DEMOCRATIC AND NEOLIBERAL LOGICS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
INTERNATIONALIZATION:
A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

By

Erin Sonneveldt

A DISSERTATION

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

Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education—Doctor of Philosophy

2021

ABSTRACT

DEMOCRATIC AND NEOLIBERAL LOGICS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
INTERNATIONALIZATION:
A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

By

Erin Sonneveldt

This study develops a critical understanding of how democracy and neoliberalism shape

community college (CC) internationalization. CCs are sites of ideological struggle as they

navigate and balance their democratic values of access with societal pressures to economically

rationalize their existence. Within the growing movement of CC internationalization, scholars

have studied practice and planning. However, researchers have yet to examine the underlying

logics. Examining logics can reveal the cultural values and forces shaping practice and the

potential perpetuation of social wrongdoings. Using democratic and neoliberal institutional

logics as my theoretical framework and the sociocognitive approach to critical discourse

analysis, I analyzed publicly available CC internationalization plans and related texts, guided by

the following research questions: 1) what are the democratic and neoliberal discourse themes in

CC internationalization plans and related discourse, 2) what democratic and neoliberal logics

underly these themes, 3) how do plan, internal, and external discourse participants advance these

themes, and 4) who is excluded and who is othered in CC internationalization discourse?

Shaped by logics of opportunity and empowerment, the democratic discourse themes

centered on making global education more accessible and preparing students for global

citizenship. Shaped by logics of production and competition, the neoliberal discourse theme

emphasized leveraging internationalization for institutional effectiveness. Within the democratic

and neoliberal themes, participants advanced the discourses in similar ways. Powerful external

groups set expectations for college leaders while plan participants directed operations through

institutional goals and strategic initiatives. Internal participants, such as global education staff, executed or operationalized institutional directives. Using a critical lens, my analysis also revealed that discourse participants believed global education was intended for domestic students—excluding international students. In addition, discourse participants conceptualized and othered international students as tools for intercultural competency training. Lastly, discourse participants transformed the domestic student into that of the competent and competitive global worker/workforce—ensuring national competitiveness and U.S. economic prosperity. This study affirms the heavy presence of neoliberal logic in CC internationalization and the neoliberalization of democratic aims. This study offers recommendations for CC leaders, global/international education practitioners, and scholars to challenge neoliberalism and advance democracy in internationalization.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The journey of my PhD was intellectually, emotionally, and physically challenging. I could not have done this without the support of my personal community. To Dr. Janet Lillie, your mentorship helped me through the ups and downs, kept me focused on completion, and further prepared me for the next phase. I am so thankful for your time and sincere interest in my development. To my family—your love and support propelled me forward and kept me grounded in my true self. Thank you for your patience, love, and encouragement. Lastly, I want to acknowledge my partner and husband, Sean. Thank you for your unending encouragement and belief in me. Besides your love and support, you gave me space and time. With enthusiasm, you helped me process ideas and read my work. You are the most loving editor. Thank you for helping me achieve this dream of mine.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

xiii

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Public community colleges (CCs)—"a fundamentally local institution"—are a unique

sector of U.S. postsecondary education, functioning at the intersection of "social justice and

educational change" (Ayers, 2013, p. 99; Baber et al., 2019, p. 209). With an open-admission

policy and a variety of educational programs at affordable tuition rates, CCs have changed the

social understanding of who can and who should have access to postsecondary education (Baber

et al., 2019). In fact, recent U.S. postsecondary enrollment data demonstrates a large proportion

of students attend CCs, and these students are racially, ethnically, nationally, and economically

diverse. In Fall 2017, approximately one third of U.S. undergraduate students enrolled in a

public, two-year CC (Ginder et al., 2018). At the same time, 35% of Black, 44% of Hispanic, and

31% of White undergraduate students enrolled in a CC (Ginder et al., 2018). In addition,

immigrant-origin students (i.e., first- or second-generation immigrants) enrolled in CCs more so

than any other type of postsecondary institution (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2019). In fact,

approximately one quarter of CC students are immigrants or children of immigrants (CCCIE,

2015). Furthermore, CCs provide access for low-income students. In 2016, for example, 37% of

CC students had an independent or family annual income of less than $20,000, and 30% had an

income level between $20,000 and $49,999 (CCRC, 2020). Certainly, recent data suggests CCs

offer access to postsecondary education in the U.S.

