented largely to the graduate-level production of specialists and did little to make entire institutions more international in character or outlook (Johnston & Edelstein, 1993, p. 9)." Such programs were clearly designed for the elite few.

Federal and private support for international education declined during the 1970s and 1980s, in part because the United States became suspicious of international activity following the Vietnam War. In addition, between 1967 and 1987, the number of undergraduate students who majored in a foreign language declined by half. In 1979, however, the federal Commission on Foreign Language and International Study issued a stunning report which caught the attention of politicians by documenting the low foreign language competency and grasp of world affairs of American students (President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, 1979). The balance-of-trade crisis of the mid-1980s also caused political leaders to begin focusing on improving the nation's educational system. Congress then provided new support for as many as one-hundred university-based area studies centers. Again, however, such programs tended to be very specific in nature and focus, and benefited a very limited number of students. According to Green (2002), the number of four-year

institutions with language degree requirements is down 22 percent since 1965, less than 1 percent of college students participate in study abroad programs, and only 40 percent of postsecondary institutions include international education as a goal within the institution's strategic plan.

Federal funding for international programs has declined dramatically in recent years as resources for Title VI programs remains roughly 25% below the fiscal year 1967 level as expressed in 1997 constant dollars (O'Meara, 1997). However, more and more institutions are beginning to state the importance of developing a global perspective among their students, and the focus has shifted to include all students. "Perhaps in part because students began to see their own economic self-interest in international education, the late 1980s and early 1990s have brought higher enrollments in language programs and other internationally oriented courses and a continued steady increase in undergraduate study abroad (Johnston & Edelstein, 1993, p. 10)." As Green (2002) notes, President Clinton promulgated a national international education policy but declined to allocate fiscal resources in support of the stated objectives. Green stated:

...in 1999, a memorandum from President Clinton on international education policy committed the federal government to supporting international education. It recommended that educators encourage international students to study in the United States; promote study abroad by U.S. students; support exchanges for faculty, students, and citizens; enhance programs at U.S. institutions that build international partnerships and expertise; expand foreign-language learning and knowledge of other cultures; support the preparation of teachers who can interpret other countries and cultures; and use technology to aid the spread of knowledge. The list is complete and admirable, but without any accompanying funding, its impact was limited.

## **THE MOTIVATION TO INTERNATIONALIZE TODAY**

Today, the motivation to internationalize American higher education comes in many forms. Constant media attention regarding American ignorance of the world has fueled interest on the part of many campuses to internationalize the curriculum (Jernigan, 1991). Some have chosen to focus on the international dimension as a strategic plan to address falling enrollments and increased costs (Scott, 1987). For example, out-of-state tuition revenue that foreign students bring to most public institutions is seen as having the potential to solve many fiscal woes. Similarly, a higher profile for international programs has been established by some with the goal of attracting support for existing and future research, attracting more international students, and encouraging more students to study abroad (Stone, 1995).

Others believe that the best argument for internationalizing higher education is that it will ensure the nation's economic competitiveness because approximately one-third of American corporations currently conduct business abroad, and more than 80 percent of American goods and services compete against foreign sources (Johnston & Edelstein, 1993). The importance of internationalization as related to issues of national security, and in order to foster human understanding across national boundaries is also noted (Aigner, Stimpfl & Nelson, 1992).

In the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in New York, Washington, D.C., and Pennsylvania, the public's overall support for international education has not diminished, yet strengthened according to a recent American

Council on Education Public Opinion Poll (American Council on Education, 2002). As Green states, "...the existence of widespread public support for international education should encourage campuses to forge ahead in bringing global perspectives to their students. The strong support for foreign language learning should be especially heartening, and the priority given international learning among young people, especially with regard to foreign language study and study abroad, is good news indeed for colleges and universities (American Council on Education, 2002, p. 2)."

In discussing three new global realities for higher education, Smuckler (1995) first agrees that our national economy is global in its nature and potential for expansion and argues that university graduates who are prepared for that new reality will be at an advantage over those who are not. Second, the new global reality is "political." That is, since decisions are made in a global context, they have become more complicated and complex. The new context requires global and not just local knowledge and expertise. The third new reality is that, "...the very moment the global landscape demands greater sophistication from our citizens and leaders, many of the federally sponsored programs that support international education are endangered in the drive to balance the federal budget (Smuckler, 1995, p. 21)." We are entering a period of diminishing federal resources (Blodgett, 1995). Smuckler (1995) argues that these new realities mean that we must accelerate the internationalization of academic programs.

Lim (1995) notes that there are two answers typically given in response to the question, why internationalize? The first is called the "competition model of

globalization.” In other words, we need to know about the world in order to successfully compete in the global marketplace. The second is called the “utilitarian model of globalization.” Lim (1995) states, “If we know more about international issues, foreign languages, etc., we can earn more money in the job market (p. 26).” Lim (1995) then offers a third model, which is termed, “humanistic globalization.” This model builds on the primary mission of educational institutions: to generate, distribute, and utilize knowledge for human betterment. The internationalization of universities must be guided by humanistic values (Lim, 1995; Johnston and Edelstein, 1993). Lim (1995) states, “...investment in global/international education has more than an immediate practical value. It can serve to nurture a new generation of people who can combine the best of the East and the West—people who think holistically, intuitively, rationally, and scientifically at the same time. Such people will facilitate understanding across different cultures and deepen global understanding (p. 32).” In short, they will be educated.

### **KEY COMPONENTS OF INTERNATIONALIZATION**

How does an institution of higher learning internationalize? Does it happen as Meszaros (1995) states? “My experience tells me that the change that needs to happen is the change that occurs daily by individual faculty, students, and administrators who have a strong commitment to internationalizing programs (p. 1).” Or, as noted by English (1995) above, does internationalization require specific institutional strategies designed to educate students to live

effectively in today's global village? That is, is a carefully planned, directed approach important?

A review of the literature highlights seven key areas to be addressed when formulating plans to internationalize an American college or university. It should be noted, however, that scholars disagree on the role and importance of each component, and the extent to which each component contributes to internationalization is not known. Yet, a synthesis of the literature suggests the following key components: (1) mission and leadership; (2) curriculum; (3) faculty; (4) study abroad; (5) international students; (6) outreach and international development; and (7) models of implementation. Each of these areas is discussed in more detail below.

### **Mission and Leadership**

"Mission" comes from the Latin word *mittere*, meaning "to throw, let go, or send." Similarly, the word "purpose" means to declare." Thus, the mission or purpose of an institution declares the fundamental reason for the organization's existence (Senge, Kleimer, Roberts, Ross, & Smith, 1994). Effective organizations center their work around a clearly defined and broadly supported mission statement. Therefore, the first step towards internationalizing a college or university is to incorporate an international dimension in the institution's mission statement as it provides important institutional guidelines in order to internationalize/globalize activities (Lim, 1995).

In the spring of 1995, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (American Association of State Colleges and Universities [AASCU],

1995) surveyed its member presidents regarding international activity on their campuses during the 1994-95 academic year and obtained a 74.7% response rate. Data indicate that over half of the institutional mission statements include a specific commitment to internationalizing the campus. Nearly one-half of the mission statements specifically set goals for internationalizing the curriculum, with the majority focusing on the integration of international perspectives into existing curriculum. One-third of the mission statements included goals pertaining to faculty involvement in international activities.

In addition to the importance of a mission statement with an international focus, several scholars argue that committed and visible presidential leadership plays an important role in strengthening an institution's international dimension (Arum, 1987; Johnston & Edelstein, 1993). "Efforts to internationalize face significant barriers, and there is little unity among participants as to either the essential elements or the main thrust. Such disunity spotlights the critical role presidents, as institutional leaders, can play in clearly defining the mission and character of the university and in forging and maintaining support for them (Nieman, 1997, p. 66)."

Five presidential actions are recommended in order to encourage and facilitate internationalization: (1) be visible in support of international programs and activities; (2) allocate appropriate resources to support such activity; (3) fund-raise specifically for international efforts; (4) have an international focus in outreach efforts; and (5) establish hiring decisions which award internationalization (Arum, 1987). The importance of the use of skills in moral

persuasion by presidents is also addressed (Lim, 1995). Such persuasion includes normative statements about global education made in speeches and discourse at the personal level. While many advocate for the importance of committed and supportive presidential leadership, challenges such leaders face when trying to internationalize have also been recognized.

Six challenges leaders face in their efforts to internationalize their institutions have been noted (Rhodes, 1990). The first is a challenge of balance. That is, the process of determining the appropriate combination of local, state, national and international opportunities in which to address. The second challenge is to find the appropriate scale and limits. As it is not possible to pursue every potential international venture and tackle all of the world's problems, determining where to focus institutional efforts, especially given the varieties of strength within institutions, can become very difficult. The third challenge is that there currently is no funding formula regarding internationalization efforts. How much should an institution spend on international faculty development, overseas study programs, and curricular reform? The challenge of persuading constituencies of the necessity, and value, of nurturing an international focus is also noted (Pacheco & Fernandez, 1992).

Some believe that to think and act globally is to betray the states that support public institutions (Rhodes, 1990). This poses particular challenges when attempting to justify tax supported resources allocated for international efforts. The fourth challenge relates to how to maintain communication and community when the institution is involved in a variety of programs that are

literally around the world. As borders expand, how is the mission and purpose of the institution maintained? The fifth challenge relates to the undergraduate curriculum. How to best internationalize the curriculum is seen as an overwhelming task. And finally, what is the most appropriate means to support these new activities?

Although many have addressed the importance of a mission statement which includes internationalization as a priority, as well as strong support from leadership, studies addressing these issues were absent in the literature. Studies have not been done to explore the potential correlation between mission statements that include an international focus and the amount of international activity on campus, for example. In addition, while many state the importance of strong presidential support, no data exist to either support or challenge this claim.

### **Curriculum**

A key ingredient to internationalizing the university can be found in the curriculum (Johnston & Edelstein, 1993; and Mestenhauser & Ellingboe, 1998). Aigner, Stimpfl and Nelson (1992) note that the focus should be on ensuring that general education includes an international component. The United States Department of Education (USDOE, 1984) states, "International education is a fundamental part of general and professional studies. It is the preparation for social, political, and economic realities that humans experience in a culturally diverse and competitive interdependent world (p. 6)." As Wheeler (1990) states, "The curriculum should enable individuals to develop competencies and sensitivities for perceiving, believing, evaluating, and behaving within the

complex human and ecological interactions that characterize the globe ( p. 5)."

However, studies regarding the internationalized curriculum are notable by their absence in the literature.

Foreign language curriculum is seen by many as a critical component to the internationalization of colleges and universities. However, many questions remain regarding the languages taught, and their actual usefulness to students even after several semesters of study. Among the so-called Less-Commonly Taught Foreign Languages (LCTFL's) are Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Russian—arguably among those most important for Americans to know in the coming decades. However, these languages account for only 5 to 8 percent of enrollment in college and university foreign language programs. French, German, and Spanish account for 90 to 95 percent of all language enrollments, even though these languages are only spoken by 14 percent of the world's population (AASCU, 1995). The problem with language study is that most college learners receive two to four years of grammar and basic exposure to the language, but they remain unable to speak it (National University Continuing Education Association, 1989).

In addition to concerns mentioned above regarding foreign language study, low correlation has been found between foreign language competence and transcultural knowledge (Barrows, 1980). Research regarding foreign language study is, "...rather slim...there have been only a few empirical studies and their conclusions are unclear (Lambert, 1989, p. 70)." Lambert (1994)

questions if foreign language competence is even required for global competence.

The problem with placing an emphasis on the curriculum, versus on those that create and sustain the curriculum, the faculty, is that most faculty are not trained to incorporate global perspectives into their courses. "No one person is born internationalized. She must research her field, borrow or invent creative applications and be constantly updated. This requires time, enthusiasm and collaboration with experts in the field. The majority of faculty are not trained to encompass an international perspective into their courses. Often they do not see or understand the value of such knowledge (Raby, 1995, p. 4)." The important question becomes, then, how to structure an environment that facilitates faculty competence and engagement in global issues.

This process begins with professional development activities that promote the creation of new classes and programs that introduce innovative teaching methodologies. To counter apathy, faculty must be encouraged through enrichment grants, sabbatical leaves, and promotional incentives to reform the curriculum (Raby, 1995). "The responsibility for the curricula is in the faculty domain. We in administration can only encourage and create incentives for this process to occur (Liverpool, 1995, p. 8)." Curricula and disciplines can only be changed by the faculty, and they must have strong international interests and appropriate support in order to do so (Johnston & Edelstein, 1993).

## **Faculty**

A review of the literature as further explored below reveals three important issues regarding the role of faculty in the internationalization process. First, many believe that faculty are the key ingredient to the internationalization process. Second, while this claim is frequently made, no such study was found which either confirmed or denied its validity. And third, while faculty are viewed by many as the key component to internationalization, they also apparently face the greatest challenges. In addition, "America's faculties also lack international consciousness and involvement (Altbach & Peterson, 1998, p. 39)."

In addressing what American institutions should be doing to promote internationalization, The United States Department of Education (USDOE, 1984) states, "The faculty are a major determinant of the substance and quality of general, professional, and graduate studies and engage in research to develop a global knowledge base. The institution recruits and supports faculty whose teaching, research, and service will enhance its international mission (p. 9)." Liverpool (1995) states, "At the core of all of our internationalization efforts is our faculty...in more and more fields, our scholars will find it essential to keep up with developments abroad by traveling to conferences and collaborating with scholars from other countries on joint projects (p. 12)." Similarly, "The contribution of the individual faculty member--as scholar, teacher, and campus opinion leader--is critical to the international enterprise (Blodgett, 1995, p. 52)."

Research with an international focus is said to be some of the most interesting (Stone, 1995). Regardless of the discipline, the pursuit of knowledge

obliges scholars to cross geographical and academic boundaries (Pacheco & Fernandez, 1992). Such activity leads to additional opportunities for the larger campus community. "Time and again, as one looks at international linkages or overseas connections across a campus, it is readily apparent that they have their origins, their initial impetus, in an individual faculty exchange experience. Many university programs are built upon the dozens of small activities conducted by individual faculty and subsequently moved forward by their departments (Blodgett, 1995, p. 53)."

However, of the 14-nation Carnegie Foundation study of the academic profession, American faculty were found to be largely uncommitted to internationalization. "While 90 percent of the faculty in 13 foreign countries believe that a scholar must read books and journals from abroad to keep up with scholarly developments, only 62 percent of American faculty believe the same. Upwards of 80 percent of the faculty in 13 countries value connections with scholars in other countries; a little over half the American professoriate agree (Altbach & Peterson, 1998, p. 39)." In addition, only 45 percent of American faculty agree that further steps should be taken to internationalize the curriculum, and the large majority report no foreign trips for study or research in the last three years. American faculty ranked last on this and every other similar measure among the 14 countries surveyed.

Yet, over forty-five percent of institutions that responded to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU, 1995) survey indicated that their faculty hiring practices encourage international and/or foreign language

expertise. Sixty-six institutions indicated that this hiring policy extends beyond the department level and has been adopted as a campus-wide policy.

Unfortunately, however, according to a National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges study, faculty perceive international engagements as damaging to their careers (NASULGC, 1993). The report states, "...the vast majority of university promotion criteria, while not intentionally hostile to international service and research, were very definitely focused on the domestic milieu (p. 3)." The importance of rules and requirements to foster a level of global activity for tenure and promotion purposes, as well as specific assignments to develop and teach courses addressing global/international issues are critical to the campus internationalization effort (Lim, 1995).

Eight obstacles to faculty international involvement have been noted: (1) when external funding is provided to faculty for international projects or opportunities, such as serving as a visiting faculty member at a foreign institution, frequently fringe benefits such as health insurance are not maintained by their home institution; (2) for faculty on sabbatical or other paid leave, health and retirement contributions may be limited while abroad; (3) restrictions on the commingling of sabbatical pay with external funding may end up penalizing the individual for accepting a prestigious international grant; (4) many institutions rely too heavily upon sabbatical leaves as the main opportunity for faculty to have extended periods of time abroad to teach and conduct research; (5) upon return to campus, many faculty members lose out in merit pay raises and tenure/promotion evaluations because they do not receive adequate credit and

recognition for their work abroad; (6) faculty often lose retirement income while abroad; (7) it is difficult to do research abroad and publish results immediately due to increase logistical challenges; and (8) some overseas opportunities are only possible if faculty retain their current salary while abroad, and no replacement funds are available for the academic unit from which a faculty member departs, causing harm to relationships with the department chair and colleagues (NASULGC, 1993).

Given the above disincentives to incorporating international perspectives, institutional policies including hiring, promotion, tenure, and curriculum must be revised (Johnston & Edelstein, 1993; Aigner, Stimpfl and Nelson, 1992). "Career rewards, hiring, and financial/administrative support are absolutely necessary to drive internationalization and to convincingly portray it as an institutional goal and direction (Aigner, Stimpfl & Nelson, 1992, p. 5)." Faculty can only play an active role if an environment is created that promotes professional development, scholarship, and public service in the international setting. "To a large extent, past efforts at internationalizing the campus have proceeded without formal direction or even a high level of institutional support...As we move into the next and more comprehensive phase of internationalization, developing an internationally knowledgeable and active faculty is a critical determinant of success (NASULGC, 1993, p. 5)."

Successful internationalization efforts have in common strong faculty development components (Liverpool, 1995). For example, intensive workshops and seminars designed to help faculty members build on existing bases of

language study would allow faculty to use foreign language in their research and teaching, if their skills were thus improved (Johnston & Edelstein, 1993).

Administrators are encouraged to find ways to support faculty leave time in other countries, participation in international development projects and foreign conferences, and research with foreign scientists.

While it seems logical that barriers must be removed in order to encourage and involve more faculty in the internationalization process, no articles were found which specifically addressed this issue. That is, no study has attempted to correlate the international activity of faculty and the lack of institutional barriers. It has not been shown, for example, that faculty personnel policies that encourage and support international activity foster more international activity on the part of the faculty. While many assert the importance of various forms of institutional support, no data exists to tie these efforts to outcomes. Nor has it been shown that un-supportive policies have discouraged faculty participation in international activity. A great deal of research and further study is needed regarding these and other faculty related issues.

### **Faculty Motivation**

Explaining individual tendencies to initiate and sustain a given activity is of concern for researchers in many fields, including higher education (Blackburn and Lawrence, 1995). Noncognitive theories of motivation assume, "...that internal needs, personality dispositions, and external incentives and rewards will cause an individual to behave in predictable ways (Blackburn and Lawrence, 1995, p. 19)." On the other hand, cognitive theories of motivation, "...assume

that people make decisions about how to behave by evaluating their capacity to respond to situations and estimating their possible losses and gains (Blackburn and Lawrence, 1995, p. 21)."

Noncognitive theories of motivation include stage theories of personality and career development as well as reinforcement and dispositional theories of motivation. Reinforcement theory asserts that behavior is caused by the environment. In other words, the environment serves as the stimuli, and the behavior is the response to the environment. Different factors in the environment motivate different responses (Atkinson, 1977). Behaviorist researchers have concluded that the selective reinforcement of desired behavior (contingent reinforcement) motivates people to behave in ways that are socially and organizationally desired (Staw, 1983).

Critics of the contingency reinforcement model to behavior modification assert that many activities are intrinsically motivating. They note, for example, that many scholars engage in research because they find the process to be innately rewarding (Deci, Nezlek & Sheinman, 1981; Lepper, Greene, & Nisbet, 1973). Therefore, the extrinsic rewards for research, such as salary incentives, can diminish the influence of intrinsic incentives. "The concern is that once the extrinsic rewards are removed, or not increased, individuals may no longer engage in the desired activity (Blackburn and Lawrence, 1995, p. 20)."

Cognitive theories of motivation assert that motivation is a function of an individuals' estimate of the probability of success (expectancy) and of the consequences of their actions (value). In other words, "cognitive theories of

motivation assume that people make decisions about how to behave by evaluating their capacity to respond to situations and estimating their possible losses and gains (Blackburn and Lawrence, 1995, p. 21).” Maehr and Braskamp’s (1986) personal investment theory asserts that people are constantly making decisions about how to invest their time and energy. “Motivation to perform a task varies in relation to the meaning it has for an individual. Meaning is determined by a person’s sense of self and by personal incentives that evolve and change over time as a result of social learning (Blackburn and Lawrence, 1995, p. 22).”

As Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) note, characteristics of individuals *and* their employing institution combine and lead to variations in faculty motivation, behavior, and productivity. That is, a close nexus exists between individual faculty characteristics and their employing institutions. Faculty motivation, behavior, and productivity stem from a complex interaction of a variety of variables. The most effective means of ensuring broader faculty support and involvement in internationalization efforts is therefore quite complex.

### **Study Abroad**

The number of U.S. college students enrolled in study abroad programs has been steadily increasing since the mid-1990s. As noted by Davis (2001), “Over the last five years, study abroad activity from U.S. institutions of higher education increased 61% (p. 17).” During the early years of the 1990’s, enrollments increased only 2% a year on an annualized basis until 1994-95, which saw a strong 10% increase over the previous year (Davis, 1998, p. 89).”

Research institutions send the largest number of students abroad each year with majors in the humanities and social sciences predominating (34%). In terms of duration, 74% of the students who study abroad do so for one semester or less, and less than 10% study abroad for an academic year. Forty-one percent (41%) of students who go abroad make the sojourn during their junior year, and most are still female (65%) and white (84%). Western Europe was by far the favorite destination for American students who studied abroad in 2000-2001 as over 50% studied there. Of these, the United Kingdom enrolled 20.4.7% (Davis, 2001).

Nearly sixty-six percent of all institutional linkages abroad include student exchanges (Darvich-Kodjouri, 1995). Such exchanges allow each student to pay home college or university tuition and fees, as well as room and board in some cases, and attend a foreign institution. Thus, the students effectively trade places. However, study abroad is seen as a marginal activity on most campuses—under encouraged, unsupported, unprepared for, and unconnected with students' work after they return (Johnston & Edelstein, 1993). More students need the unique experience that can be gained by living and studying in another country (Gardner, 1990).

The importance of the involvement of faculty in the leadership and design of study abroad programs is also noted (Johnston & Edelstein, 1993). Liverpool (1995) states, "...it (the curriculum) should be complemented by cross-cultural and practical experiences abroad that educate students about problems and issues that cut across specific disciplines and regions of the world (p. 8)." A more practical approach to the study of foreign cultures is needed, such as the

study of current political systems, religions and traditions, lifestyles, educational systems, gender roles, dress, business methods, beliefs and attitudes (Pacheco & Fernandez, 1992). Further, Liverpool (1995) states, "If we are to provide our students with a global education, we must move beyond Europe as a destination point for our study-abroad experiences. We must create opportunities for students in the sciences and other technical and professional disciplines to study abroad. And we must link the international exchange experience with the curricula and as part of the normal uninterrupted process of acquiring a degree... (p. 10)." The importance of including study abroad in the academic goals of the institution, and in the long-range planning of the university is also noted (Aigner, Stimpfl and Nelson, 1992).

While studies have shown the importance of such experiences to the personal and academic development of individual students, studies are lacking which demonstrate the relevance of study abroad programs to the internationalization of colleges and universities. For example, studies that demonstrate the impact of the study abroad experience on the student's home campus, after he or she has returned, were not found. Data that support the importance of a foreign study experience to the infusion of global perspectives in the student's courses at the home campus are also not to be found.

### **International Students**

The number of foreign students studying in the United States during academic year 2000-2001 totaled 547,867 (Davis, 2001). This number represents an increase of 6.4% over 1999-2000, and builds on the previous

year's 4.8% increase in foreign student enrollments. Enrollment patterns during the previous years appear to have reversed a six-year trend of decelerating foreign student enrollments. However, given the discussion above regarding the numbers of students from the United States who study in other countries, note the imbalance of nearly six to one. That is, for every six students who come to the United States to study, only one student from the United States goes to another country to study. In addition, the majority of students who come to the United States to study do so in order to obtain a degree, while the vast majority of students from the United States who go abroad to study do so for short periods. While students coming to the United States to study arrive mainly from Asian countries, the majority of students who go abroad from the United States go to Western Europe.

"One measure of the impact international students have on a host country's educational system is the share they hold of the entire higher education population (Davis, 1995, p. 1)." Despite the increases in foreign student flows since 1954-55, these students' share of the overall U.S. higher education student population increased only from 1.4% to 3.6% in 1998-99. Asian students make up over half of the international student population in the United States (55%). Most Asian students come from China (59,939), India (54,664), Japan (46,497), the Republic of Korea (45,685), and Taiwan (28,566). By contrast, students from Europe make up 15% of all of the international students in the United States. Most European students originate from Germany (9,568), the United Kingdom (7,765), Russia (6,609), and France (6,241). Roughly 13% of all U.S. students in

higher education are enrolled at the graduate level, yet over 43% of all international students in this country are graduate students.

As the number of foreign students in the United States has grown, so too has their contribution to national, state and local economies. During the 2000-2001 academic year, for example, foreign student expenditures on living expenses, college tuition and fees exceeded \$11 billion in non-U.S. funds. Well over 100,000 full- and part-time jobs were created by these expenditures. Over two-thirds (66%) of all foreign students receive most of their funding for U.S. study from personal and family sources (Davis, 2001).

While the financial benefits are certainly attractive to many college and university administrators, "...our goal must transcend the economic incentive of recruiting international students. These students enrich the lives of our domestic students, faculty, and our community. They contribute to the intellectual strength and extend the global horizons of American students, both in the classroom and through social interactions...we need to employ a more deliberate strategy to better integrate international students into the overall life of the campus (Liverpool, 1995, p. 11)." Sharma and Jung (1985) demonstrated that the higher the interaction level U.S. students have with international students, the more positive the attitude of U.S. students towards cosmopolitan world outlook, cultural pluralism, world mindedness, understanding of their own culture, support for internationalism, overseas career aspirations, and political liberalism. However, the interaction between American and international students in fact appears to be quite limited (Paige, 1983).

The lack of the use of foreign students attending U.S. colleges and universities as a resource for language instruction is highlighted noting that most foreign students attending U.S. colleges and universities can be assured that their native language skills will go unused (Johnston & Edelstein, 1993). A clear statement of purpose that defines reasons for enrolling foreign students, and adequate support services to meet their special needs is needed. In addition, foreign student enrollments should reflect diversity and balance, and the students should be used as a resource (Aigner, Stimpfl & Nelson, 1992). "Foreign students are a resource only if they can be convinced of the utility and personal benefit of that role. Students spending huge amounts of money to attend a foreign university often have little interest in programs that benefit the university (Aigner, Stimpfl & Nelson, 1992, p. 7)."

The influence of international teaching assistants on the global competence of their American undergraduate students has yet to be explored (Lewis, 1995). Additionally, the contributions international students make on the global competence of their professors and fellow classmates is also yet to be studied. It is not safe to assume that just because an institution enrolls a sizeable number of international students that that institution infuses global perspectives in the curriculum, campus events and activities, and the like. It may just be that the campus is diverse, but not necessarily global in content or focus. Further study is required to appropriately ascertain the impact of foreign student enrollment to the internationalization process.

## **Outreach and International Development**

Of the seven key components addressed in this paper, outreach and international development was clearly the least understood and written about in the literature, as the importance to faculty of this mode of scholarship is not addressed. However, the importance of such efforts in the overall campus internationalization effort was clearly stated by a couple of authors. Kopp (1995) states, "Outreach acts as a conduit for two-way exchanges between the university and the larger world society. It increases access for a diverse global society with multiple needs. It facilitates collaboration with other scholars, other disciplines, other public and private sector organizations in this country and abroad (p. 59)." Thus, outreach expands opportunities for the larger campus community to get involved in international activity. In addition to the importance of international outreach activity to the campus, such activity is seen as important for the surrounding community as well.

Liverpool (1995) states, "We must ensure that the international aspect of our outreach is sufficient to meet the community's needs. One way to do this is through public conferences and forums involving business, industry, and other sectors (p. 14)." In this way the college or university can serve to educate the community about the world. Such seminars and conferences would also be useful to the professional development of faculty and staff. The types of programs and outreach activity which best contribute to the internationalization of colleges and universities are not well understood, and certainly require further analysis.

## **Models of Implementation**

A review of the literature suggests six key factors for consideration when planning a strategy to internationalize an institution of higher learning: (1) programs and activities should be institutionalized; (2) focus should be multidimensional and well-integrated across curricular and administrative areas; (3) a depth and intensity is necessary to allow all members of the campus community adequate opportunity for involvement and participation; (4) a high profile administrator with direct access to the chief academic officer and president of the institution; (5) a centralized office which coordinates all aspects of the international effort; and (6) observable change.

In a study of 15 institutions with successful international programs, three similar characteristics were found: (1) their programs were institutionalized—they did not depend on one person or source of funds and their continuance was widely assumed and supported; (2) the programs were multi-dimensional and well-integrated; and (3) they had a depth and intensity sufficient to provide substantial numbers of students and faculty with international competence (Johnston & Edelstein, 1993). It should be noted, however, that “successful international programs” was not defined, other than recognition by the authors that these institutions were “active” internationally.

Institutions need a high profile administrator to act as a leader in the international realm (Aigner, Stimpfl & Nelson, 1992). Most believe that administrators responsible for the internationalization of the campus should have direct access to the Provost and President of the institution (Stone, 1995). The

importance of giving the individual charged with the primary responsibility for internationalizing the institution the appropriate status and authority is also noted (Johnston & Edelstein, 1993). However, Johnston and Edelstein (1993) also state that the individual must have, "...the respect of colleagues necessary to develop support for the program--and that they know how to build commitments and coalitions across the campus. Gaining the support of a diverse group of key individuals at different levels and in different disciplines is one of the most salient ingredients of successful programs (p. 77)." This is especially true since administrators responsible for international activities are expected to constantly coordinate the flow of information on international topics (Stone, 1995).

Over sixty-one percent of institutions responding to an American Association of State Colleges and Universities survey have a centralized office for international programs (Darvich-Kodjouri, 1995). However, as Harari (1984) states, "...we see time and again the foreign student adviser working separately from the international admissions office and from the study abroad office and all three working separately from those responsible for a program of English as a Second Language, or an international development contract overseas, or from committees focusing on internationalizing the curriculum or developing partnerships with the business community or the K-12 schools in the international area (p. 7)." The integration and mutual reinforcement of a centralized office makes a positive impact on the international ethos of an institution (Harari, 1984).

The importance of observable change is noted by Alutto (1990) who states, "It is important to have symbols of change--publicity, new titles and

administrative units, the distribution of public relations material, conferences, etc., to give people the impression that a change is taking place. Too much can be counterproductive because it looks hollow, but you need enough high-profile symbolic actions to give momentum (p. 8)."

The American Council on Education's Commission on International Education's report (1996) recommends ten ground rules in order to frame a plan of action for internationalization. The ground rules are as follows: (1) require that all graduates demonstrate competence in at least one foreign language; (2) encourage understanding of at least one other culture; (3) increase understanding of global systems; (4) revamp curricula to reflect the need for international understanding; (5) expand study abroad and internship opportunities for all students; (6) focus on faculty development and rewards; (7) examine the organizational needs of international education; (8) build consortia to enhance capabilities; (9) cooperate with institutions in other countries; and (10) work with local schools and communities.

There is no one best approach to internationalization (Johnston & Edelstein, 1993). Success in internationalizing efforts will depend on four things: (1) service; (2) coordination; (3) cooperation; and (4) small-scale change (Aigner, Stimpfl & Nelson 1992). "Administrators who hope to effect change must prove their worth and worthiness through service to faculty, students and the community outside the university. This service must be submissive, supportive and readily available (Aigner, Stimpfl & Nelson, 1992, p. 10)." Service includes such activity as providing sufficient administrative support to facilitate the flow of

scholars around the world, and working with faculty to help make important international projects and activities a success. Coordination is important as often times department a will be involved with a major project in country c, while department b is involved in the same country. Neither department is aware of the activity of the other, and providing overall support and coordination will not only likely reduce cost to both departments, but likely enhance the project overall.

### **SUMMARY OF MAJOR COMPONENTS OF INTERNATIONALIZATION**

A summary of key points regarding the internationalization process as defined by the literature is as follows: (1) strong leadership that flows from a clearly defined mission statement which includes specific references to the importance of internationalization; (2) an infusion of global perspectives across the curriculum; (3) a campus ethos which encourages, develops and supports faculty involvement in international education; (4) study abroad programs that are well integrated into the academic programs of the institution; (5) the presence of a diverse set of international students who are well integrated into campus life; (6) international outreach programs that are relevant to the needs of the campus and surrounding community; and (7) a well-coordinated, centralized office with a top level administrator that works with a faculty oversight committee.

### **IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

As noted above, many believe faculty are the key ingredient to the internationalization process. Yet, the reasons why faculty become and remain involved in forms of international scholarship have not been studied. What factors contribute to and sustain faculty involvement in international scholarship?

This is a key question for college and university administrators interested in advancing faculty involvement in international scholarship. Knowing when, how, and why faculty become involved in international scholarship will help determine the extent to which faculty involvement in such efforts is initiated and sustained by intrinsic, or extrinsic factors. If extrinsic factors are found to play a key role in determining faculty involvement in international scholarship, then administrative intervention (such as rewards and incentives for such activity) may significantly enhance such efforts. The literature is silent regarding these important questions.

## **Chapter 3: Methodology**

### **GENERAL APPROACH**

This is a qualitative study using interviews to explore faculty involvement in international scholarship in an Area Studies Program at Central State University (pseudonym). As little theory has been generated regarding faculty involvement in international scholarship, a research method was needed that would function inductively rather than deductively as it is important to generate ideas rather than to test them. Qualitative research methods that use life stories proved helpful. As Faraday and Plummer (1979) note, methods that use life stories such as portraiture and life history are at their best when they are used to help generate concepts, hunches, and ideas. To solicit the life stories of faculty members, I used an interpretive approach. An interpretive approach to inquiry asserts that the inquirer constructs a close and careful reading of the people he or she studies (Geertz, 1973).

#### **Exploration of My Beliefs Regarding Qualitative Forms of Inquiry**

Questions of method are secondary to questions of paradigm in educational inquiry. Paradigms serve as basic belief systems that guide the process of inquiry and discovery not only in regards to method, but also in ontologically and epistemologically significant ways (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Although I have always felt more inclined towards qualitative versus quantitative forms of inquiry during my graduate studies, I have realized in formulating plans for a dissertation that my commitments to qualitative forms

of inquiry were neither well constructed nor defended. In particular, I have realized that I had really no sense of place or fit within the qualitative continuum. Thus, the process of formulating plans for research within the broad framework of faculty involvement in international scholarship first required that I explore my own belief system as it relates to educational inquiry.

As suggested by Guba and Lincoln (1994), "Inquiry paradigms define for inquirers what it is they are about, and what falls within and outside the limits of legitimate inquiry (p. 108)." While there is no way to establish the ultimate truthfulness of a given paradigm, they are important since they guide the investigator in significant ways. "A paradigm may be viewed as a set of basic beliefs (or metaphysics) that deals with ultimates or first principles (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 107)."

Such paradigms are defined by responses given to three fundamental questions. The first is an ontological question. "What is the form and nature of reality and, therefore, what is there that can be known about it?" The second is an epistemological question. "What is the nature of the relationship between the knower or would-be knower and what can be known?" The third question, a methodological one, follows naturally from the first two. "How can the inquirer (would-be knower) go about finding out whatever he or she believes can be known (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 108)?"

As I contemplate my belief system in regards to the three questions as stated above, I find myself oddly inclined in the direction of postpositivism as well as constructivism as defined by Guba and Lincoln (1994). I wrestle most with the ontological question. Specifically, while tempted, I'm not sure that I want to go so far as to agree with the position held by constructivists that reality is apprehendable in multiple, intangible mental constructions which are purely socially and experientially based. Yet, an analogy used by Eisner (1992) makes a great deal of sense to me. He states, "What we come to see depends upon what we seek, and what we seek depends upon what we know how to say. Artists, Gombrich reminds us, do not paint what they can see, they see what they are able to paint. An empty mind sees nothing (p. 12)." Thus, constructions held by individuals are not more or less "true," but more or less informed and/or sophisticated. To an extent, this conforms to my worldview.

Perhaps I become a bit hesitant when presented with similar views stated more dogmatically. As Phillips (1990) notes, "It is now recognized that there is no absolutely secure starting point for knowledge; nothing is known with such certainty that all possibility of future revision is removed. All knowledge is tentative (p. 21)." I'm not necessarily willing to go this far. I tend to be more comfortable with the ontological question as addressed by the postpositivist view. While the postpositivist view assumes an objective reality, it grants that such reality can only be apprehended imperfectly—as well as probabilistically. In short, while intrigued with much of the ontological

argument as presented by constructivists, I'm not willing to dismiss the notion that there actually is an objective reality to be known and understood.

Concerning the epistemological question, while I believe the relationship between the investigator and the subject to be transactional to a great extent, I am not inclined to believe that *all* knowledge is created through interaction among investigator and respondents. Eisner (1992) notes, "...all experience is transactive; hence all we can know is the result of a transaction between our sentient and intelligent selves and a world we cannot know in its pristine state (p. 14)."

While I support the notion that renders obsolete the view of researcher solely as detached observer, I'm not ready to place as much emphasis and importance on the creation of knowledge through the relationship between researcher and subject. That is, I strongly agree with Rosaldo (1989) who states, "In my view, social analysts can rarely, if ever, become detached observers (p. 169)."

I am comfortable, however, with the transactional nature of researcher to subject as stated by Guba and Lincoln (1994), "...the notion that findings are created through the interaction of inquirer and phenomenon (which, in the social sciences, is usually people) is often a more plausible description of the inquiry process than is the notion that findings are discovered through objective observations 'as they really are, and as they really work' (p. 107)." Perhaps the tone, which allows for other alternatives, suits me here (i.e., "often a more plausible..."). Thus, even though I find myself vacillating within

and between these paradigms, thinking through such issues has reinforced my preference for interpretive and dialectical methods in educational inquiry.

### **Assumptions of Qualitative Modes of Inquiry**

Qualitative research design can be traced back to cultural anthropology and sociology, and has relatively recently been adopted by educational researchers (Borg & Gall, 1989). Scholars contend that qualitative research can be distinguished from quantitative forms by unique design characteristics. Merriam (1988) notes six major assumptions:

1. Qualitative researchers are concerned primarily with process, rather than outcomes or products.
2. Qualitative researchers are interested in meaning—how people make sense of their lives, experiences, and their structures of the world.
3. The qualitative researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis. Data are mediated through this human instrument, rather than through inventories, questionnaires, or machines.
4. Qualitative research involves fieldwork. The researcher typically goes to the people, setting, site, or institution to observe or record behavior in its natural setting.
5. Qualitative research is descriptive in that the researcher is interested in process, meaning, and understanding gained through words or pictures.

6. The process of qualitative research is inductive in that the researcher builds abstractions, concepts, hypotheses, and theories from details (pp. 19-20).

Thus, there are five particular research purposes especially suited for qualitative studies: (1) understanding the meaning participants give events, situations, and actions; (2) understanding the particular context in which participants act, and the influence the context has on their actions; (3) identifying unanticipated phenomena and influences; (4) understanding the process by which events take place; and (5) developing causal explanations (Maxwell, 1996). The researcher therefore makes sense of a social phenomenon by contrasting, comparing, replicating, cataloguing and classifying the object of study (Miles & Huberman, 1984).

This study does not seek to test a specific theory of faculty involvement in international scholarship. However, it is shaped by noncognitive and cognitive theories of motivation, as well as Blackburn and Lawrence's (1995) notion that characteristics of individuals and their employing institution combine and lead to variations in faculty motivation, behavior, and productivity. As Morse (1991) states, "Characteristics of a qualitative research problem are: (a) the concept is 'immature' due to a conspicuous lack of theory and previous research; (b) a notion that the available theory may be inaccurate, inappropriate, incorrect, or biased; (c) a need exists to explore and describe the phenomena and to develop theory; or (d) the nature of the

phenomenon may not be suited to quantitative measures (p. 120).” Thus, this study is well suited for a qualitative design.

## **Life History**

Qualitative research methods that focus on stories encourage subjects to explain the importance of historical factors and constraints in their lives.

“The life history, life story, biographical method presents the experiences and definitions held by one person, one group, or one organization as this person, group, or organization interprets those experiences (Denzin, 1989, p. 183).”

“Narratives ‘get at’—and I use that phrase consciously—what can neither be said in numbers nor disclosed in literal text (Eisner, 1997, p. 264).” “Human behavior, unlike that of physical objects, cannot be understood without reference to the meanings and purposes attached by human actors to their activities (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 106).”

The life history research method became popular initially among sociologists trained at the University of Chicago in the early 1900s. They were interested in recording, “an anthology of experience in people’s own words (Kotre, 1984, p. 25).” As Denzin (1989) notes above, the writer of life history seeks to portray the subject almost exclusively through their own words. In this sense, then, the researcher must rely almost exclusively upon what he or she is being told by the subject. The researcher accepts at face value the subject’s account and recollection of events. While similar, this method differs in this way from biography, in which the validity of a research subject’s story is authenticated by outside sources.

Life stories are studied by researchers within large contexts, or plots. "Plot' is the chain of causation which dictates that these events are somehow linked and that therefore they are to be depicted in relation to one another (Weiland, 2003, p. 5)." Since the researcher cannot possibly portray the entire life of a subject, plot helps the researcher select which events to include, as well as order them into a process leading to a conclusion. In this study, faculty engagement in international scholarship serves as the plot.

"Just as life story telling is done by the subject and the scholar, so too is interpretation a shared activity (Weiland, 2003, p. 6)." The account told serves as the subject's interpretation of what has transpired in his or her life. As Byron (1992) notes, "Every person accumulates his or her own individualized fund of cultural knowledge and social experience, the product of a lifetime of cultural acquisition and social interaction: a biography. One's biography is, for all practical purposes, one's social persona (p. 175)." Yet, because this method presents individual experiences as defined by the subject, the objectivity of these interpretations provides the primary data for analysis (Denzin, 1989).

### **TYPE OF DESIGN**

This study utilizes the qualitative comparative case study design and an interpretive interview method to explore faculty involvement in international scholarship in an Area Studies Program at Central State University. Through interviews, the phenomenon of international scholarship is explored as it is played out in the lives of those being studied. Data from all faculty interviews

are presented in summary form, followed by a richer description of the lives of three faculty interviewed. These are presented in the form of brief life story profiles.

### **Site Selection**

The study takes place in the context of an Area Studies Program at Central State University (CSU). CSU is a large research intensive institution recognized for its excellence in the internationalization effort. The history of this effort is further described in Chapter 4. Since I have experience with the institution and am familiar with its operations and issues, I knew whom to approach in order to obtain approval for conducting the study. In addition, I knew enough about the institution in order to interact comfortably with administrators and faculty. Yet, my lack of intimate familiarity with individual faculty helped eliminate bias and distortion of my findings.

I chose to select faculty from an Area Studies Program at Central State University based on its exemplary record of outstanding service as a national resource center on the study of a major world region, as well as its multidisciplinary approach to scholarship. I was interested in interviewing faculty who shared much in common in terms of the context of their work, yet still from a wide range of disciplines, and known for their international scholarship. As further described in Chapter 4, faculty in the Area Studies Program at CSU represent seventeen departments, and five professional schools and colleges. Given the program's designation as a National

Research Center since 1965, affiliated faculty are recognized experts in international scholarship.

### **Selecting Interviewees**

A letter was sent to the director of the Area Studies Program requesting a meeting to discuss participation in my study (see Appendix A). After obtaining approval from the director to pursue my study, I began identifying faculty from the area studies program for participation in the study. In order to select faculty for interviews, I reviewed 85 faculty profiles as contained in the area studies program's proposal for 2003-2006 funding submitted under Title VI, Higher Education Act of 1965 for a National Resource Center and Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships.

Faculty initially reviewed represented the following schools, colleges, and departments. From the College of Arts and Sciences, faculty represented African Studies; African-American and Diaspora Studies; Anthropology; Art History; Communication and Culture; Comparative Literature; English; Folklore & Ethnomusicology; Geography & Center for Institutions, Population and Environmental Change; History; Linguistics; Near Eastern Languages and Cultures; Political Science & Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis; Sociology; Spanish and Portuguese; and Theater and Drama. From the professional schools, faculty represented Education, Journalism, Law, Medicine, and Public and Environmental Affairs. Others included African Language instructors, Librarians, Museum Curators, other

Center directors, and faculty from Central State University's regional campuses.

From this distinguished group of faculty, I first identified those who met the following criteria:

1. no more than 25% faculty appointment within Area Studies at Central State University;
2. no administrative appointment with the Area Studies Program; and
3. no administrative appointment within the University.

Based upon this initial review, I eliminated 63 faculty from consideration, and was therefore left with 22 faculty for further review.

Since I was interested in interviewing 8 faculty from the Area Studies Program best suited for the purposes of this study, I then reviewed the following characteristics of the initial 22 faculty in an attempt to further delineate my sample:

1. courses currently taught with an international focus;
2. the number of dissertations supervised with an international focus;
3. international distinctions received;
4. foreign language competence;
5. overseas experience;
6. international research and teaching specialization;
7. recent publications with an international focus;

8. institutional grants received related to international projects; and
9. international service.

Based upon this additional review, I was unable to identify distinguishing factors that seemed appropriate cause to further delineate the sample. In addition to the above criteria, I sought a sample of faculty diverse in gender, ethnicity, and disciplinary background.

In order to identify the 8 faculty best suited to this study, I sought the assistance from the Director of Central State University's Area Studies Program; and the University's Dean for International Programs. I met individually with each of them, explained my selection criteria, and requested their assistance in further refining the pool based on their knowledge of the faculty. Interestingly, the Director and Dean were unanimous in their endorsement of 8 of the 22 faculty I had identified. The remaining 14 faculty from the initial group of 22 were eliminated for various reasons, including the assumption of a new administrative appointment, marginal activity in the Area Studies Program, and retirement.

I then sent an e-mail to each of the eight faculty members identified describing the study and inviting each to participate (Appendix B). One week after sending the e-mail, I phoned the faculty members and asked if they had received the letter, if they had any questions, and if they would be interested in participating in the study. Interview dates and times were established with those who agreed to participate. Seven of the eight faculty members selected

agreed to participate in my study. In addition, I interviewed the Director of the Area Studies Program, as well as the Dean for International Programs.

## **Interviews**

I initially interviewed seven faculty, as well as the Director of the Area Studies Program and the Dean for International Programs. As noted by Creswell (1994), "The idea of qualitative research is to purposefully select informants (or documents or visual material) that will best answer the research question. No attempt is made to randomly select informants (p. 148)." In the case of this study, participants needed to be selected based on their involvement in international scholarship in order to best answer the research question. A random sampling of faculty was not suited to this study.

After establishing an interview date, time, and location, I conducted face-to-face, one on one, in-person interviews with each subject. All interviews took place in the private offices of the subjects. The interview protocol as outlined in Appendix D was utilized. I took field notes during the interviews and audiotaped them for subsequent transcription.

Following this first round of interviews and subsequent data analysis, I identified three faculty from the initial sample of seven to study further. I was interested in presenting brief life story profiles of these faculty as a means of providing a richer description and context to my findings. In order to portray their life story profiles using their involvement in international scholarship as plot, I conducted a second interview with each, and obtained additional information concerning their involvement in this domain of scholarship. These

three faculty were chosen for a number of reasons. First, I was interested in offering a variety of experiences with international scholarship in regards to discipline, gender, and time spent in the faculty role. Second, they were amazingly gifted scholars, with an incredible passion and enthusiasm for their work. And perhaps as a result of their passion, they were happy to give me additional time and information about their involvement in international scholarship. Their stories are presented in Chapter 6 of this paper.

### **Public Document Analysis**

In addition to interviews, public documents (e.g., the institution's mission statement, promotion and tenure criteria, memos, minutes, and archival material from the Area Studies Program and Office of International Programs) were analyzed. I also used departmental review and planning documents and university required planning documents to assist in a general description of the program. The analysis of public documents helped establish institutional factors that impact faculty involvement in international scholarship.

### **Data Analysis**

As suggested by Creswell (1994), data analysis was conducted as an activity simultaneously with data collection, data interpretation, and narrative report writing. Creswell (1994) notes, "In qualitative analysis several simultaneous activities engage the attention of the researcher: collecting information from the field, sorting the information into categories, formatting

the information into a story or picture, and actually writing the qualitative text (p. 153)."

The process of data analysis was based on reduction and interpretation as defined by Marshall and Rossman (1989). In this process, the researcher takes a large amount of information and reduces it to patterns, categories, and/or themes and then interprets the data by using a schema. "While much work in the analysis process consists of 'taking apart' (for instance, into smaller pieces), the final goal is the emergence of a larger, consolidated picture (Tesch, 1990, p. 97)."

Following data coding suggestions as provided by Tesch (1990), I used the following eight steps:

1. Get a sense of the whole. Read through all of the transcriptions carefully. Perhaps jot down some ideas as they come to mind.
2. Pick one document (one interview)—the most interesting, the shortest, the one on the top of the pile. Go through it, asking yourself, What is this about? Do not think about the 'substance' of the information, but rather its underlying meaning. Write thoughts in the margin.
3. When you have completed this task for several informants, make a list of all topics. Cluster together similar topics. Form these topics into columns that might be arrayed as major topics, unique topics, and leftovers.

4. Now take this list and go back to your data. Abbreviate the topics as codes and write the codes next to the appropriate segments of the text. Try out this preliminary organizing scheme to see whether new categories and codes emerge.
5. Find the most descriptive wording for your topics and turn them into categories. Look for reducing your total list of categories by grouping topics that relate to each other. Perhaps draw lines between your categories to show interrelationships.
6. Make a final decision on the abbreviation for each category and alphabetize those codes.
7. Assemble the data material belonging to each category in one place and perform a preliminary analysis.
8. If necessary, recode your existing data. (pp. 142-145).

### **Confidentiality**

In order to protect the identities of the faculty who participated in this study, I have not revealed their identities, or the identity of the University. Thus, in reporting my findings, I use the pseudonym Central State University (CSU) to denote the University. To further protect the identities of study participants, I assigned a pseudonym, "Area Studies Program," to the unit of common affiliation among faculty interviewed. Data are stored on a password protected computer in my home office. Interview transcription tapes are stored in a locked fire-safe in my home office.

I also assigned pseudonyms to all faculty members bearing no resemblance to their actual names. These pseudonyms were assigned to participants prior to the first interview. Cassette tapes and interview notes were labeled using the pseudonyms. Finally, prior to data collection, I ensured that Michigan State's University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS) approved my study.

### **Ethical Considerations**

Ethical considerations are discussed by most scholars who address issues pertaining to qualitative designs (Locke, Spirduso & Sliverman, 1982; Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Merriam, 1988; Spradley, 1980). The researcher is obliged to respect the rights, needs, values, and desires of the informants. In order to do so, the following safeguards were employed in this study: (1) the purpose and objectives of the study, and an indication of how data were to be used, was clearly articulated to the informants both verbally and in writing; (2) written permission was obtained from the informant in order to proceed with the study as described; (3) a research exemption form was filed; (4) informants were notified of all data collection devices and activities; (5) verbatim transcriptions and written interpretations were made available to the informant; and (6) the informant's rights, interests and wishes were considered first when choices were made regarding reporting of the data (Creswell, 1994).

## **LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

### **Researcher Bias**

“Qualitative research is interpretative research (Creswell, 1994, p. 147).” Thus, the biases, values, and judgment of the researcher must be clearly understood. Yet, these factors are not necessarily detrimental to the study as the investigator’s contribution to the study can be useful and positive (Locke, Spirduso & Silverman, 1987).

My perceptions of higher education and international scholarship have been shaped by my personal experiences. From 1989 to 1993 I served as a Foreign Student Advisor and Program Coordinator in the Office of International Students and Scholars at a large Research I institution that enrolled approximately 3,500 foreign students. I was responsible for advising foreign students and scholars on immigration, personal, financial, and cultural issues and concerns, and coordinated the new student orientation program for approximately 1,500 students per year. I then served five years as Director of the Office of International Education at a mid-sized Comprehensive I institution where I had oversight responsibility for foreign student recruitment, admission, programs and services, and study abroad and faculty exchange. I then served from 1999 to 2002 as Director of the Office of International Students and Scholars at a large urban Research I institution that enrolled approximately 3,200 foreign students and hosted 600 visiting scholars each year. I currently serve as Associate Dean for International Programs and Director of the Office of International Services at a

large Research I institution that enrolls approximately 3,300 foreign students, and hosts approximately 600 visiting scholars per year.

Particularly in my role as Director of the Office of International Education from 1994-1998, I was involved in top level administrative activities and decisions regarding campus internationalization efforts. The President and Vice President for Academic Affairs were keenly interested in creating a campus environment that helped domestic students thrive in our global society. During my tenure in this role I worked closely with faculty, and senior academic and student affairs administrators with the goal of "internationalizing" the institution.

During my involvement in this effort I realized that definitions of internationalization varied widely across campus. To some, the term simply meant providing more study abroad opportunities for students. To others, it meant having more faculty who regularly teach, conduct research, and present papers abroad. Others believed that a radical transformation of the core curriculum was necessary. There was also very little agreement on where the institution should focus its limited resources.

In addition, there was never a dearth of competing priorities which one could easily argue were just as, if not more important than internationalization. Given that resources were limited, determining where to focus those resources was especially challenging. Do you increase the admission office's budget for international student recruitment with the goal of bringing more international students to the institution, or do you increase the

budget of the international student office in order to provide better programs and services with the goal of retaining more international students? Or, do you provide incentives for faculty such as release time to revamp the curriculum with the goal of incorporating a global perspective?

Such questions motivated me to pursue the literature. I began my quest interested in finding out how internationalization efforts were conceptualized and defined. Given my experience in the field of international education and exchange, I knew what my colleagues believed to be the key components of campus international efforts, but I was curious to learn more about outcomes related to these components. From an administrative perspective, I was interested in learning more about those areas in which the institution could potentially have the greatest impact. As my review of the literature indicates, while seven key areas have been addressed in the literature, outcomes are little known and understood. Interest in this study was a direct result of my desire to serve as a knowledgeable resource for my institution, and potentially other institutions as well. Given the above discussion, the void of theory regarding faculty involvement in international scholarship, as well as my desire to generate data rich in detail and embedded in context, qualitative research methods were selected for this study.

### **Issues of Validity and Reliability**

Merriam (1988) notes that internal validity is the accuracy of the information and the degree to which it matches reality. To ensure internal

validity in this study, data were collected through multiple sources to include interviews and document analysis. In addition, informants provided feedback by reviewing findings as they emerged throughout the analysis process. An ongoing dialogue regarding my interpretations of information provided by informants ensured the truth and value of the data. This was accomplished by sharing interview transcripts as well as interpretations of information provided and document analysis with participants.

I interacted with faculty significantly involved in international scholarship through interviews. My primary goal was to understand when, how, and why faculty became involved in international scholarship. Yet, in addition to working toward a diligent understanding of my subject, my experience in the field of international education played an important role as well. This is because I am most comfortable with forms of inquiry where knowledge is elicited and refined through interaction between and among the researcher and subject. In this sense, I agree with the constructivist position. I am not comfortable in the detached observer role, nor do I believe this is a particularly meaningful way to conduct social inquiry. My own biases have been articulated under the heading "The Role of the Researcher."

The quality of this research is therefore based heavily on my own trustworthiness as a researcher, as well as on the authenticity of my work. As Guba and Lincoln (1994) note, "The issue of quality criteria in constructivism is nevertheless not well resolved, and further critique is needed (p. 114)." As the intent of qualitative research is not to generalize findings, but to form a

unique interpretation of events, the generalizability of this study is limited (Merriam, 1988). And given the uniqueness of the study, replication in another context would be difficult (Creswell, 1994). "Unlike with quantitative designs, few writers agree on a precise procedure for data collection, analysis, and reporting of qualitative research (Creswell, 1994, p. 143)."

## **Chapter 4: The International Effort at CSU**

### **An Overview of CSU and International Programs**

Central State University (CSU), founded in 1824, is an eight campus system with a total enrollment of more than 98,000 students. The largest campus is a Research I university, with an enrollment of 38,908 students (33,540 full-time). Of the 38,908 students enrolled on Central State's largest campus, 79 percent are undergraduates.

Recently regarded as a model of effective campus internationalization efforts by two prominent higher education associations, Central State University has been building its reputation as an international university for more than 50 years. The institutions' influential president from 1938 to 1962 foresaw the post-war leadership role that the United States would assume and its implications for U.S. higher education. While clearly understanding the role of the university in relation to the service it provided the state, the president believed the university also had a responsibility to connect students to the world.

During the 1940s and 1950s, a foundation was built under the direction of this visionary president to support an incredible array of interdisciplinary language and area studies programs and international centers that form the core of the university's expertise in global knowledge, understanding, and expertise today. Over the years, the university has enabled thousands of students to have educational experiences abroad while attracting a steady

flow of international students and visiting scholars to its campuses. In fact, the University is one of our nation's leading hosts to international students and visiting scholars.

The Office of International Programs provides central oversight for international initiatives, activities, and resources for the eight campus system. The office is headed by a dean with a faculty appointment, who reports directly to the president. In terms of proximity, the Office of International Programs is immediately adjacent to the Office of the President in the main administration building, providing the unit with prominent presence and visibility.

The dean for international programs directs an administrative staff of 45, including four associate deans and two assistant deans. Three of the associate deans are based on the main campus, whereas the fourth is based at the largest of the branch campuses. The three associate deans on the main campus provide oversight and direction to three major sub-units within international programs: the Office of International Services which provides immigration and other support services to international students and visiting scholars; the Office of Overseas Study which manages the University's study abroad and exchange programs; and International Research and Development which guides and directs federal grants in support of international education and exchange to the tune of 30 million dollars currently. Through the Office of International Programs, grants are available to support research abroad, internationalization of the curriculum,

international professional development, travel for overseas conferences, short-term exchange development, and more.

### **Area Studies Program**

Central State University's international reputation rests on the strength of its 12 internationally focused multidisciplinary centers. An impressive 30 percent of the university's 1,615 FTE (full-time equivalent) faculty specialize in international studies research and teaching. When totaled, more than 500 courses with an international, foreign language, and/or world cultural content are available to undergraduate students. Areas of international concentration within the curriculum include 11 language and literature majors, four distinct area studies majors, six area studies certificate programs, seven area studies minors, and an international studies minor focusing on global and transnational perspectives.

The Area Studies Program at Central State University has been a U.S. Department of Education National Resource Center every year since 1965. Recognized as one of the leading centers for the interdisciplinary study of a major world region, the prominence of the program rests firmly on the expertise of its distinguished faculty who represent 14 academic departments and 5 professional schools, offering more than 150 courses related to the continent. The program also prides itself on the recruitment of outstanding students specializing in the study of the continent. More than 330 Ph.D. dissertations concerning the continent have been completed at Central State,

and degree recipients have taken academic positions in 32 states and 20 foreign countries.

The Area Studies Program draws on a strong Central State University faculty who specialize on the continent, an outstanding program in languages and linguistics, and an excellent collection in the University archives, libraries, and other units to organize a program focusing on interdisciplinary research and teaching in the arts, humanities, social sciences, and the professional schools. The number of courses taught ranges from 135 to 155 per year. Nearly 40% of the total courses offered are 100% specific to the continent in terms of content. In the last three years alone, 47 new courses dealing with the continent have been added, with 19 (40%) having 100% content specific to the region of specialization. In addition to new courses, 11 existing courses within the university have been modified to include content specific to the world region. These include first-year survey courses in Folklore & Ethnomusicology, Linguistics, Sociology, and Comparative Literature.

### **Challenges to International scholarship at CSU**

As is further discussed in Chapter 5, faculty interviewed in this study spoke of three barriers to engagement in international scholarship at CSU. These included the faculty role as currently defined, personal/family demands, and institutional roadblocks. In terms of the faculty role as currently defined, faculty interviewed were primarily concerned that the institution was becoming increasingly restrictive in regards to foreign travel during the academic year. While strong support exists for international

engagement and associated foreign travel within certain segments of the institution, many still view these activities as superfluous to the essential elements within the faculty role. Faculty interviewed were also more broadly concerned that the role of a faculty member in the U.S. is defined in large measure by close proximity to the home campus, and its students.

Given a renewed emphasis on the importance of teaching at this major research institution, faculty interviewed are feeling increasingly pressured by CSU administrators to engage in foreign travel only when classes are not in session. Such travel is necessary to remain engaged in international associations, to attend meetings and present papers at conferences abroad, to establish as well as reaffirm partnerships with foreign colleagues, and to engage in research in other countries. Given other competing priorities within the faculty role, limiting foreign travel to semester breaks and the summer makes active engagement in international scholarship a major logistical challenge.