Yet, like other higher education providers, CCs face pressure to prioritize the economic

return of education for students and of students. This pressure may result from state and federal

performance-based funding policy (Baber et al., 2019; Viggiano et al., 2018) and the public's

declining support for public goods, including higher education (Labaree, 2018). In either case,

this pressure is a manifestation of neoliberalism. Neoliberalism "applies economic rationality to

the structure and value of all social institutions" (Bader et al., 2019, p. 213), including human relations (Day, 2016; George, 1999). In the context of CC education, neoliberalism shapes how people and policy makers view the role of CCs and their constituents. For example, in a critical discourse analysis of CC mission statements, Ayers (2005) argued that neoliberal discourses, such as *preparing students to meet the needs of local business*, "condensed education to a market function" thereby reconstructing "the meaning of education" (p. 543). Such neoliberal discourses perpetuate beliefs that markets determine "the value and legitimacy of knowledge" (Ayers, 2005, p. 543). Given the power of neoliberalism to transform public education, Baber and colleagues (2019) call for continued research on the role of neoliberal forces in CCs—specifically how these forces impact access and equity.

Clearly, CCs are sites of ideological struggle as they navigate and balance their democratic values of access with societal pressures to economically rationalize their existence (Baber et al., 2019). One way to examine such ideological struggle is to assess institutional logics. Institutional logics are symbolic systems that organize and pattern activity around certain ideologies (Alford & Friedland, 1985). Democratic logics involve ideologies of "free opportunity" (Dahl, 1971, p. 2) and principles such as opportunity, community, empowerment, and emancipation. Neoliberal logics involve ideologies of market governance and principles such as competition, production, commodification, and privatization. In this study, I am concerned with the growing internationalization movement within the CC sector and how it fits within democratic and neoliberal logics of CCs. In postsecondary education, internationalization is "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (Knight, 2004, p. 2). It seems CC internationalization can be interpreted and used in two ways—1) as way to advance democratic

ideals including creating learning opportunity for students and fostering a populace with democratic dispositions; and 2) as a way to generate money and appeal to the needs of for-profit businesses. Like many institutional logic scholars, I approached this study viewing democracy and neoliberalism as competing logics in tension. That said, institutional logics may not be so independent. In fact, several scholars have examined the convergence or hybridization of institutional logics (see Ayers & Gonzales, 2018; Greenwood, Diaz, Li, and Lorente, 2010; Osei-Kofi, Shahjahan, & Patton, 2010; Reay & Hinnings, 2009).

An Introduction to Internationalization in the Community College Sector

For over 60 years, community colleges (CCs) have engaged in internationalization with nearly 36% of CCs offering some form of international education (Raby, 2020). Despite a long history and a significant proportion of colleges offering international education, the degree to which CCs internationalize varies. For example, Green and Siaya (2005) surveyed 233 CCs to understand how heavily CCs engaged in internationalization. Using a five-point scale (none, low, medium, medium-high, and high), the researchers found that 60% of the colleges surveyed (n=140) engaged in internationalization at low levels (none, low, medium) and 40% (n=93) engaged at high levels (medium-high, high) (Green & Siaya, 2005). Thus, it seems most CCs that internationalize do so in a limited way. The literature indicates CCs have not been able to holistically integrate international education (Raby & Valeau, 2016). One barrier to holistic integration is the perceived tension between the global function of internationalization and the local mission of CCs (Harder, 2010; McRaven & Somers, 2017; Raby & Valeau, 2016).