This is especially true when one considers the incongruence of academic calendars around the world, and the additional challenges brought to bear depending on the time of year and/or season one travels (when it's summer in East Lansing; it's winter in Brisbane). While faculty interviewed understand and support the importance of their teaching responsibilities at home, they would benefit from further cooperation from their colleagues in covering a missed class or two, as well as additional institutional support in

the form of graduate assistants or temporary instructors available to cover teaching responsibilities during an extended absence.

While CSU will probably not be able to completely mitigate the barriers to international scholarship that come from personal/family demands, increased flexibility and support for foreign travel during the academic year will go a long way in supporting this important form of scholarship. That is, when faculty are having to balance the needs of their personal and/or family demands with restrictive policies or expectations in terms of foreign travel, this makes an already challenging endeavor even more difficult. In order for faculty to take extended periods abroad to effectively participate in international scholarship, both professional and personal factors need to align in almost perfect harmony. Otherwise, the challenges seem too difficult to overcome.

Another challenge to international scholarship at CSU concerns institutional roadblocks which come primarily in the form of departmental norms and expectations for appropriate faculty behavior. While many of the faculty interviewed in this study benefit from colleagues and administrators supportive of their international endeavors, some do not enjoy such support. In fact, certain departments at CSU discourage participation in international scholarship, and can be quite hostile to movements by faculty towards this form of scholarship. Still other faculty interviewed feel isolated from the broader campus community, as they interact almost exclusively with those who understand and support their commitment to international scholarship.

Continued efforts are needed to weave the international dimension within the overall fabric of the institution, extending far beyond the reach of a specific area studies program or project as coordinated by the Office of International Programs.

In addition to the above challenges as discussed by faculty, several issues will likely dominate the future direction of the overall effort to internationalize at CSU, as well as their impact on faculty engagement in international scholarship. For example, along with 200 other U.S. universities, CSU is actively engaged in the public-private effort to develop and implement Internet2. Put simply, Internet2 is a faster version of the Internet, which among other things offers expanded possibilities and opportunities for the utilization of technology in education delivery.

While the utilization of such technology may further enhance and promote the international effort at CSU, new methodologies will likely also challenge existing institutional norms and values concerning faculty engagement in international scholarship. Some may argue, for example, that given limited fiscal resources, face-to-face contact can be legitimately replaced by screen-to-screen contact as a means of engagement in international scholarship. CSU, like many other institutions, will wrestle with finding the appropriate balance and utilization of exciting new technologies when coupled with campus internationalization initiatives.

Another major challenge facing CSU in terms of its ongoing commitment to faculty involvement in international scholarship is the aging of

its faculty in the interdisciplinary area studies programs. Many of the faculty associated with the Area Studies Program in this study, for example, are nearing the age of retirement. While finding faculty with equivalent international expertise will be a daunting task in itself, there is also no guarantee that departments with hiring authority will replace retiring faculty with others who have similar expertise.

The traditional interdisciplinary area studies approach to global inquiry is also being challenged by some for its relevance and applicability, as professional schools are doing a better job of internationalizing their curriculum and preparing students for an increasingly complex world. In other words, as institutions like CSU continue to weave international issues and concerns throughout the curriculum, the need for centers which specialize in a given region may be further questioned and challenged. The challenge for CSU will be to remain responsive to interest and growth throughout the institution, while continuing to build upon the strengths of the regional expertise of many of its area studies centers and faculty.

Finally, diminishing resources pose difficult challenges for CSU and its efforts to further facilitate and promote faculty involvement in international scholarship. While utilization of the fiscal management model Resource Centered Management (RCM) has given greater fiscal control to academic deans and department chairs, programs with declining student enrollment face extremely difficult choices as funding is tied more directly to tuition revenue generated from student enrollments. Since many courses in

international studies are housed within the arts and humanities, declining enrollments in these majors only further challenge the existence of these courses . Funding from the central administration to continue to encourage and promote international scholarship among CSU faculty is a key factor to the ongoing growth and development of its expertise in this domain.

## Chapter 5: Summary Findings

This study utilized the qualitative comparative case study design and an interpretive interview method to explore when, how, and why faculty engaged in international scholarship at Central State University became so engaged. The study also explored with faculty committed to international scholarship factors that facilitate and support their efforts, as well as those that constrain this form of scholarship. Finally, faculty offered recommendations to assist colleges and universities interested in facilitating and promoting international scholarship among the faculty. This chapter presents in summary form findings related to the above key questions, and is followed in Chapter 6 by life story portraits of three of the faculty interviewed.

### WHEN

The first key question in this study sought to explore *when* faculty engaged in international scholarship began pursuing this particular facet of the faculty role. This question was of interest because knowing the initial impetus for international scholarship within the faculty role may help determine factors important to facilitate this form of scholarship among faculty not currently involved in this domain of scholarship. As the analysis below will demonstrate, the majority of faculty interviewed in this study were already committed to international scholarship upon assuming the faculty role. Thus, for the majority of faculty interviewed, their employing institutions played no role in initiating their involvement in international scholarship.

Five of the seven faculty interviewed in this study brought the commitment to international scholarship with them to the faculty role. They specifically trained for careers that encompassed an international perspective, and each of them pursued graduate school education and training in disciplines which were by their nature comparative, and/or international in scope and focus. Of the remaining two faculty members involved in this study, one began involvement in international scholarship mid-career when she was introduced to an international visiting scholar on campus, and the other engaged internationally late-career as a result of her own intellectual development and frustration with her discipline's lack of a global perspective. Portraits of these two faculty are presented later in this paper, along with the story of one faculty member who brought the commitment to international scholarship with him to the faculty role.

Thus, in only one case did the faculty member's employing institution play a key role, albeit very indirect, in lighting the spark that lead to a global focus in the faculty role. And in this case, by matter of principle the faculty member believed it was first important to learn and explore her own culture prior to seriously studying another. She stated that her intention even prior to graduate study was to engage in international scholarship, but philosophically this could not be an area of interest early on in her career as it would compromise her belief that in order to understand another culture, you must first understand your own. In her words, "...I had every intention of working in another culture and working internationally...but I tried not to from the

beginning...because I really did feel strongly that I would be more comfortable working with other cultures if I had looked at my own (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)." Professor Adamson's life story portrait, particularly instructive from the perspective of learning about the influence an institution can have in facilitating and promoting faculty involvement in international scholarship, is presented in Chapter 6.

The remaining faculty member's beginning in international scholarship had nothing to do with her employing institution. As Professor Freedmont recalled rather bitterly, "There was nothing here at this particular setting that would have encouraged me in that direction (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)." Professor Freedmont's developing world view, and growing inner conviction of the inadequacies of her discipline in this regard lead her to believe that she was providing a disservice for major segments of the population of kids in American schools by excluding music from their increasingly diverse cultures in the introduction to music text she was compiling. It wasn't until Professor Freedmont was inclined by matter of her own professional standards and convictions to engage the world of music in her teaching that she came to be aware of the tremendous resources to facilitate and support international scholarship at Central State University. In order to better understand factors that contributed to Professor Freedmont's commitment to international scholarship, her life story portrait is presented in Chapter 6.

The majority of faculty interviewed in this study, then, were already committed to involvement in international scholarship upon assuming the faculty role. To further highlight this notion, Professor Slessenger's story is presented in Chapter 6. Like Professor Slessenger, most faculty interviewed in this study are engaged in international scholarship primarily as a result of their internal make-up and life experiences prior to the faculty role. In all but two cases, they brought a commitment to international scholarship with them to their positions as junior faculty. They were highly selective of their employing institutions, and gave priority to those institutions which provided the best opportunity to incorporate an international dimension in the faculty role.

As will be discussed later in this paper, however, factors external to the personal dispositions of these faculty have also played a role in their on-going interests and level of commitment as international scholars. These factors include ongoing support from their employing institutions. As will be demonstrated later in this paper, one could argue that the employing institution played a central role in the ongoing facilitation and development of the initial interest in international scholarship for the two faculty interviewed who engaged in international scholarship later during their careers in academe. Had these faculty been at a different institution, their interests may have fizzled out.

## HOW

The second key question in this study sought to explore *how* faculty actively engaged in international scholarship became so engaged. This question was important as faculty experiences in this regard may help scholars better understand factors that promote international scholarship. In addition, a better understanding of the factors which contributed to the current level of engagement internationally among the faculty interviewed may help guide and direct limited university resources allocated for faculty development and similar initiatives intended to advance international scholarship.

As represented in Table I, six themes emerged in regards to the question of how faculty engaged in international scholarship became so engaged. The themes include: childhood influences; undergraduate opportunities; graduate school education and training; adult living and working abroad experiences; mentors and advisors; and adult intellectual development. Each of these factors is further described below, and are further illuminated in the faculty portraits as presented in Chapter 6.

**Table 1: How Faculty Engaged in International Scholarship Became so Engaged**

Childhood Influences
Undergraduate Opportunities
Graduate School Education and Training
Adult Living and Working Abroad Experiences
Mentors and Advisors
Adult Intellectual Development

## **Childhood Influences**

Childhood influences were discussed more often and in more contexts than any other factor by faculty when probed about influences that lead to their interests in international scholarship. Two faculty specifically referred to being raised by parents whose interests went against the norm. Professor Wilkerson stated, "My parents were both artists...they had interests that took them outside of the usual ways of doing things...we always had interests in things that were different from other people (M. Wilkerson, interview, April 24, 2003)."

Another common theme discussed by faculty was the notion of being raised to be open-minded. Professor Griffith recalls, "We were raised to be open minded...to go in the direction we wanted...my background was open to the world in general (S. Griffith, interview, May 21, 2003)." Similarly, Professor Wilkerson stated, "I've noticed that even among my colleagues, I embrace change more easily than a lot of people and did even when I was young...and I do think an openness and a receptiveness is necessary to be able to adapt to cultures (M. Wilkerson, interview, April 24, 2003)."

Six of the seven faculty interviewed were raised by well educated parents, with at least one parent in each home having completed the minimum of a Bachelor's degree. From teachers and ministers to aerospace engineers, the majority of faculty interviewed had highly educated parents. Similarly, the overall level of sophistication in the home, interest in learning generally and more specifically about the world, and a commitment to social

justice issues were discussed by five of the faculty interviewed as significant factors leading to their global interests. As Professor Sullivan recalls proudly, "My parents were very active politically...and I learned early a commitment to social justice (L. Sullivan, interview, April 23, 2003)."

In general, the faculty interviewed were raised by parents who were actively involved in their communities, interested in socializing with others, and getting to know not only their own country and culture, but others as well. Three of the seven faculty interviewed shared at length about regular opportunities to interact with people from around the world in their own homes as their parents enjoyed hosting and entertaining visitors. This exposure in early childhood to people and places different from one's own, as well as the feeling of being somewhat unique or different themselves, played an important role in the general openness and receptivity faculty had towards other people, countries and cultures. As Green (2003) notes, "The value that individuals place on international/intercultural learning often correlates with their personal experiences in interacting with people from other cultures." Data from three of the faculty interviewed also suggests that feeling different may also play a role in an individual's openness to others who are viewed as different by the predominant culture.

Travel both domestically and internationally was the norm for five of the faculty interviewed, and foreign travel in particular was viewed as somewhat routine. "When I was growing up I was around people for whom going to Africa was no big deal (S. Griffith, interview, May 21, 2003)." Two of

the five faculty interviewed discussed travel domestically, but specifically to areas of diversity within the United States. When asked to pinpoint the impetus for his interests in international scholarship, Professor Slessenger stated, "I guess the interest could be traced to local travel and seeing some of the different cultures (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)."

In addition to the above factors, four of the seven faculty discussed the importance of living in a diverse community during their formative years as a key contributing factor for their interest in international scholarship. For Professor Crestwell, living abroad as a missionary kid was the key factor in her interest and concern for the world. As another example, Professor Sullivan grew up in Seattle, a diverse city with a large Asian population. She believed this exposure at an early age to people from other countries and cultures helped facilitate her interest in the world.

Finally, social justice issues were modeled by the parents of two faculty interviewed, and this commitment was viewed as a key factor in shaping their world views. Two other faculty had childhood interests and hobbies related to the world such as collecting foreign stamps and coins, tracking changes in country leadership, borders, and the like. "I became interested in Africa on a quite romantic level...stamp collections, stories of crocodiles, and so on (S. Griffith, interview, May 21, 2003)." For faculty interviewed in this study, then, the initial impetus for engagement in international scholarship had a great deal to do with family upbringing and childhood experiences.

## **Undergraduate Opportunities**

While undergraduate opportunities were mentioned by some of the faculty interviewed as a contributing factor in their development of interests in international scholarship, reference to these experiences was made almost in passing. Two faculty interviewed mentioned that they studied abroad during their undergraduate days, two mentioned participation in foreign language study courses as an undergraduate student, and one mentioned the influence of an undergraduate course with international content. However, none of the faculty interviewed made a direct connection from these experiences to their interest in international scholarship, or viewed them as playing a key role in their interest in international scholarship. On the contrary, they seemed to be viewed simply as appropriate experiences given the international interests they had at the time. While study abroad and foreign language study experiences may indeed be transformative experiences for many undergraduate students, for the faculty interviewed in this study, it was simply a factor consistent with their interests as young adults.

## **Graduate School Education and Training**

Five of the seven faculty interviewed pointed to the importance of their graduate school education and training as a key factor that contributed to their current level of involvement in international scholarship. Thus, graduate school education and training helped facilitate, develop, and sustain the international interests these faculty brought with them to graduate school, but did not serve as the impetus for engagement in international scholarship. As

Professor Crestwell recalls, graduate school helped launch her career in a number of important ways. She stated, "The chance to meet major scholars in the field in the Area Studies Center generally...the core group of students doing the same thing that I was doing...these were all things I had here at Central State (A. Crestwell, interview, April 25, 2003)."

Of importance to note, however, is that five of the seven faculty interviewed pursued graduate programs with an international and/or comparative focus as they had international interests prior to graduate study. "I went into Anthropology with a concentration in Folklore, and I had every intention of working in another culture and working internationally (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)." None of the faculty interviewed indicated that their engagement in international scholarship today was a result of their graduate school experience. In addition, the two faculty members who engaged internationally at some point following graduate study both discussed the inadequacy of their graduate education and training in terms of its recognition of global issues and concerns within the discipline.

### **Adult Living and Working Abroad Experiences**

In addition to childhood travel experiences, experiences as an adult living and/or working abroad also played an important role in the formation of the global interests and concerns of faculty interviewed. This factor was common among all faculty interviewed. While not all faculty interviewed had foreign travel experiences prior to their involvement in international

scholarship, they all spoke of the importance of adult experiences abroad to their on-going interests and commitment.

As noted by Professor Freedmont, "It was first hand contact that was transforming for me (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)." Three of the seven faculty interviewed lived abroad prior to their faculty role, and four faculty interviewed spent time working abroad either sometime during or before their faculty role. As Green (2003) notes, "Not surprisingly, faculty and students who have already had international experience are more likely to support and participate in international education." For Professor Sullivan, "...my experience living and working abroad really made the difference (L. Sullivan, interview, April 23, 2003)." Following a two year assignment abroad, Sullivan decided to attend graduate school for the purpose of engaging internationally within the faculty role.

### **Mentors and Advisors**

Mentors and advisors played an important role in the ongoing development and facilitation of international scholarship for four of the seven faculty interviewed. These faculty frequently made reference to the importance of encouragement and support gleaned from mentors who introduced them to foreign visitors, included them in foreign research projects, or simply made them aware of an international opportunity within their domain of scholarship. For Professor Griffith, her current international interests and world-renowned expertise stems from what at the time seemed like a very simple, and somewhat casual invitation from her dissertation advisor. She

recalls, "My advisor said, 'Why don't you move down the coast and join me,' so I thought, 'why not' (S. Griffith, interview, May 21, 2003)." This seemingly casual invitation at the time set the course for Professor Griffith's expertise in her discipline pertaining to her country and region of specialization.

### **Adult Intellectual Development**

Green (2003) found that, "Comprehensive internationalization affects 'the hearts and minds' of faculty and staff, requiring that they change voluntarily." For three faculty interviewed in this study, their experiences lend support to this assertion, as they spoke of their own personal and intellectual development as a key contributing factor towards their involvement in international scholarship.

While a variety of factors likely influenced this development, faculty who spoke of their personal growth in this regard struggled with the task of attempting to identify an impetus for it. Professor Freedmont described her development as, "...a process of realizing that the way music from many cultures is done strips us from any knowledge of the culture...I began to realize that multi-cultural wasn't something you just did, but it was something you had to commit to for the reasons of making a better world and helping people understand each other (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)." This growth was characterized as a gradual evolution of thought, having little to do with a specific event, but the accumulation of a lifetime of experiences.

When probed to further consider significant factors leading to their development intellectually, three faculty also spoke of the importance of the

Fulbright program. With full financial support and the freedom to engage their research topic with little disruption, Fulbright support enabled these faculty to engage their international interests with an intensity and focus that is difficult to muster given the competing priorities of the normal faculty routine. For these faculty though, the Fulbright experience served primarily to further enhance and support an existing commitment to international scholarship.

## **WHY**

The third key question explored in this study seeks to better understand why faculty became involved in international scholarship. This question is important as faculty experiences in this regard may help determine the relative value of rewards and incentives sometimes used to entice faculty to engage in international scholarship. As indicated in Table 2, upon exploration of this question, four important themes emerged from the interviews: the internal make-up of the individual; intrinsic rewards; extrinsic rewards; and external factors. Each of these factors is further described below.

**Table 2: Why Faculty Became Involved in International Scholarship**

Internal Make-up of the Individual
Intrinsic Rewards
Extrinsic Rewards
External Factors

### **Internal Make-Up of the Individual**

Many of the faculty interviewed actively engaged in international scholarship view themselves as adventurous risk-takers, always ready for the next challenge. All of the faculty interviewed described themselves as open-

minded. As a group, they enjoyed comparing themselves to their colleagues, and were keenly aware of their uniqueness in terms of their disposition to change, and their openness to new experiences and opportunities for cross-cultural learning and understanding. Professor Griffith best summarized the feeling of the faculty interviewed. "Those that go on overseas study really take risks...so I think that just might be the type of person we are, none of my friends in the peace corps or whatever were just sitting around...they were game for anything (S. Griffith, interview, May 21, 2003)."

### **Intrinsic Rewards**

In addition to the motivation that comes from an individual's internal disposition as described above, faculty involved in international scholarship also find the work to be an incredibly exciting form of scholarship, and spoke of the intrinsic rewards the work brings to their lives. While rewards and incentives for international scholarship may be scarce at home, having the world so to speak as your domain, and being highly regarded and respected by colleagues worldwide brings tremendous gratification for these faculty. As has been previously noted, many scholars engage in research because they find the process to be innately rewarding (Deci, Nezlek & Sheinman, 1981; Lepper, Greene, & Nisbet, 1973).

Professor Freedmont stated, "I'm on one of the most exciting journeys anyone could be on because I encounter people, I go places, I make connections, I get to go and be part of music making (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)." In reference to what international engagement

gives the average faculty member, Professor Slessenger noted, "It gives those folks a bigger domain of operation (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)." As Stone (1995) notes, research with an international focus is said to be some of the most interesting scholarship a faculty member can pursue. And seeing the world of opportunities avail itself to students brings tremendous satisfaction as well. "I have a group of students who are highly committed to what I am doing...who carry the bond the international experience brings, to do important work out there that excites me to see (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)."

### **Extrinsic Rewards**

While intrinsic rewards for their work in international scholarship were prominent in the thinking of faculty interviewed, extrinsic rewards were desired but not realized. As Altbach and Peterson (1998) indicate, institutions generally do not create incentives to encourage and reward greater internationalism among faculty (Altbach & Peterson, 1998). None of the faculty interviewed believed that they have obtained extrinsic rewards for their commitment to international scholarship. Only two stated that they believed their engagement internationally was an expectation for promotion and tenure, and only one faculty member stated that international scholarship was valued by the institution. Concerning promotion and tenure, Professor Slessenger stated, "It's not a requirement but for me I think it would be a large failure if I didn't (Slessenger, 2003)." Similarly, Professor Sullivan stated, "It's appreciated, but I don't think you get any special recognition...everybody

knows that it's a good thing and that it contributes to the school but I don't think that it is particularly valued (L. Sullivan, interview, April 23, 2003)."

None of the faculty interviewed mentioned salary, promotion and tenure, or rewards and bonuses as motivating factors to their engagement in international scholarship. While they make recommendations along these lines to encourage broader involvement and support among the faculty (discussed later in this chapter), external rewards did not play an important role in their own commitment to international scholarship. These findings question previous assertions that rules and requirements to foster a level of global activity for tenure and promotion purposes are "critical" to the campus internationalization effort (Johnston & Edelstein, 1993; Aigner, Stimpfl and Nelson, 1992; and Lim, 1995).

### **External Factors**

Faculty interviewed in this study were keenly aware of current world events, global issues and concerns. As a group, they actively participate in a number of international associations, read a multitude of international publications and journals, and monitor major media outlets, both foreign and domestic.

Three faculty made casual reference to the role major world events played as a motivating factor towards their interests in international scholarship, but they didn't view these events as significant contributors. On the contrary, they were viewed as deterrents for other faculty. As Professor Crestwell noted, "All of the wars and coups all over. I had that with my own

research in Liberia in 1989, it was a war zone. And you really have to make some hard decisions about going back there...and even my travel back and forth to Saudi Arabia after September 11<sup>th</sup>...it's not going to keep me from travel but I think for some people that would be a deterrent from doing international travel (A. Crestwell, interview, April 25, 2003)."

## **FACILITATORS**

The fourth key question in this study sought to explore factors that contribute to faculty involvement in international scholarship. As represented in Table 3, five themes emerged as faculty reflected on factors that contribute to faculty involvement in international scholarship: an institutional ethos of internationalization; a diverse array of foreign students and scholars; like-minded colleagues; strong study abroad and institutional exchange programs; and supportive spouses. Each of these factors is further described below, and provide insight into ways in which institutions may help encourage and promote international scholarship among the faculty.

**Table 3: Factors that Contribute to Faculty Involvement in International Scholarship**

Institutional Ethos of Internationalization
Diverse Array of Foreign Students and Scholars
Like-Minded Colleagues
Strong Study Abroad and Institutional Exchange Programs
Supportive Spouses

### **Institutional Ethos of Internationalization**

Faculty interviewed frequently made note of the importance of the institutional culture at Central State University, and its reputation for excellence in international programs. In addition to serving as a prominent

base for their work, this reputation helps them make connections and open doors to prominent individuals, agencies and organizations worldwide. As Professor Slessenger notes, "The university plays a role in that it's a platform...I have found that to be amazing...the CSU shadow has gotten me into places that I probably wouldn't have gotten into (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)." Professor Adamson described the university in this regard as an, "...institutional force...it just goes and goes and goes (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)." The institution's reputation for excellence in international programs and initiatives also serves to validate the work of faculty committed to international scholarship among their colleagues.

In addition to noting the international reputation of the institution and its importance in facilitating, promoting, and valuing international scholarship, all seven of the faculty interviewed specifically discussed the strength of the Office of International Program's efforts at CSU as a key factor as well. In regards to the professional staff working in various units within international programs, Professor Crestwell states, "They were really the people who provided the leads as it were to establishing those contacts and to helping facilitate the connections that came (A. Crestwell, interview, April 25, 2003)." Faculty interviewed spoke of the overall spirit of cooperation and dedication among staff within international programs. They discussed the important role these staff members play in terms of providing overall coordination and coherence to a diverse array of programs and opportunities, while at the same time helping faculty navigate obstacles.

While the organizational structure within the Office of International Programs is complex, faculty interviewed knew the names of key staff, and they understood the essential functions of units within the department. As Green (2003) notes, "Whatever structure is used, it must facilitate coherence and coordination among the many threads of international education (curriculum, international students, study abroad, and campus life) and have sufficient resources and personnel to accomplish its mission."

In addition to praising a number of specific units and individuals within International Programs, two faculty interviewed specifically made reference to the role of the current Dean in validating the importance of international scholarship. As a distinguished and highly respected faculty member, the Dean enjoys tremendous support from faculty and administrators alike at CSU. Speaking of the current dean, Professor Slessenger said, "It's good to have that strong voice that's backing you (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)." The importance of the overall structure and individual leadership necessary to advance an internationalization effort is noted by Green (2003) who states, "Internationalization can only be more than a loose collection of activities if a coherent, widely understood strategy is not in place. Creating such a strategy requires leadership from the top. The president and provost, as well as other senior leaders...are key players. As leaders, they must consistently articulate the importance of internationalization, keep attention focused on the issue, secure and allocate resources for it, provide symbolic support, engage external groups, and cultivate on-campus leadership and

support.” Many of the faculty interviewed have benefited from the international strategy in place at Central State, and appreciate the leadership and support which comes from senior level administrators at the institution.

Lim's (1995) assertion that the use of skills in moral persuasion, including normative statements about global education made in speeches and discourse at the personal level by senior level administrators, was supported as a key factor in validating international scholarship by two faculty interviewed in this study. The importance of high profile proclamations and endorsement for international scholarship was perhaps best highlighted by Professor Slessenger as he discussed trying to muster support and recognition for international initiatives among his colleagues. Slessenger noted that many of these individuals serve on important departmental committees responsible for faculty evaluation and promotion, and they have no international experience. Discussing his colleagues, Professor Slessenger stated:

We're back where things go on in terms of them (his faculty colleagues) agreeing to let me take off or let me teach the second eight week course, or a promotion that is being reviewed by the salary committee and it's not just the salary committee here, it's the evaluation committee and they see that I am doing something that doesn't really connect for them.

Otherwise, they would have difficulty making a bridge to it...but if they've already got it in their heads that this is a valued thing—then there is a connection there...and there's been a good deal of communication about the value of it...part of that is communicating to faculty that there are international opportunities there, not just one guy who is involved in it (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003).

Faculty have benefited from the legitimacy, coherence, and visibility for internationalization given the institution by the current dean and other senior

level administrators at CSU. Speaking broadly about the overall culture of the institution, and the strength of the international effort specifically, in reference to Professor Adamson's engagement internationally, she noted that, "It was all these pieces here coming together that led me to going ahead with it and also to be successful (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)."

In addition to the overall culture within the institution, and the important role played by staff within International Programs, the strength and support of the Area Studies Center was also praised by six of the seven faculty interviewed. As noted by Green (2003), "Academic disciplines, which serve as the organizing principle for the institution as well as for scholarship, are a second institutional barrier to internationalization. Academic departments are the keeper of the curriculum, faculty lines, teaching assignments, and resources. Disciplinary divides prevent many faculty members from working across disciplinary boundaries—one of the critical intellectual dimensions of an internationalized curriculum." All faculty interviewed were associated with the Area Studies Center, and spoke highly of the importance of the interdisciplinary nature of the program. In reference to the interdisciplinary strength of the Area Studies Program for students, Professor Adamson stated:

"I tell students this all the time, when they are thinking about not coming here (CSU) or getting a Ph.D. or whatever. I tell them we don't have a huge amount of money here but because we have the Area Studies Program your chances of doing well, of having good people to work with you, your chances of having your application to Fulbright or whatever are going to be good (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003).

The above findings call into question Johnston and Edelstein's (1993) assertion that language and area studies programs have done little to make institutions more international in character or outlook. The Area Studies Program at CSU has done a great deal to facilitate and promote broad campus internationalization.

Institutional overseas travel grants designed to encourage and promote international scholarship were also noted by five of the faculty interviewed as key factors used to encourage international scholarship among faculty. As Raby (1995) noted, "No one person is born internationalized. She must research her field, borrow or invent creative applications and be constantly updated. This requires time, enthusiasm and collaboration with experts in the field. The majority of faculty are not trained to encompass an international perspective into their courses (p. 4)." An institutional ethos of internationalization, and strong administrative support structures in place to facilitate and promote faculty involvement in international scholarship, play a crucial role in an institution's effort in this regard.

### **Diverse Array of Foreign Students and Scholars**

Six of the seven faculty interviewed mentioned the important role played by international students and scholars in facilitating their international scholarship. As Liverpool (1995) noted, international students enrich the lives of domestic students, faculty, and our communities. International students and scholars often serve as valuable resources for U.S. faculty interested in teaching or conducting research abroad. Many international students and

visiting scholars come to specific institutions within the United States upon the recommendation from a faculty advisor or colleague in their home country. These individuals often play important roles in helping U.S. faculty make and/or continue important connections, and establish joint research projects in venues otherwise difficult to engage without a personal connection.

### **Like-Minded Colleagues**

Professional associations and other opportunities to interact with like-minded colleagues also played a key role in facilitating the international scholarship of four faculty interviewed. "The members are international and the interests are, of course, international. So through these associations I keep very lively and good connections with people in international work (L. Sullivan, interview, April 23, 2003)." Also mentioned were the importance of professional networking and collaboration, professional publications with an international focus, foreign media, and library holdings. "The value among colleagues is high...but in another university setting it can feel like you're sort of an odd man out (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)." As Slessenger implies, these connections are particularly important for faculty who find themselves on campuses with little to no support for international scholarship.

### **Strong Study Abroad and Institutional Exchange Programs**

The importance of study abroad programs and students was discussed by three faculty interviewed. As Professor Wilkerson stated, "Having study abroad programs is a good way to get faculty to begin to be interested in international things if they don't have that interest (M. Wilkerson, interview,

April 24, 2003).” An additional three faculty interviewed mentioned the role institutional exchange agreements play in facilitating and promoting international scholarship. “I’ve found that if someone can sort of hand you a connection, which the (International Program) did for me...and all you have to do is e-mail the guy to get the ball rolling...it was so valuable (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003).”

### **Supportive Spouses**

Two faculty noted the importance of a supportive spouse. “My husband enjoys international travel and working abroad (A. Crestwell, interview, April 25, 2003).” As will be discussed further below, personal and family demands were discussed by many of the faculty interviewed as an inhibiting factor to involvement in international scholarship. While personal and family responsibilities remain challenging to balance when coupled with engagement in international scholarship, supportive spouses help mitigate those obstacles, and their enthusiasm for foreign travel played an important role in the scholarly pursuits of these faculty.

### **CONSTRAINTS**

The final key question in this study sought to explore factors that constrain faculty involvement in international scholarship. As noted by Green (2003), “Barriers can be institutional in nature, caused by policies, practices, and traditions, or they can be individual, resulting from administrator, faculty, and student attitudes.” As reflected in Table 4, three major themes emerged in this study as constraints to international scholarship: the faculty role as

currently defined; personal/family demands; and institutional roadblocks.

Each of these factors is further discussed below.

**Table 4: Factors that Constrain Faculty Involvement in International Scholarship**

Faculty Role as Currently Defined
Personal/Family Demands
Institutional Roadblocks

### **Faculty Role as Currently Defined**

Five faculty discussed the difficulties encountered with foreign travel during the academic year, and the limits associated with the traditional faculty role. Reflecting on the difficulty of lining up overseas opportunities with the academic calendar in the U.S., Professor Slessenger noted, "So much of the international idea is about coming and going, and the teaching load is sometimes different from the teaching load in terms of timing overseas (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)." As many institutions encourage faculty to utilize sabbatical time for international scholarship, Professor Wilkerson cautioned, "You can't take advantage of any of the projects that happen during the regular academic year...not everything fits neatly into a sabbatical (M. Wilkerson, interview, April 24, 2003)."

Four faculty interviewed also discussed the time demands required for active engagement in international scholarship, and stated that at times these demands were simply too much to bear. Other inhibiting factors noted were tenure and promotion pressures, and the sometimes disenfranchising nature of international scholarship. For example, while Professor Slessenger found benefits from strong collegial support for his efforts in international

scholarship, he noted that, "Everybody that I interact with almost is doing things international (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)." However, at times his international work leaves him feeling disconnected from the majority of faculty on campus who are not engaged in international scholarship.

The competitive nature of funding opportunities in support of international scholarship, given the relatively small pool available, was also seen as a constraint by several faculty interviewed. Given that there are few extrinsic incentives, the majority of faculty interviewed believe the task of encouraging colleagues not inclined to engage internationally to be very challenging. "There's not always so much reward, but there's a lot of competition (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)." In addition, some of the faculty interviewed believe that international scholarship, especially prior to tenure, can hurt a junior faculty member's opportunities for tenure, and in fact may be damaging to their careers. This belief is consistent with findings from a 1993 National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges study, in which faculty were reported to perceive international engagements as damaging to their careers (NASULGC, 1993). As Professor Sullivan noted, "It's not really counterproductive to tenure, but it is harder to maintain (L. Sullivan, interview, April 23, 2003)." That is, given the barriers to international scholarship as discussed above, faculty who pursue this form of scholarship as a significant part of their overall portfolio, face more challenges and obstacles along the way to tenure. These factors make the pursuit of tenure more difficult to maintain.

## **Personal/Family Demands**

The difficulties of international scholarship, coupled with small children and other personal responsibilities, was discussed by four faculty interviewed in this study. In order for faculty to take extended periods abroad to effectively participate in international scholarship, both professional and personal factors need to align in almost perfect harmony, otherwise the challenges seem too difficult to overcome. For example, as one female professor observed, "I've been a mentor for other women...and they are scrambling for tenure but they also want to have their family (S. Griffith, interview, May 21, 2003)." This notion was supported by Professor Sullivan who stated, "Having a three year old is one of the biggest disincentives to travel because he's not quite old enough to come along (L. Sullivan, interview, April 23, 2003)."

## **Institutional Roadblocks**

The overall lack of school, college, or department support for international scholarship was discussed as a constraint by three faculty interviewed in this study. As Green (2003) notes, "If international scholarship, teaching, and service are not recognized, or worse yet, considered a distraction from the more 'important' work of faculty, this will serve as a powerful disincentive to faculty, especially untenured faculty." The following quotes from faculty interviews highlight the potential impact on faculty motivation when international scholarship is not valued within their departments or employing institutions.

Professor Sullivan is critical not only of her own department at CSU, but of the field of Education in general. "You know, I spent some time working in a faculty role, I spent some time working for non-profit development and frankly, there's something about, particularly Education schools, that are not generally very open to international scholarship and I think this is true around the world. They tend to be focused on teaching centered for the country that you are in (L. Sullivan, interview, April 23, 2003)." In essence, then, if your work is focused on the international realm in the field of Education, you are working outside of the expectations and traditions of your discipline.

For Professor Freedmont, the lack of commitment to international scholarship was a key factor in her decision to change departments from Music Education to Music in General Studies. She states, "...one of the reasons I'm in this department instead of where I was is that they didn't acknowledge the research I was doing on international music as relevant because it wasn't published in the music journals and didn't take the form of their research...there was nothing here at this particular setting that would have encouraged me in that direction (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)."

Similarly, Professor Wilkerson states, "They've never seen this as particularly important...there's also a certain attitude in my field (journalism) that anybody can do international research, it's something that I've felt over my whole career...there is still the attitude that you can transfer

methodologies and theories to anyplace you please and just set up shop and conduct the study and have it work (M. Wilkerson, interview, April 24, 2003).” While faculty in general pride themselves on the benefits academic freedom brings to their work, professional standards and practices within one's discipline and employing institution clearly play a role in determining the extent to which faculty embark on international scholarship.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM FACULTY INTERVIEWED**

Finally, when faculty were asked to share their ideas and recommendations to better encourage, promote, and facilitate international scholarship, three themes emerged: more funding; stronger networking and collaboration; and more resources for international education professional expertise at the school/department level.

### **More Funding**

Speaking for more institutional resources in support of campus internationalization efforts, Professor Adamson declared, “If you want to go international, you have to have the money to help people get around (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003).” Of all of the suggestions offered by faculty interviewed, the need for more funding opportunities to facilitate and promote international scholarship was the most frequently mentioned factor. This finding is consistent with key barriers as identified by Green (2003) who states, “Among the most prominent institutional barriers are insufficient resources, lack of incentives, rigid disciplinary structures, and lack of leadership. Funding for course development and for international travel and

work is usually in short supply—a deficit exacerbated by the marginal status of internationalization on most campuses (Green, 2003)."

While faculty interviewed offered multiple examples of ways to fiscally support campus internationalization efforts, the most commonly mentioned examples included: more funding to support visiting scholars; more funding to support international hospitality; more funding to hire research assistants to support international research; more funding for international travel grants to support research, establish institutional linkages abroad, and attend international conferences; more funding to attract the best graduate students in language and area studies programs; funding to support faculty release time to infuse an international perspective in existing coursework; and funding to provide a pool of temporary instructors to cover missed class time for faculty engaged in international scholarship abroad.

Discussing the need for temporary instructors to cover classes when faculty need to be out of the country during the academic year, Professor Slessenger shared the following example from the experience of a colleague. "In order to give their professors more time overseas, they have a large pool even at the department level of lecturers, so that when someone needed to take off it was never a problem, never an argument, you just bring in the lecturer to teach that course that year...because the timing issue is so great (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)."

While speaking for the need for more funding devoted to international research travel grants, Professor Crestwell advocated for the need for a

simplified, less competitive process as well. "I think there is some money available but sometimes it takes a lot of work to write up those proposals, and compete for grants. It just seems like it would be nice if when faculty wanted to go, they would have a research fund that they could dip into and take that travel that they need to take (A. Crestwell, interview, April 25, 2003)." And as Professor Sullivan noted, "In an ideal world, the institution would say this is so important that they will buy out part of your time (L. Sullivan, interview, April 23, 2003)."

### **Networking and Collaboration**

Faculty interviewed also discussed important steps institutions can take to better facilitate and promote networking and collaboration as a means of helping faculty make international connections within their disciplines. For example, CSU maintains a database of institutional affiliations by country and institution. The purpose of this list is to help ensure that faculty are aware of opportunities currently underway, and to promote collaboration and cooperation among academic departments on campus. Almost every seasoned international education professional has a story or two about being in country x, only then to learn that a faculty member or administrator from the institution was just there the day before. Providing a centralized database of international connections not only alleviates embarrassing situations like the example above, but also promotes these opportunities among interested faculty.

For the average faculty member not currently engaged internationally though, this database is relatively meaningless from the perspective of several faculty interviewed. As Professor Slessenger noted, "I'm sure that when faculty see this list of countries, or essentially, universities overseas, there's still a big obstacle (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)." Professor Crestwell suggests, "...trying to connect them with something in terms of their own research or teaching interests (A. Crestwell, interview, April 25, 2003)." In other words, such databases need to also include brief descriptions about specific projects underway, as well as specific opportunities available for others by discipline. And opposed to simply making the database available to those who request it, or happen to stumble across it on a website, these faculty recommend that staff in International Programs use the information to promote specific opportunities at the department level. Administrators responsible for international activities are expected to constantly coordinate the flow of information on international topics (Stone, 1995).

Connecting visiting scholars to the resources of the institution, as well as to faculty, staff, and students was noted by several faculty interviewed as a means of facilitating international scholarship. Many faculty interviewed regularly host visiting scholars from abroad, but struggle with ways to integrate them into the campus. The lack of resources to provide hospitality makes even the planning of a simple welcome reception a major challenge. Many faculty provide food and beverage from their personal funds for such

events, or simply choose to do nothing at all due to the lack of institutional support. "The social part of events is really important. It is just appalling that we don't have something better for these people here (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)."

When the international resources of institutions are minimal, two faculty interviewed recommended looking to the greater community for opportunities to make international connections. "International groceries and restaurants or Indian doctors or whoever that happens to be in your community can be used to maximize the international connections (M. Wilkerson, interview, April 24, 2003)."

#### **International Education Professional Expertise at School/Department Level**

Having benefited from the knowledge and expertise of staff in the Office of International Programs at CSU, two faculty discussed the desire for dedicated professional staff resources at the school/college and/or department level to work alongside faculty in the facilitation of international scholarship. Support at this level from international education professionals, perhaps who maintain a dual reporting to the Dean of International Programs, and the Dean of the School of College, would help facilitate and support department specific goals and objectives for internationalization. Especially for large institutions, with highly decentralized systems and structures, these individuals would serve in similar capacities to human resource professionals, business professionals, student affairs professional and others who work within a school, college, or department.

## **Summary**

This study utilized the qualitative comparative case study design and an interpretive interview method to explore when, how, and why faculty engaged in international scholarship became so engaged. The study also explored with faculty committed to international scholarship factors that facilitate and support their efforts, as well as those that constrain this form of scholarship. Finally, faculty offered recommendations to assist colleges and universities interested in facilitation and promoting international scholarship among the faculty.

The first key question sought to explore when faculty engaged in international scholarship began pursuing this particular facet of the faculty role. Data from faculty interviews revealed that the majority of faculty brought the commitment to international scholarship with them to the faculty role. Their involvement in international scholarship was primarily a result of their internal make-up and life experiences prior to the faculty role.