Approaches to Internationalization

Because internationalization is a process, internationalization scholars have constructed a schema to capture "internationalization approaches" (Branham, 2018; Butler, 2016; Knight,

2004; Knight, 2012). In varying ways, these approaches integrate international, intercultural, and global dimensions into the mission and core operations of a HEI (Knight, 2004). The literature outlines six internationalization approaches in university (not CC) contexts: (a) abroad; (b) activities; (c) outcomes; (d) comprehensive; (e) local; and (f) process (Knight, 2004; Hudzik, 2011). Approaches reflect what the institution values and prioritizes in international education (Knight, 2004). In addition, HEIs may use multiple approaches and may transition between approaches (Knight, 2004). Generally, when it comes to internationalization, CCs have used an activities approach (Branham, 2018; Raby & Valeau, 2016), which is the implementation of single programs and activities (e.g., education abroad) across individual units (Knight, 2004). They also have used the outcomes approach which is the expansion of measurable international outcomes (e.g., number of international students) (Brennan & Dellow, 2013). In both university and CC contexts, these efforts often yield isolated internationalization activities—fragmented from institutional missions and structures (Knight, 2012; Knight & de Wit, 2018; Raby & Valeau, 2016). To address the lack of holistic integration, CC scholars and international educators have pushed for a top-down comprehensive approach (Butler, 2016; Castro-Salazar et al., 2016; Rodriguez, 2016) as well as a bottom-up local approach (Branham, 2018; Robertson, 2015; Yakaboski & Perozzi, 2018).

Assessing Internationalization

Most internationalization research focuses on universities even though the practice is well-established in CCs. For over 60 years, CCs have implemented cross-border education as part of curriculum and pedagogy in academic and student services (Raby & Valeau, 2016). Research has shown internationalization benefits CC students including their academic achievement, personal development, and job readiness. For example, in a study sponsored by the

Institute for International Education (IIE), researchers found that short- and long-term education abroad experiences developed participants' "21st century workforce skills;" and long-term education abroad positively impacted job opportunities after graduation as well as career progression and promotion (Farrugia & Sanger, 2017, p. 6). Despite these benefits, several scholars question whether internationalization serves the CC democratic mission (Raby & Valeau, 2016; Viggiano et al., 2018; Wooden, 2016).

Some suggest that internationalization hinders the democratic aims of CCs and is often used as an economic tool for individual mobility, such as through global credentialing programs (Rodriquez, 2016), education abroad (Farrugia & Sanger, 2017), or international student enrollment (Viggiano et al., 2018). For example, Viggiano and colleagues (2018) used critical perspectives and justice theory to examine the justifications of CC decision makers to recruit international students at three CCs. The researchers suggest CC decision makers could be engaged in unethical practice. Specifically, Viggiano et al. (2018) found that colleges recruited international students from privileged backgrounds, justifying high tuition fees because of the students' privilege. Research also reveals that education abroad is a privileged activity. For example, education abroad is largely accessible to students who are physically able and can afford the time and money (Johnstone & Edwards, 2019; Luo & Jamieson-Drake, 2015). These privileges mean predominantly White, middle-class students engage/participate most often in study abroad (Raby & Valeau, 2016). In fact, the most recent IIE data show in 2017–2018, 70% of U.S. postsecondary education abroad students were White (IIE, 2019c)—a reflection of how access is contingent on racialized wealth. Indeed, scholarship critiquing CC internationalization has illuminated ethical dilemmas (e.g., exploiting international students, furthering the privileges of White and wealthy students, and limiting access to underrepresented students). If CCs

internationalize in similar ways as other higher education institutions (HEIs), then CC

internationalization risks introducing experiences only a privileged minority of students might be

able to afford. This type of internationalization may counter the democratic mission of CCs and

divert resources away from core functions. Thus, critically examining CC internationalization

from an access and equity perspective is important.

Research critiquing CC internationalization is limited and has largely used case study

methodology and interview methods. While this work is important, CC scholars have yet to

examine the logics underlying CC internationalization—manifest as they are in institutional

plans. By examining logics, a researcher can reveal the cultural values and forces shaping

"identity, actions, aims, norms, values and resources" (van Dijk, 2006, p. 115); and critical

discourse analysis (CDA) is one interdisciplinary methodology researchers use to uncover latent

ideologies and structures of power. For example, in his seminal work, Ayers (2005) uncovered

neoliberal discourses in CC mission statements. While Ayers (2005) did not specifically analyze

internationalization discourse, he drew attention to how neoliberalism produced inequality and

argued it represented an affront to democracy. Building on Ayers' (2005) work, I aim to study

the logics shaping the articulation and implementation of internationalization efforts in CCs.