The second key question in this study sought to explore how faculty actively engaged in international scholarship became so engaged. Seven major themes were found to be factors that contributed to the process of faculty pursuing international scholarship, including childhood influences, undergraduate opportunities, graduate school education and training, adult living and working abroad experiences, mentors and advisors, and adult intellectual development.

The third key question explored in this study sought to better understand why faculty became involved in international scholarship. In terms of factors that motivate faculty to sustain their involvement in international scholarship, four themes emerged including the internal make-up of the individual, intrinsic rewards, extrinsic rewards, and external factors.

The fourth key question in this study sought to explore factors that contribute to faculty involvement in international scholarship. Five themes emerged as faculty reflected on factors that facilitate, encourage, and/or promote involvement in international scholarship, including an institutional ethos of internationalization, a diverse array of foreign students and scholars, like-minded colleagues, strong study abroad and institutional exchange programs, and supportive spouses.

The final key question in this study sought to explore factors that constrain faculty involvement in international scholarship. In terms of constraints to engagement in international scholarship, three major themes emerged including the faculty role as currently defined, personal/family demands, and institutional roadblocks.

Finally, in order to better encourage, promote, and facilitate faculty involvement in international scholarship, faculty recommend more funding, stronger networking and collaboration, and more resources for international education professionals at the school/department level.

As a means of providing a richer description and analysis of the above findings, the life stories of three of the faculty interviewed in this study will be

presented in the form of brief portraits in Chapter 6. The life story portraits of these faculty will help illuminate many of the major themes and patterns that emerged from faculty interviews, and offer additional insights into they key questions as explored in this study.

Professor Harold Slessenger's story offers insights into the life of an individual who brought the commitment to international scholarship with him to the faculty role. The life story portrait of Professor Ruth Adamson offers insights into the role an institution can play in encouraging and promoting international scholarship. Finally, Professor Evelyn Freedmont's portrait offers insight into the role that an individual's personal and intellectual development plays in initiating engagement in international scholarship.

## **Chapter 6: Three Faculty Portraits**

This study utilized the qualitative comparative case study design and an interpretive interview method to explore when, how, and why faculty engaged in international scholarship at Central State University became so engaged. The study also explored with faculty committed to international scholarship factors that facilitate and support their efforts, as well as those that constrain this form of scholarship. Finally, faculty offered recommendations to assist colleges and universities interested in facilitating and promoting international scholarship among the faculty. Summary findings from the interviews of seven faculty are presented in Chapter 5 above.

As a means of providing a richer description and analysis of the summary findings as presented in Chapter 5, this chapter provides life story portraits of three of the faculty interviewed. The following three faculty were chosen for a number of reasons. First, I was interested in offering a variety of experiences with international scholarship in regards to discipline, gender, and time spent in the faculty role. Second, they are amazingly gifted scholars, with an incredible passion and enthusiasm for their work in international scholarship. Perhaps as a result of their passion, they were happy to give me additional time and information in order to tell their stories.

Each brief portrait helps illuminate many of the major themes and patterns that emerged from faculty interviews, and offers additional insights into the key questions as explored in this study. Professor Harold

Slessenger's portrait offers insights into the life of an individual who brought the commitment to international scholarship with him to the faculty role. The life story portrait of Professor Ruth Adamson offers insights into the role an institution can play in encouraging and promoting international scholarship. And finally, Professor Evelyn Freedmont's portrait offers insight into the role that an individual's personal and intellectual development plays in initiating engagement in international scholarship.

### **HAROLD SLESSENGER**

"I wanted a job where I could travel a lot and do lots of different things as opposed to making money to then do what you want (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)."

Growing up in a home where both of your parents are teachers has its advantages—and perhaps, some disadvantages as well. For Harold Slessenger, the three months mom and dad had off during the summer afforded wonderful opportunities for travel, both domestically and internationally—a significant factor in the development of his world view and professional aspirations. As will be further explored in this chapter, Professor Slessenger traces his interest in international scholarship back to childhood travel experiences.

As a biologist, Slessenger's father had quite a bit of field experience in Ecology and Ecosystems, and enjoyed commingling this experience with local level agricultural issues. His mom, an elementary teacher, particularly enjoyed the leisure travel affords. In addition to multiple trips to rural areas within the United States during his formative years, at age thirteen Slessenger

made his first trip to Mexico, and from that point on, he has been outside of the United States at least once per year.

As an undergraduate college student majoring in Ecology, Slessenger followed in his father's footsteps and worked as an intern responsible for taking watershed gauging station readings to monitor groundwater flow and reservoir conditions in Idaho; as a field course participant in Guatemala, assisting in the acquisition of field data on bat diversity, foraging habits, and community structure; as a biological assistant in the development of management techniques for the utilization of a hybrid species of Asian grass carp as an economically effective and environmentally acceptable method of aquatic vegetation control in impounded waters; and as a laboratory technician responsible for dissection and taxonomic preparation of mammal specimens. During his junior year, Slessenger received a scholarship to participate in a foreign study program at the Universidad de Costa Rica. He conducted individual research with the Department of Biology at the Universidad de Costa Rica on the environmental impact of harbor facilities on a mangrove ecosystem. As a young man, Slessenger had already combined his interest in Ecology with interesting forms of international scholarship.

During the first year of his Master's program, Slessenger served as a research assistant concerning Agro forestry in the Northeast Peruvian Amazon to assess the process of abandonment of swiddens and the management of fallow plants as supplementary sources of food, cash, firewood, building materials, medicines and fibers. Second year Master's

study afforded him the opportunity to serve as a project assistant as part of a research group investigating the importance of air pollution in residential homes.

Following completion of his Master's degree, Slessenger served briefly as a consultant for the preparation of a Land Tenure Center project in Somalia and also as a consultant assisting a rural development firm with background research, contacts, and writing of technical material in connection with the preparation of a proposal to the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) for an irrigation improvement project in Somalia. He then served for approximately two and one-half years as an in-country project manager and research specialist for a USAID project in Somalia. Slessenger then returned to the United States to assume a research assistant position as part of a group responsible for research into land use and land cover change in Massachusetts.

During doctoral studies, Slessenger served as a research associate assisting in the analysis of remotely sensed video data of Malawi to conduct environmental assessments, and analyzed land use and vegetative change over time in southern Arizona. He then spent two years as a project manager and associate researcher on a major USAID grant in Mozambique on land tenure issues. He used this experience for his dissertation. Finally, he spent a semester as a teaching assistant responsible for the upper division course at his institution on Environmental and Resource Geography.

Upon completion of his Ph.D. in 1997, Slessenger spent just over a year as part of a university group put together to review, evaluate, and research various methodologies for conducting food security work in Ethiopia. He then served for several months as an Instructor, then as a Postdoctoral Fellow before joining the faculty ranks in January of 2000. As he states, "It wasn't a straight evolution to a faculty position (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)." Yet, his path to the professoriate represents an impressive combination of education and experience in the international milieu.

Now an Associate Professor in the Department of Geography at Central State University, Slessenger has over twenty years experience in designing and implementing development and research projects on land tenure, food security, natural resources and agriculture in Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. Slessenger holds a Ph.D. in Geography and Regional Development, an M.S. in Environmental Studies – Land Resources, and a B.A. in Environmental Studies. Slessenger is an Adjunct Faculty member in the Center for Latin American Studies, as well as an Adjunct Faculty member for the Area Studies Program at Central State University. He is an Executive Board Member of the Area Studies Program, and serves as chair of the programs' technology committee.

Slessenger has also served as a consultant to a USAID project in East Timor, and is the recipient of two major sponsored research grants. The first was a USAID grant for \$600,000 to study economic growth and resource security. The second is a National Science Foundation grant for \$200,000 to

study migration and environmental change in a Zambian frontier. He is the author of more than 30 refereed articles, four book reviews, and has presented 30 papers at professional conferences around the world. He is a member of the Association of American Geographers, and is active in the following specialty groups: Africa, Cultural Ecology, and Human Dimensions of Global Change. Slessenger is also a member of the International Geographical Union, the African Studies Association, the International Association for the Study of Common Property, the Academic Council on the United Nations System, the American Council of the United Nations University, and the American Association of University Professors. He is fluent in Spanish, and has language facility in Portuguese.

Slessenger entered graduate school with an interest in research and teaching world development problems from an international perspective. As noted above, he traces this interest to, "...local travel and seeing some of the different cultures (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)." People, places, and practices different from those of the Slessenger family were "seen and promoted" as "interesting and exciting and exotic (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)" by his parents. This enthusiasm for learning about the world, commingled with his interest in ecological systems resulted in his interest in looking at problems in the developing world with the realization that the notion of development is viewed differently depending on an individual's perspective. As Slessenger states, "...it was that sort of interest in seeing the different

ways of doing agriculture...from the Amazon to the Ivory Coast of Africa (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)."

Intrigued by the notion of perspective, Slessenger recalls being interested at a relatively young age in the way in which his parents viewed land as compared with his grandparents. As German immigrant farmers, he states, his grandparents:

"...had this perspective that the land is something to be conquered and you shew the animals off it and try to grow wheat crop in central Kansas where they lived with a large colony of similar immigrants. Their perspective means you never really engage rural areas in fun. Whereas, just one generation away, my father and mother have a very different perspective--like we go camping, and fishing and all these things that my grandparents would flee from and go to the city for fun. That sort of odd change I found interesting (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)."

Initially during graduate school his interests were in Latin America, in advancing his Spanish language skills, and looking at development issues within the region. "I'd been living in Costa Rica and went back to graduate school for the purpose of getting a degree for an international career in some way (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)." These interests were encouraged and promoted by a faculty member at Slessenger's graduate institution who involved him in a project in Peru. Graduate studies also helped him expand his interest to looking at different people, systems, and livelihoods beyond Latin America to Africa. "Graduate school allows you to sort of expand on that and look at where else in the world are similar issues at play...so, where do the things in Latin America occur elsewhere (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)?"

Drawn to Central State University by the quality of the institution and in particular, the strength of the Area Studies Program, Slessenger was hired by the Geography Department with the understanding that he would have a focus in a major world region. "I came into the Geography Department with the understanding that I would have a focus there and I very much needed the Area Studies Program that Central State University has; it is well-known, that's part of what drew me here (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)." He typically teaches courses on political ecology, rural development, environmental change, and climate change, using examples from where he has lived and worked. Slessenger is actively involved in mentoring international students, and leads research in a major world region for a multidisciplinary research center on campus. This summer he heads overseas with three students to study environmental change. Slessenger is also involved in helping to establish exchange agreements with foreign institutions within the Department of Geography.

Slessenger distinguishes himself from many of his faculty colleagues as follows. "They're not really well traveled, or even if there's a particular view of the world as outside, it's dirty and it's strange food and all those things can be seen as resistant or can be seen and presented as exciting, alluring, colorful, and interesting (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)." From Slessenger's perspective, presenting the world to today's college student is most effective when it is presented as exciting, alluring, and colorful. He models for his students the world view presented to him as a child.

Slessenger believes he has played an important role within his department over the past three years in helping to educate colleagues concerning the unique interests, needs, and concerns of international students. He states, "...the reality of having an international student come on board and load them up the first semester with things that you could load up an American with like heavy statistics and calculations and 15 credit semesters is just overwhelming...with international students you have to ease them into it. So, there's some education on my part within the department which seems to me that the international perspective hasn't been high (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)."

Yet, the Geography Department has been particularly supportive of Slessenger's desire to spend time in the field, which for him, typically means in another country. He has been given permission to teach second 8 week courses (while CSU is on a semester system, some departments offer intensive eight week courses during the sixteen week semester), allowing an opportunity for international research during the first 8 weeks of the term. He also credits the Dean for International Programs, "...it's good to have that strong voice that's backing you up. So, if you've got this strong idea from outside (the department) that says, 'this is valuable,' that has a lot of clout (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)."

The motivation for Slessenger to continue pursuits in international scholarship comes in, "...belonging to a bigger picture...the topics you engage in overseas are global level issues...for me it's the environmental

change, agricultural development...with these issues in mind you have a large profile to international trends (H. Slessenger, interview, April 29, 2003)."

In summary, as one of five faculty interviewed in this study who brought the commitment to international scholarship with them to the faculty role, Professor Slessenger's story reflects the powerful force family background and childhood play in the lives of the majority of faculty interviewed. More than anything else, early childhood experiences put these faculty on the path towards active engagement in international scholarship. Slessenger's initial interests were then further enhanced and facilitated during undergraduate and graduate school education and experiences, which helped propel his research interests beyond Latin America. Slessenger's story also reveals the importance of institutional strategies and structures that serve to facilitate and promote campus internationalization efforts, referred to in this study as an ethos of internationalization on campus. The support gained from Professor Slessenger's home department, although many of his colleagues are not engaged internationally, is crucial to his ongoing scholarly pursuits. Central State University benefits from Slessenger's commitment to international scholarship, and he in turn benefits from the international strengths of the institution as a whole, and the support he engenders from his employing department.

## **RUTH ADAMSON**

**"I wanted to be in the United Nations. That was my goal for a long, long time (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)."**

Growing up in the 1950's on a ranch in Texas meant that people from all over the world would regularly visit, "...so they could see a ranch and ride a horse" recalls Ruth Adamson (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003).

Adamson believes this experience helped shape her worldview in significant ways as early on in her development she felt as though she and her family were exotic. "I had experiences where Americans would say, 'wow, how did you ever get an education?' (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)."

Opportunities to learn about other countries and cultures in the Mexican church she attended as a child also played a key role in her interest about the world. "It was sort of like, 'okay, now we're going to talk about China, now we're going to talk about Japan, and India and Africa' (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)."

At age 13, Ruth went to New York with family friends who had moved to the "big city" and returned to the small Texas town they once called home for a summer visit. They offered to take Ruth back with them to New York for a couple of weeks, and promised to show her the sights. After spending a couple of weeks in New York and Washington, D.C., Ruth began dreaming about someday working at the United Nations. She recalls, "...I went to the U.N. and that was it. I wanted to be in the U.N. That was my goal for a long, long time (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)."

Adamson stayed connected to her international interests in high school and college by spending a summer studying Spanish in Mexico, and traveling to the country numerous times during her high school days. During undergraduate studies, she went to Russia and traveled throughout Europe as part of a trip for credit organized by a History professor. These experiences had, "...a very profound impact (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)" on Ruth, but apparently not enough to sway her from the pressures faced by many young women during the 1950's. Like most of her educated female friends, Ruth got married, and began teaching.

After several years of teaching and a divorce, Ruth decided to pursue her international interests and return to graduate school. "When I entered graduate school, I was going to fulfill all of my dreams...I finally said, 'okay, enough. I'm going to do what I want to do now.' I definitely wanted to work internationally...I went into Anthropology with a concentration in Folklore, and I had every intention of working in another culture and working internationally but I didn't have a clue as to just how that would play out (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)." And it didn't play out for a very long time.

Not only did Ruth not know where or how she would engage internationally, she also had a number of obstacles to confront and overcome. The first were of a practical nature. She recalls, "...I had in mind working in another culture but I tried not to from the beginning partly because I had small children, partly because of funding (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)." The second were philosophical. She states, "...also because of

ideology...and I think that might have been the strongest reason actually, because I really did feel strongly that I would be more comfortable working with another culture if I had looked at my own...I really did believe in studying other societies, but I actually really do think that if you only look at another culture and you've never looked at your own, even a piece of your own, then I think that it is very likely that you might take that stance with you where you are seeing people as an 'other' (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)."

Ruth believes her thinking in this regard was supported by the underpinnings of her discipline, but she states, "I don't think it came from my training. I think I brought it with me...but it was still the case that anthropology was done somewhere else and folklore could be someplace else and it was also in your own culture (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)." Perhaps Ruth brought this commitment with her from childhood as she was never quite comfortable being viewed by others as "exotic." Or perhaps the tensions between Anthropology and Folklore were influencing her direction in ways she is not comfortable recognizing.

Adamson completed a Ph.D. in Anthropology (Folklore) in 1979, and assumed a position as lecturer at a major university for the next three years. She was then promoted to an Assistant Professor, and remained in this role for four years prior to accepting an Associate Professor position at Central State University in 1986. She currently serves as Associate Professor in the Department of Anthropology, and holds a joint appointment in the Department of Folklore and Ethnomusicology, serves as a faculty member in the Area

Studies Program, the American Studies Program, and as an Adjunct Professor in the Russian East European Institute.

Ruth has received numerous honors and awards, including two CSU President's Council on International Programs grants for foreign travel, a Fulbright Research Scholar grant in Ghana, and a United States Information Agency Linkage Grant also in Ghana. She is the author of one book, and co-editor of another. Adamson has contributed seventeen chapters to other texts, has 32 articles in journals and reference works, has done 9 reviews, two movies, delivered 38 papers at scholarly meetings, and has been invited to give 64 lectures and scholarly presentations. Adamson has membership in numerous professional organizations, including the American Anthropological Association (AAA), the Africanist Section of the AAA, the Association for Feminist Anthropology, Political and Legal Anthropology, American Folklore Society, African Studies Association (ASA), the Women's Caucus of the ASA, Western History Association, and Law and Society. She has an impressive record of professional service, university service, and service to professional organizations.

Adamson spent seven years studying her own culture in the form of frontier women, cowboys and clowns, Texas traditions and festival queens before thinking again seriously about international scholarship. While she doesn't make reference to the role played by her employing institution in this regard, one wonders whether the change in educational institutions helped facilitate the rekindling of the international spark that emerged in early

childhood. Moving from an employing institution in Texas not necessarily known for excellence in international scholarship, to an institution with a strong global presence likely had an influence. As Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) note, characteristics of individuals and their employing institution combine and lead to variations in faculty motivation, behavior, and productivity. "When I came here (to CSU) I felt like I was really ready to work in a different culture and if I didn't do it soon I wasn't going to do it because it was time to make that switch...I think for me it was just sort of a lifelong project moving piece by piece until I got all the pieces together rather than it being from one event (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)."

The international scope of Central State University was appealing to Adamson, who began regularly attending internationally focused workshops, seminars, and lectures offered by various departments. In addition, relatively large numbers of international students and visiting scholars on campus meant that her exposure to her continent of specialization in international scholarship began to grow. At a lecture Adamson was giving on festival queens, she met an engaging scholar who encouraged her to study festival queens in his home country. She recalls, "...I met someone who actually heard me give a talk on festival queens and said, 'you know, you really should go and study festival queens there', and of course, that was like, 'yes, you're right, that is exactly what I want to do' (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)."

After doing some initial research, Adamson connected with the Director of the Area Studies Program, and found additional support and encouragement. She was directed towards a foreign study travel grant offered by the President's office. "It was all these pieces here coming together that led me to going ahead with it and also to be successful (R. Adamson, interview, April 15, 2003)," she recalls. Professor Adamson got the grant, and ever since has been deeply engaged in international scholarship.

As was the case for Professor Slessenger, Professor Adamson's interest in international scholarship can perhaps best be traced back to family upbringing and childhood experiences. Living in a diverse community, regularly having visitors in her home, and the opportunity to visit the United Nations at an early age lit the spark for Adamson. Professor Adamson also continued to pursue her international interests throughout young adulthood, until she married after college and began teaching. Upon completion of graduate school, she encountered obstacles that prevented her engagement internationally, both personal and philosophical. Making a change in employing institutions then played a key role in her re-engagement internationally upon meeting a visiting scholar at CSU, and then quickly connecting with the wealth of international resources and expertise at CSU. While Professor Adamson's upbringing positioned her well for international scholarship in the faculty role, had she not changed employing institutions, she may not have ever pursued this facet of the faculty role.

## **EVELYN FREEDMONT**

**"I began to realize that multi-cultural wasn't something you just did, but it was something you had to commit to for the reasons of making a better world and helping people understand each other (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)."**

Born in 1860, Evelyn Freedmont's grandfather insisted that his African-American helper was not a slave, but someone who worked for him, and ate at the table with his family. "So I think we were brought up with an attitude toward diversity, certainly there were patterns that you couldn't avoid just because you grew up in a certain time and place, but I think there was something early on that was always present (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)." Today, an innovative music educator committed to children's singing, teacher education, and multicultural music, Freedmont thrives on seeing her students open up to the value of non-western forms of music. Her multicultural music education program incorporates the latest technology, and new methods for contributing to cultural understanding through music.

Freedmont completed a Bachelor of Music in Voice in 1965. During her undergraduate program, she studied at the Mozarteum in Salzburg, Austria. During graduate study, she served as an Associate Instructor in the Multiple Arts Program and Music Methods for Classroom Teachers at a major university. She then spent 13 years as an Elementary Vocal Music Specialist in a large Midwestern school system. In 1977, she accepted a part-time Assistant Professor of Music position in the Music Education Department of a major university. In 1983, Freedmont changed employing institutions and

assumed the position of Associate Instructor. Shortly thereafter, she returned to her previous institution in 1984 as Professor of Music. In 1996 Freedmont changed departments, and began serving as Chair of the Music in General Studies Department and Professor of Music. She completed a Master of Music Education degree in 1971, and obtained a Ph.D. in Music Education in 1985.

Freedmont is the recipient of a number of honors and distinctions. In 1999, she received acclaim as the state's most outstanding musician from the Music Educators Association. In 1991, she received the President's award for distinguished teaching at Central State University. She is a member of a number of professional organizations, including the Music Educators National Conference, the Organization of American Kodaly, the American Choral Directors Association, the International Society for Music Education, the International Kodaly Society, and the Society for Ethnomusicology.

Freedmont is the creator of an interactive multimedia approach to teaching global music. Her product features native musical models presented in context with pronunciation, movements, translations and extensive cultural information. Four volumes are currently available, featuring music from South Africa, Hungary, and Japan. Two are in process, from Azerbaijan, and New Zealand.

She is also founder of Central State University's School of Music International Vocal Ensemble which specializes in vocal music from diverse cultures. The ensemble has been awarded numerous grants to support

bringing artists to campus, interactive links with artists in remote places, and teacher workshops to disseminate an interactive model of presentation.

Freedmont is also co-founder and co-chair of a bi-annual conference for teachers of elementary music methods. The first conference was held in 1991.

Freedmont has twenty-one commissions for numerous honor choirs, festivals and local children's choirs. She has numerous arrangements and compositions, including three collections of classroom arrangements. She is also the author of a number of research articles, invited articles, conference proceedings, book chapters, and papers for various publications on children's singing voices, children's choirs and multicultural music education.

While working on a music text series for grades kindergarten to six in the early 1990's, Freedmont recalls struggling with the appropriateness of the material given the diversity in today's elementary school. These reflections, which challenged her educational background and training to its very core, resulted in a transformative change in the way in which she viewed her role as a faculty member. She described the initial impetus for involvement in international scholarship as follows:

There's something in the news every day, but I don't think there was a major event that sparked my involvement...it was more of a gradual evolution of thought. I just really couldn't listen to the news for awhile. I still don't really want to hear about it. I'm overwhelmed by the hatred and the acts of violence on the basis of nothing more than race and sometimes religious differences...and I looked at the way we were teaching and I thought, we're not doing anything to help the situation (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003).

Almost akin to an awakening, Freedmont recalls feeling, "...that what we were doing wasn't really appropriate for all children of every nationality in the United States because we have a totally geocentric approach to teaching music and it hasn't changed (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)." She goes on to state that she,

"...began the process of realizing that the way music from many cultures is done strips us from any knowledge of the culture. There's no attendance to knowing about the people. A picture on the page is the extent of what you might get. The song has been sifted through western notation, tuned to our scales, and set to our vocal techniques. All aspects of the style are gone. Everything is familiar to us. Even the language has been translated into the closest English equivalent, which doesn't even cut it with German, let alone an African click. So I became a leader and a spokesperson for this in the process of writing the book (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)."

As Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) indicate, "Motivation to perform a task varies in relation to the meaning it has for an individual. Meaning is determined by a person's sense of self and by personal incentives that evolve and change over time as a result of social learning."

Having completed the text of which she is extremely proud, Freedmont then began to look closely at her home department and was dismayed at the level of ethnocentrism among her colleagues. She states, "I became very sensitized to some of these issues and I came back to my institution—and I don't think there's a more Eurocentric program in the United States than the one I'm a part of (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)." So, Freedmont grappled with how to incorporate this new passion within an otherwise unsupportive environment.

She woke up in the middle of the night with an idea. Every music student at CSU is required to take a 2 credit hour ensemble course which meets five hours per week. Freedmont contemplated the notion of creating an ensemble that would perform music from outside of the western tradition and in doing so would find a way that would teach students about culture, and, "...honor the practices of people that are not European (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)." Still somewhat surprised that her proposal to begin such an ensemble was approved, she recalls, "Magically, I made it through the red tape and became director of the ensemble...here I am in the Education Department taking over a music ensemble that was a major ensemble, but it worked (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)." Professor Freedmont further described the development of her engagement in international scholarship as follows:

The model I wanted to use was not notation. The music was not notated in the culture, so we would not sing from notation. That required that I either have live artists to teach the music or I have video materials to teach the music. What I started to do, wherever I went—I lucked out because I was invited at that time to teach in Australia and I was presenting at a conference and there was a choir from South Africa there and they allowed me to videotape and they shared a lot of materials with me. So, I was able to develop a different method, an oral method using technology to present the music and I discovered so many things about learning and different ways of learning music particularly. But also about teaching when you do an oral approach and I began to wake up to the incredible resources around me here at CSU and I actually applied for a directives grant which was an initiative that had come from the Chancellor and got two years funded to travel and to bring an artist here for a year. He was able to finish a degree in Ethnomusicology and return back to Zimbabwe (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003).

Upon reflection, Freedmont is clearly driven to pursue international scholarship for intrinsic reasons. She displayed a tremendous sense of

dedication and commitment to her students, and spoke passionately about the role she has played in helping to open up the world of music to them. She stated, "I really did it with music education students in mind because I just could not fathom that they would go out into this country and teach and not have any notion of foreign music, and carry with them the bias that music schools give their students (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)." In addition to learning about various forms of music around the world, Professor Freedmont gives her students much more in the form of a better understanding of the world's countries, cultures, and people.

In her words, Professor Freedmont views role as one of a cultural educator. She states, "I now say I'm not a music educator anymore, I'm a cultural educator and I use music to help people understand one another (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)." She goes on to state:

I think it's critically important for us to transform the teachers and students point of view about all kinds of things. We were singing music from Islam last semester because I wanted them to have some ideas. When they talk to somebody, let's not just assume, make assumptions about people because they are Islamic. There was such a turn back to patriotism, I don't think it's something we need more of and I don't think we recognize how closed we are. In some of the other areas we talk to there is more of a global view. They are willing to say, 'okay, I see your point' (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003).

Reflecting upon the importance of support within a faculty member's home department for involvement in international scholarship, Professor Freedmont stated, "...one of the reasons I'm in this department instead of where I was is that they didn't acknowledge the research I was doing on international music as relevant because it wasn't published in music journals

and didn't take the form of their research and so it wasn't relevant...the administration (academic) and their attitude is, 'well, that's not quality' (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)." Fortunately, for Professor Freedmont, she was able to change departments and retain her commitment to international scholarship. For faculty not fortunate to be able to make such a switch, norms and expectations among one's colleagues will likely play a powerful role in determining whether the interest remains. As Professor Freedmont stated:

There was nothing here at this particular setting (within her department) that would have encouraged me in that direction (international scholarship). I had to fight for two years on a committee to get the revised core to include one three hour course that was in any music or art outside western art tradition, and the chair had to break the tie. And it has never been put into place. I speak out. I think they're racist in their views. But I think they drove me there. There was nothing here that would have led me (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003).

Even though Professor Freedmont has been able to pursue her interests in international scholarship by changing departments, it is clear that she continues this work with little to no support from her colleagues. And she works very hard to not make waves. She stated, "I put myself kind of in the ghetto where I can carry on without competing. I take the dregs of the singers because they (her colleagues who run other ensembles) want all of the great singers. I don't want them. So, I've kind of found my way of operating without hitting impediments (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)."

But for Professor Freedmont, the efforts are worth it. "I'm on one of the most exciting journeys anyone could be on because I encounter people, I go places, I make connections, I get to go and be part of music making. I don't

teach, I facilitate the learning of my students and put them in touch with people or materials to broaden them and so I'm learning. It's an opportunity for me to learn (E. Freedmont, interview, April 21, 2003)."

Professor Freedmont's commitment to international scholarship then ties most directly to her own personal growth and intellectual development, as opposed to family upbringing and childhood experiences. While Freedmont spoke of certain family influences, and in particular her grandfather's approach to his slave, these influences were much less direct than in the previous two cases as presented above. Despite great odds, Professor Freedmont has pursued her passion, driven by the belief that she must do something to make the world a better place. While she has received little to no support from her colleagues, she has benefited tremendously from the encouragement and support she has received from the international resources of CSU.

## **Chapter 7: Conclusion**

This study utilized the qualitative comparative case study design and an interpretive interview method to explore when, how, and why faculty engaged in international scholarship became so engaged. The study also explored with faculty committed to international scholarship factors that facilitate and support their efforts, as well as those that constrain this form of scholarship. Finally, faculty offered recommendations to assist colleges and universities interested in facilitating and promoting international scholarship among their colleagues.

### **When**

The first key question sought to explore when faculty engaged in international scholarship began pursuing this particular facet of the faculty role. As Tenant (1997) indicates, most theories of adult development either explain learning and development in terms of the internal make-up of the person or the external forces impinging on the person. Data from faculty interviews revealed that the majority of faculty brought the commitment to international scholarship with them to the faculty role. Their involvement in international scholarship was primarily a result of their internal make-up and life experiences prior to the faculty role. This finding suggests that institutional attempts to promote international scholarship among faculty not currently active in this domain of scholarship may prove difficult. Specific administrative strategies designed to initiate faculty involvement in international scholarship were not identified by faculty interviewed as the

impetus for their involvement. Yet, as the stories of three faculty profiles reflect, and data from the other faculty interviewed support, institutional efforts play a key role in facilitating and supporting the efforts of faculty already inclined to pursue international scholarship. For one faculty member interviewed, the institutional culture of internationalization helped rekindle an enthusiasm for international scholarship that lay dormant for many years. These findings support a premise postulated by Johnston and Edelstein (1993) who note that, curricula and disciplines can only be changed by the faculty, and they must have strong international interests and appropriate support in order to do so. In other words, faculty bring the interest, and institutions provide the support.

## **How**

The second key question in this study sought to explore how faculty actively engaged in international scholarship became so engaged. Data gleaned from faculty interviews pertaining to this question suggest areas where administrative intervention in terms of support provided for faculty engagement in international scholarship may have the greatest impact. In addition, this study has contributed to our understanding of the key processes and components of internationalization outside of the control of the administration that have contributed to faculty involvement in international scholarship.

Seven major themes were found to be factors that contributed to the process of faculty pursuing international scholarship. Of these, two were

found to be outside of the control of university administration, including childhood influences, and adult living and working abroad experiences. While factors within the control of the administration were not found to be the impetus for faculty engagement in international scholarship, nonetheless, these variables contributed to faculty engagement, and suggest potential areas of influence for administrators interested in further promoting faculty involvement in international scholarship. These include undergraduate opportunities, graduate school education and training, adult living and working abroad experiences, mentors and advisors, and adult intellectual development. While undergraduate opportunities and graduate school education and training reflect areas of long-term investment in terms of building future international scholars, it should be encouraging to those administrators pushing for expanded study abroad opportunities and an internationalization of the curriculum, to note the role these factors played in the lives of the faculty interviewed in this study. New and creative ways are needed to fund and support opportunities for faculty to live and work abroad, to connect faculty committed to international scholarship with junior faculty to serve as advisors and mentors, and to promote opportunities to facilitate the ongoing personal and intellectual development of faculty in this domain. This can perhaps best be accomplished through special speakers, workshops and seminars with an international focus.

## **Why**

The third key question explored in this study sought to better understand why faculty became involved in international scholarship. Four themes emerged including the internal make-up of the individual, intrinsic rewards, extrinsic rewards, and external factors. Many of the faculty interviewed found a great deal of encouragement and motivation to pursue international scholarship and teaching from intrinsic rewards. This finding suggests that rather simple, low cost efforts on the part of university administrators will go a long way towards encouraging and supporting these efforts. For example, annual awards for international faculty scholarship, receptions to recognize visiting scholars and their on-campus faculty hosts, publishing profiles of faculty work abroad in departmental newsletters, and the like. While faculty interviewed did not find much motivation from external rewards, they spoke in unison about the need for stronger fiscal support from the institution to encourage and support broader faculty involvement. For faculty not inclined to be involved in international scholarship due to their internal make-up, external rewards may be the most effective means of initiating their involvement. As scholars note, given the disincentives to incorporating international perspectives, institutional policies including hiring, promotion, tenure, and curriculum must be revised (Johnston & Edelstein, 1993; Aigner, Stimpfl and Nelson, 1992). "Career rewards, hiring, and financial/administrative support are absolutely necessary to drive

internationalization and to convincingly portray it as an institutional goal and direction (Aigner, Stimpfl & Nelson, 1992, p. 5)."

### **Facilitators**

The fourth key question in this study sought to explore factors that contribute to faculty involvement in international scholarship. Five themes emerged as faculty reflected on factors that contribute to faculty involvement in international scholarship, including an institutional ethos of internationalization, a diverse array of foreign students and scholars, like-minded colleagues, strong study abroad and institutional exchange programs, and supportive spouses. These findings closely parallel key points regarding the internationalization process as outlined in the literature review for this study. These include: (1) strong leadership that flows from a clearly defined mission statement which includes specific references to the importance of internationalization; (2) an infusion of global perspectives across the curriculum; (3) a campus ethos which encourages, develops and supports faculty involvement in international education; (4) study abroad programs that are well integrated into the academic programs of the institution; (5) the presence of a diverse set of international students who are well integrated into campus life; (6) international outreach programs that are relevant to the needs of the campus and surrounding community; and (7) a well-coordinated, centralized office with a top level administrator that works with a faculty oversight committee.

## **Constraints**

The final key question in this study sought to explore factors that constrain faculty involvement in international scholarship. In terms of constraints to engagement in international scholarship, three major themes emerged including the faculty role as currently defined, personal/family demands, and institutional roadblocks. While institutions can do little to alleviate personal/family demands in regards to international scholarship, university administrators need to find new and creative means of facilitating and supporting international scholarship within the needs and demands of the institution and faculty expectations. In order to better encourage, promote, and facilitate faculty involvement in international scholarship, faculty recommend more funding, stronger networking and collaboration, and more resources for international education professionals at the school/department level.

## **IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY AND PRACTICE**

While factors within the control of university administrators were not found to be the impetus for faculty engagement in international scholarship, several institutional efforts were found to play a key role in facilitating and supporting the efforts of faculty already inclined to pursue international scholarship. In addition, faculty committed to international scholarship discussed a number of helpful ideas and suggestions for encouraging and promoting international scholarship among faculty not currently engaged in this domain. Data from this study suggests three broad areas where

institutions interested in furthering the international scholarship initiatives of faculty should concentrate their policy and practice initiatives. These include: creating a campus ethos of internationalization; providing tangible support for international scholarship; and fostering faculty development in international scholarship.

### **Create a Campus Ethos of Internationalization**

According to the faculty interviewed in this study, and to two recent studies concerning campus internationalization, Central State University has a campus ethos of internationalization. The importance of the University's international programs and initiatives is widely known and supported, and these efforts go well beyond a select few faculty and staff. The international dimension of the University is woven into the fabric of the institution, and plays an important role in the overall culture of the campus and community. This ethos of internationalization plays an important role in validating the work of faculty already committed to international scholarship, and in facilitating and promoting involvement among others. Based on data gleaned from this study, institutions interested in establishing and/or strengthening a campus ethos of internationalization should consider the following:

- Expand undergraduate and graduate curricular opportunities through more courses with an international and/or comparative focus;
- Recognize the international efforts and initiatives of faculty, staff, and students through awards and recognition ceremonies,

welcome receptions for visiting scholars and their faculty hosts, profiles in alumni magazines and other campus publications, and public proclamations;

- Increase the presence of, and better integrate international students and visiting scholars on campus;
- Place a priority on hiring faculty already committed to international scholarship; and
- Strengthen study abroad and institutional exchange programs and opportunities for faculty, staff, and students.

Each of these measures, and more, will help institutions create an ethos of internationalization, which in turn will help facilitate and support international scholarship.

### **Provide Tangible Support for International Scholarship**

Faculty interviewed in this study did not find much personal motivation from external rewards for international scholarship. Yet, they spoke in unison about the need for stronger fiscal support from the institution to encourage and support broader faculty involvement. For faculty not inclined to be involved in international scholarship due to their internal make-up, external incentives and rewards may be the most effective means of initiating their involvement. Specifically, faculty interviewed in this study recommend the following:

- Provide release time to internationalize existing curriculum and/or develop new courses;

- Include international scholarship initiatives among promotion and tenure criteria;
- Allow faculty greater flexibility in arranging out-of-country opportunities during the academic year by helping to arrange coverage for missed classes and other responsibilities; and
- Utilize international education professionals at the school/department level as a means of providing discipline-specific support for international initiatives.

As discussed above, data gleaned from this study also suggest that rather simple, low cost efforts on the part of university administrators will go a long way towards encouraging and supporting international scholarship. Annual awards for international faculty scholarship, receptions to recognize visiting scholars and their on-campus faculty hosts, and publishing profiles of faculty work abroad in departmental newsletters provide good examples of ways to encourage and promote this form of scholarship.

### **Foster Faculty Development in International Scholarship**

While institutions can do little to alleviate family demands or garner the support of faculty spouses for international scholarship, their impact can be much more significant when it comes to supporting individual faculty development in international scholarship. As Raby (1995) notes, "No one person is born internationalized...the majority of faculty are not trained to encompass an international perspective into their courses (p. 4)." Thus, many faculty will need the assistance of their employing institutions in order to

facilitate their learning and development in this regard. In order to foster faculty development in international scholarship, faculty interviewed in this study suggest the following:

- Enhance graduate school education and training to better prepare aspiring and junior faculty for active engagement in a variety of forms of international scholarship;
- Utilize mentors and advisors to encourage, advise, and support faculty interested in pursuing international scholarship;
- Facilitate networking and collaboration among faculty engaged in international scholarship with those who have an interest in this domain;
- Identify, facilitate, and promote living and working abroad experiences and opportunities for faculty; and
- Promote intellectual development of faculty in the international domain through in-country workshops, on-campus seminars, guest lectures, and special speakers.

### **Implications for Future Research**

This study sought to understand the context in which faculty engage in forms of international scholarship. More specifically, when, how, and why do faculty become involved in efforts to incorporate a global perspective in their teaching? The following key questions were addressed:

- ◆ When do (did) faculty actively involved in international scholarship become so involved?

- ◆ How do (did) faculty actively involved in international scholarship become so involved?
- ◆ Why do (did) faculty actively involved in international scholarship become so involved?
- ◆ What factors contribute to faculty involvement in international scholarship?
- ◆ What factors constrain faculty involvement in international scholarship?
- ◆ What recommendations do faculty actively engaged in international scholarship have to further encourage and promote international scholarship among other faculty?

In order to ensure that faculty selected for participation in this study were indeed actively involved in international scholarship, a decision was made to select faculty from within an area studies program at Central State University. While this helped ensure that faculty selected for interviews met the selection criteria of being “actively involved in international scholarship,” the sample was likely skewed to include faculty already committed to international scholarship upon assuming the faculty role. This is due to the already existing international expertise of the typical faculty member who would be qualified to be affiliated with an area studies program which specializes in a particular world region.

The higher education community would benefit from a replication of this study, which seeks to select faculty who were not committed to international scholarship upon assuming their faculty role, but became involved in this form of scholarship later in their careers. Faculty not already

committed to international scholarship upon assuming the faculty role could offer a more accurate view of institutional factors that either facilitated or constrained their involvement. Their experiences may also be more instructive to university administrators attempting to encourage broader faculty involvement in international scholarship, and in particular, among faculty not currently engaged in this domain of scholarship.

Given the small number of faculty interviewed in this study, it would also be beneficial to replicate this study among a broader representation of faculty engaged in international scholarship at CSU or a similar institution. It is also important to expand data collection to include faculty from multiple schools known for their commitment to international scholarship. This would result in an ability to generalize findings, as well as identify major patterns and themes relative to international scholarship among multiple institutional types and sizes. CSU is a major Research I institution, and the area studies program from which faculty were selected to participate in interviews is a further subset of this unique institution. Thus, similar studies involving more faculty from different institutional types are needed.

In addition, while faculty interviewed in this study had in common an affiliation with the Area Studies Center at CSU, they each represented a unique department and discipline. While data suggests possible disciplinary differences in regards to the support faculty received for international scholarship, further study is needed to determine the role an individual's discipline plays in their engagement in international scholarship. Are there

disciplinary differences in this regard? And if so, what forms do these differences take, and what impact do they have on faculty and students?

Some of the faculty interviewed in this study spoke of the difficulties they encounter attempting to balance the competing demands of their roles, especially when these roles play out in an international context. A tension exists for these faculty in terms of their obligations to the institution and their students, and their desire to be actively engaged in various forms of international scholarship. In other words, at times to be actively involved in international scholarship means to neglect students enrolled in a course if active international engagement means having to miss several classes during a semester in order to participate in scholarly activity abroad. This tension requires additional analysis and study. What is the impact on teaching when a scholar is actively engaged internationally? Are the benefits to the student worth the cost?

Finally, it would be helpful to better understand why many faculty remain disengaged from international scholarship. A study of faculty not involved in international scholarship may help illuminate key factors required to encourage and promote broader faculty involvement in international scholarship. Further study and analysis of faculty not engaged in international scholarship may also better illuminate issues concerning institutional barriers and other impediments to this important form of scholarship.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **CONTACT LETTER TO DIRECTOR OF AREA STUDIES PROGRAM**

Date

Dr. Smith, Director  
International Program  
Department Address  
Central State University  
Anytown, USA 44444

Dear Dr. Smith:

I am writing to invite you and the Area Studies Program to participate in a study examining faculty involvement in international scholarship. This study: *FACULTY ENGAGED IN INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP: A STUDY OF WHEN, HOW, AND WHY*, is the basis for my dissertation for the Department of Educational Administration at Michigan State University.

This study seeks to describe how faculty actively involved in international scholarship become so involved. I have chosen your program to draw a sample of faculty for interviews based on its reputation for actively seeking to encourage and support various forms of international scholarship.

Broadly defined, international scholarship in this study refers to activity in the faculty domains of discovery, integration, application, and teaching that incorporate an international perspective. Faculty actively involved in international scholarship will likely be in regular contact with colleagues in other countries. They are likely to present papers at conferences abroad, be actively involved as advisors and mentors to international students, and lead groups of domestic students on study, research, and service projects abroad. In addition, they will consistently incorporate perspectives of other countries and cultures in classroom instruction, and encourage students to do the same in projects and assignments.

My interest in this topic stems from my desire to learn more about factors that contribute to faculty involvement in international scholarship. This study should be of interest to faculty and administrators as it will hopefully shed light

on ways in which institutions can have the greatest impact on faculty involvement in international scholarship.

Participation in this study would consist of a 60-90 minute interview with you and a 60-90 minute interview with eight faculty members affiliated with the International Program. I would ask for a copy of curriculum vitae from each faculty member as background information and I may ask for departmental information (if publicly available) such as promotion and tenure guidelines, internationalization efforts, planning documents, or committee meeting notes.

All material I collect for this study will be treated confidentially and presented in a manner that will not permit the identification of any individual, or the department. Pseudonyms will be assigned to each individual and identifying characteristics will be deleted. In addition, it is important to note that this study is not being funded by any office or person at Central State University or elsewhere.

I will call you within the next two weeks to discuss this project further. If you would like to speak with me before that time, please contact me at the address, telephone number, or e-mail address indicated below. I look forward to talking with you soon.

Sincerely,

Christopher J. Viers

## **APPENDIX B**

### **CONTACT LETTER TO FACULTY**

Date

Dr. Smith, Professor  
Department  
Department Address  
Central State University  
Anytown, USA 44444

Dear Professor. Smith:

With approval from Dr. Smith, Director of the International Program, I am writing to invite you to participate in a study examining faculty involvement in international scholarship. This study: *FACULTY ENGAGED IN INTERNATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP: A STUDY OF WHEN, HOW, AND WHY*, is the basis for my dissertation for the Department of Educational Administration at Michigan State University.

This study seeks to describe how faculty actively involved in international scholarship become so involved. I have chosen the International Program to draw a sample of faculty for interviews based on its reputation for actively seeking to encourage and support various forms of international scholarship.

Broadly defined, international scholarship in this study refers to activity in the faculty domains of discovery, integration, application, and teaching that incorporate an international perspective. Faculty actively involved in international scholarship then will likely be in regular contact with colleagues in other countries. They are likely to present papers at conferences abroad, be actively involved as advisors and mentors to international students, and lead groups of domestic students on study, research, and service projects abroad. In addition, they will consistently incorporate perspectives of other countries and cultures in classroom instruction, and encourage students to do the same in projects and assignments.

My interest in this topic stems from my desire to learn more about factors that contribute to faculty involvement in international scholarship. This study should be of interest to faculty and administrators as it will hopefully shed light

on ways in which institutions can have the greatest impact on faculty involvement in international scholarship.

Participation in this study would consist of one 60-90 minute interview. I would ask for a copy of your curriculum vitae as background information prior to the interview.

All material I collect for this study will be treated confidentially and presented in a manner that will not permit the identification of any individual, or the department. Pseudonyms will be assigned to each individual and identifying characteristics will be deleted. In addition, it is important to note that this study is not being funded by any office or person at Central State University or elsewhere.

I will call you within the next two weeks to discuss this project further. If you would like to speak with me before that time, please contact me at the address, telephone number, or e-mail address indicated below. I look forward to talking with you soon.

Sincerely,

Christopher J. Viers

## **APPENDIX C**

### **CONSENT FORM: Faculty Involvement in International Scholarship**

In signing this form, you are agreeing to participate in a research project which concerns when, how, and why you became involved in international scholarship. You will be interviewed for approximately 60 to 90 minutes.

The researcher will hold your responses in confidence and no comments will be attributed to you in any reports on this study. Your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law. No details will be provided in any verbal or written reports that could identify you, and you will be assigned a pseudonym to further protect your identity. Your participation is voluntary and you may decline to answer any questions or withdraw your participation in this study at any time without penalty.

Risks associated with participation in this study are very low. Participation will not present harm to your physical, psychological, social, legal, or economic well being. You may benefit from participation in this study by better understanding the initial impetus for your involvement in international scholarship. In addition, the higher education community may benefit from having a better idea regarding factors which initiate and sustain faculty involvement in international scholarship.

Please initial one statement below:

\_\_\_\_\_ Initial here to confirm your consent that the interview be audio taped.  
At any time you may ask that the tape recorder be stopped.

\_\_\_\_\_ Initial here to confirm that you do not consent that the interview be audio taped.

If you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a subject, please contact Dr. Ashir Kumar, Michigan State University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, 202 Olds Hall, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1046, phone (517) 355-2180, fax (517) 432-4503, e-mail [UCRIHS@msu.edu](mailto:UCRIHS@msu.edu).

For any questions regarding the study, please contact: Dr. Roger G. Baldwin, 429 Erickson Hall, College of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, (phone) 517-355-6452, e-mail [rbaldwin@msu.edu](mailto:rbaldwin@msu.edu); or Mr. Christopher J. Viers, 1201 Woods Edge Way, Bloomington, Indiana 47401, (phone) 812-333-2649, e-mail [cviers@indiana.edu](mailto:cviers@indiana.edu).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name (printed)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

## **APPENDIX D**

### **Interview Protocol: International scholarship**

The purpose of this interview is to gain information concerning your involvement in international scholarship. The interview protocol, "International scholarship" has been developed to address these issues. The protocol will help provide an understanding as to when, how, and why faculty become involved in international scholarship.

During the interview, the interviewer will ask a variety of questions related to the subject's involvement in regards to international scholarship. Many of the questions will be discussed in some depth in order to gain a rich understanding of the subject's educational life.

#### **Opening Remarks**

The purpose of this interview is to gain information about your involvement in forms of international scholarship. During the interview, I will ask you a variety of questions related to when, how, and why you became involved in international scholarship. I hope that we can consider many of these questions in some depth in order to gain a rich understanding of your faculty role as it relates to international scholarship.

Before proceeding further, I would like to define the term "international scholarship." For purposes of our discussion, international scholarship is defined as the integration of an international perspective into the work of the professorate including the scholarship of discovery, integration, application, and teaching in order to equip students for responsible citizenship in an

increasingly diverse society and global world. Faculty actively involved in international scholarship will likely be in regular contact with colleagues in other countries. They are likely to present papers at conferences abroad, be actively involved as advisors and mentors to international students, and lead groups of domestic students on study, research, and service projects abroad. After all, "...great teachers...stimulate active, not passive, learning and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers, with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over (Boyer, 1990, p. 24)." In addition, they will consistently incorporate perspectives of other countries and cultures in classroom instruction, and encourage students to do the same in projects and assignments. Do you have any questions?

**A. Introduction**

- A1. Please describe your educational background in terms of the institutions you have attended and the degrees obtained.
- A2. For how many years have you served as a full-time faculty member?
- A3. How long have you been employed by Central State University?
- A4. What is your current academic rank?

**B. When**

- B1. Did you enter graduate school with an interest in international scholarship? If yes, how would you assess

the nature and scope of this interest? If no, proceed to question B2. What do you believe to be the reason for this interest?

**B2.** Was your involvement in international scholarship initiated during your graduate training? If yes, how would you assess the nature and scope of this training? If no, proceed to question B3. What forms did it take? What were you expected to know or do, and why?

**B3.** At what point in your career as a faculty member was your involvement in international scholarship initiated?

**C. How**

**C1.** At the point in which you became involved in international scholarship, what form did this initial involvement take?

**C2.** What did you do to facilitate or direct your own learning and development in international scholarship?

**C3.** Was there a specific person who played a significant role in your initial involvement in international scholarship? If yes, who was that person? How did this person spark your interest in international scholarship?

**C4.** Did your involvement in international scholarship come as a direct result of your personal interest in this facet of your faculty role? Do you recall a specific event, or reason behind your interest?

- C5. Were there any external factors that contributed to your involvement in international scholarship? For example, did your interest peak as a result of travel to a foreign country, a global event, issue, or crisis?
- C6. Did your employing institution require that you engage in international scholarship as a requirement for promotion and/or tenure? If yes, how did this factor contribute to your current involvement? Did it define or direct your involvement in a helpful way?
- C7. Did your employing institution provide encouragement and/or rewards for involvement in international scholarship? If yes, what form did this take?
- C8. What factors or conditions, if any, impede your work in international scholarship?

**D. Why**

- D1. What initially motivated you to engage in international scholarship?
- D2. What continues to motivate and sustain your involvement in international scholarship?
- D3. What role does your employing institution play in your continued involvement in international scholarship? How important is this role?
- D4. What individuals play the most important role in

sustaining your involvement in international scholarship  
(colleagues internal to your employing institution, external  
to your employing institution, your department chair, the  
college dean, etc.)?

- D4. Is there anything else you would like to add or tell me  
about your involvement in international scholarship?

Thank you for your time.

## REFERENCES

- Aigner, J. S., Stimpfl, J. R., & Nelson, P. (1992). Internationalizing the university: Making it work. United States Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 342 316).
- Altbach, P. G., & Peterson, P. M. (1998). Internationalize Higher Education. Change, (July/August), pp. 36-39.
- Atkinson, J. W. (1977). Motivation for achievement. In T. Blass (Ed.), *Personality Variables* (pp. 25-108). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Alutto, J. A. (1990, January). Case discussion: A framework for introducing international perspectives in a school of management. Paper presented at the AACSB New Dean's Seminar, Scottsdale, AZ.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities (1995). International activity on state college and university campuses. Washington, D.C.
- American Council on Education. (2002). Promising Practices: Spotlighting Excellence in Comprehensive Internationalization. Washington, D.C.
- American Council on Education. (2002). ACE Public Opinion Poll Finds Support for International Education Remains Strong in September 11 Aftermath. Washington, D.C., September 5, 2002.
- American Council on Education. (1996). Educating Americans for a world in flux: Ten ground rules for internationalizing higher education. Commission on International Education, Washington, D.C.
- Arum, S. (1987). Promoting international education: The president sets the pace. Educational Record, 68 (2), pp. 18-22.
- Barrows, T. S. (1980). College students' knowledge and beliefs: A survey of global understanding. The Final Report of the Global Understanding Project. New Rochelle, NY. Change Magazine Press.
- Barker, T. S., & Hoemeke, T. (1995). International education: A profile of Texas. International Review, 5 (Spring 1995).
- Blackburn, R. T., and Lawrence, J. H. (1995). Faculty at Work: Motivation, Expectation, Satisfaction. The Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore.

- Blodgett, S. A. (1995, October). A low-cost, high-return investment in building the international dimension. In P.R. Liverpool (Vice Provost for International Programs), Building a World Class University: A campus symposium on strengthening international programs at Virginia Tech.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). Multimethod research: A synthesis of styles. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Boyer, E. (1990). Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching: California.
- Byron, R. (1992). Ethnography and biography: On the understanding of culture. Ethos, 57(3-4), pp. 169-182.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). Research design: Qualitative & Quantitative Approaches. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Darvich-Kodjouri, K. (1995). International activity on state college and university campuses. American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.
- Davis, T. M. (Ed.) (2001). Open doors: Report on international educational exchange: 1994-95. Institute of International Education, New York, NY.
- Davis, T. M. (Ed.) (1998). Open doors: Report on international educational exchange: 1997-98. Institute of International Education, New York, NY.
- Davis, T. M. (Ed.) (1995). Open doors: Report on international educational exchange: 1993-94. Institute of International Education, New York, NY.
- Deci, E. L., Nezlek, J., & Sheinman, L. (1981). Characteristics of the rewarder and intrinsic motivation of the rewarder. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, (40), pp. 1-10.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989). The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological Methods. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Ellingboe, B. J. (1998). Divisional strategies to internationalize a campus portrait. In J. A. Mestenhauser and B. J. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the Higher Education Curriculum: Internationalizing the Campus.* American Council on Education: Oryx Press.
- Eisner, E. W. (1992). Objectivity in educational research. Curriculum Inquiry (22), (1): pp. 9-15.

- Eisner, E. W. (1997). The new frontier in qualitative research methodology. Qualitative Inquiry (3), (3): 259-273.
- English, T. M. (Ed.) (1995). Assessing student outcomes of internationalization. Paper presented at NAFSA: Association of International Educators 47th Annual Conference.
- Faraday, A., & Plummer, K. (1979). Doing life stories. Sociological Review, 27(4): pp. 773-798.
- Gardner, D. P. (1990). Internationalization: The state of the institution. Education Record (Spring 1990), pp. 8-12.
- Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic Books.
- Green, M. (2002). Internationalizing undergraduate education: Challenges and lessons of success. In Promising practices: Spotlighting excellence in comprehensive internationalization.
- Green, M. (2003). The challenge of internationalizing undergraduate education: Global learning for all. Paper presented at the Global Challenges and U.S. Higher Education Conference, Duke University.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of Qualitative Research (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage).
- Harari, M. (1984). International integration of California State University, Long Beach. California State University, Long Beach (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 316 132).
- Jernigan, C. (1991). Internationalizing the curriculum of California's undergraduates. International Review, 1 (Spring 1991).
- Johnston, J. S., & Edelstein, R. J. (1993). Beyond borders: Profiles in international education. Association of American Colleges and American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business.
- Kopp, W. L. (1995, October). International outreach. In P.R. Liverpool (Vice Provost for International Programs), Building a World Class University: A campus symposium on strengthening international programs at Virginia Tech.
- Kotre, J. (1984). Outliving the self: Generativity and the interpretation of lives. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Lambert, R. D., Ed. (1994). Educational exchange and global competence. New York: Council on International Education Exchange.
- Lambert, R. D. (1989). International studies and the undergraduate. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Lepper, M. R., Greene, D., & Nisbet, R.E. (1973). Undermining children's intrinsic motivation with extrinsic rewards: A test of the over justification hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 28, 129-137.
- Lewis, S. L. (1995, May-June). Assessing Student Outcomes of Internationalization, NAFSA:AIE 47th American Conference.
- Lim, G. C. (1995, October). Internationalization of the curriculum: Humanistic globalization approach. In P.R. Liverpool (Vice Provost for International Programs), Building a World Class University: A campus symposium on strengthening international programs at Virginia Tech.
- Liverpool, P. R. (1995, October). Positioning Virginia Tech to Compete in the international arena. In P.R. Liverpool (Vice Provost for International Programs), Building a World Class University: A campus symposium on strengthening international programs at Virginia Tech.
- Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W., & Silverman, S. J. (1987). Proposals that work: A guide for planning dissertations and grant proposals (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Maehr, M. L., & Breskamp, L. A. (1986). The motivation factor: A theory of personal achievement. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1989). Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1996). Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach. Sage Publications, Inc., CA.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mestenhauser, J. A., & Ellingboe, B. J. (1998). Reforming the higher education Curriculum: Internationalizing the campus. Phoenix, AZ: The American Council on Education and The Oryx Press.

- Meszaros, P. S. (1995, October). Welcome and opening remarks. In P.R. Liverpool (Vice Provost for International Programs), Building a World Class University: A campus symposium on strengthening international programs at Virginia Tech.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Morse, J. M. (1991). Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation. Nursing Research, 40(1), 120-123.
- National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, (1993). Internationalizing higher education through the faculty. Commission on International Affairs, Washington, D. C.
- National University Continuing Education Association (1989). Challenges for continuing higher education leadership: Global interdependence, issues and opportunities. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 339 813).
- Nieman, C.L. (1997). On the role of the university president in international education. International Review, 7, pp.63-75.
- O'Meara, P. (1997). Testimony on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act Title VI, International Education Programs. Subcommittee on postsecondary education, training, and lifelong learning, U.S. House of Representatives. June 17, 1997.
- Pacheco, M., & Fernandez, C. (1992). Knowing no boundaries: The university as world citizen. Education Record, 73 (2), pp. 23-27.
- Paige, R. M. (1983). Cultures in contact: On intercultural relations among American and foreign students in the United States university context. Handbook for Intercultural Training, Volume III. Area Studies in Intercultural Training.
- Phillips, D. C. (1990). Subjectivity and objectivity: An Objective Inquiry. In Elliott Eisner and Alan Peshkin (Eds.), Qualitative Inquiry in Education: The Continuing Debate. New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 19-37.
- Ping, C. (1995, October). Leadership imperatives for internationalizing higher education. In P.R. Liverpool (Vice Provost for International Programs), Building a World Class University: A campus symposium on strengthening international programs at Virginia Tech.

- President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies (1979). Strength Through Wisdom: A critique of U.S. capability, Washington, D. C., U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Raby, R. L. (1995, February). Internationalizing the curriculum: Ideals vs. Reality. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association of California Community College Administrators, San Jose, CA.
- Rhodes, F. H. T. (1990, October). The new American university. Paper presented at the Twelfth David Dodds Henry Lecture, University of Illinois, Chicago, OH. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 343 503).
- Rosaldo, R. (1989). Subjectivity in social analysis. Culture and truth: The remaking of social analysis, Boston: Beacon.
- Scott, R. A. (1987, January). Developing an institutional strategy for international education: Principles, objectives, and progress. Based on a presentation at the Higher Educational International Leadership Summit, New Jersey. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 288 445).
- Senge, P.M., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R.B., & Smith, B. J. (1994). The fifth discipline fieldbook: Strategies and tools for building a learning organization. Doubleday Dell Publishing Group, Inc. New York, New York 10036.
- Sharma, M. P., & Jung, L. B. (1985). How Cross-Cultural Social Participation Affects the International Attitudes of U.S. Students. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 9, pp. 377-387.
- Smuckler, R. H. (1995, October). Higher education and the new global landscape. In P.R. Liverpool (Vice Provost for International Programs), Building a World Class University: A campus symposium on strengthening international programs at Virginia Tech.
- Spradley, J. P. (1980). Participant Observation. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Staw, B. M. (1983). Motivation research versus the art of faculty management. *Review of Higher Education*, 6(4), 302-321.
- Stone, G. R. (1995). Report of the ad hoc committee on international and regional programs. The University of Chicago Record, 30 (2), October 26, 1995.

Tenant, M. (1997). Psychology & Adult Learning. Routledge: London, United Kingdom.

Tesch, R. (1990). Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools. New York: Falmer.

United States Department of Education (1984, November). Guidelines: Incorporating an international dimension in colleges and universities. Washington, D.C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256 213).

Wheeler, A. H. (1990, November). Internationalizing the curriculum through cooperation, collaboration, and commitment. Paper presented at the National Council of States on Inservice Education, 15th Annual National Conference, Orlando, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 327 490).

Weiland, S. (2003). Teacher education 991: Special topics in curriculum, teaching, and educational psychology. Michigan State University syllabus, Fall 2003 Semester.