Next, I delineate important terminology used in the study.

Distinctions in Terminology

In this section, I begin by defining and contrasting the terms *globalization*,

internationalization, and *global/international/intercultural (GII) education*. Then, I briefly

compare the terms *logics* and *discourse*. Lastly, I briefly discuss the relationship between

institutional plans and *internationalization plans*.

Globalization, Internationalization, and Global/International/International Education

In this study, I use several similar terms from the field of international education: globalization, internationalization, global education, international education, and intercultural education. In Chapter Two, I review literature related to these terms but do not define or discuss them. Therefore, I provide some background information in the subsections that follow. Despite their similarity, these are distinct terms, and I do not use these terms interchangeably in this study.

Globalization

Internationalization scholars and practitioners often define globalization as the social, economic, technological, and scientific forces that shape realities and impact postsecondary education (Altbach, 2004; 2006; 2009). Although scholars widely use Altbach's definition, it is not without critique (Cantwell & Maldonado-Maldonado, 2009; Marginson & Rhoades, 2002; Marginson & Swair, 2005; Robertson, 2006). For instance, Cantwell and Maldonado-Maldonado (2009) challenged two common assumptions in Altbach's definition: 1) that globalization is hierarchical—dominating local levels, and 2) that institutions respond to globalization automatically, rationally, and with autonomy (p. 291). To explore this assumed hierarchical relationship, Cantwell and Maldonado-Maldonado (2009) applied two theoretical concepts[1] to four internationalization stories. In general, story participants conceived of globalization as external, transcendent, and hierarchal to local. However, the scholars also found that power was "embedded in the way globalization [was] perceived" (p. 304). For example, globalization could also be understood as dynamic and interactive with local spaces (Cantwell & Maldonado-Maldonado, 2009). Similarly, other scholars have contested a single, hierarchal and static

---

[1] Foucault's theories of power and governance and Giddens' theory of structuration

conceptualization of globalization. According to Steger (2017), globalization "operates on an ideological dimension"—a globalism (p. 109). Steger argues there are three types of globalisms—each with their own "norms, claims, beliefs, and narratives about globalization" (p. 109). For this study, I am particularly interested in Steger's concepts of market globalism and justice globalism. Market globalism includes neoliberal beliefs that the competitive marketplace and consumerism will "realize global order" (p.112). In opposition to market globalism is justice globalism (Steger, 2017). Justice globalism is comprised of egalitarian ideologies of global solidary, redistribution of wealth and power, and local wellbeing (Steger, 2017). Although globalization is not the focus of this study, I acknowledge the existence of global/external forces and recognize the interactive process and agency of individuals, structures, and systems. In addition, I presume concepts of global are also places of ideological tension, as many CCs evaluate how they engage in a global competitive market and/or a justice-oriented globalism, for example. This organizational engagement with globalization is the process of internationalization (Knight, 2004; Cantwell & Maldonado-Maldonado, 2009; Maringe, 2010).

Internationalization

As mentioned, internationalization is "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (Knight, 2004, p. 2). Although Knight's definition is widely used by scholars and practitioners across institution types, it was developed within a university context. In a recent study mapping the operations of CC internationalization, Copeland and colleagues (2017) expanded Knight's (2004) definition to include elements unique to CCs. For these researchers, internationalization is CC "stakeholders' recognition of globalization influences and the integration of a local community's need for programmatic offerings and student services"

(Copeland, et al., 2017, p. 367). For my work, I used both Knight (2004) and Copeland et al.'s, (2017) definitions of internationalization, meaning I define internationalization as the integration of global/intercultural/international (GII) dimensions into the purpose, functions, or delivery of CC education to meet local needs influenced by global forces. While internationalization is about process and integration, global/intercultural/international education are the outcomes and practices of internationalization (Branham, 2018; Knight & de Wit, 2018).

Global Education

Global education is intended to develop one's self-awareness and ability to engage responsibly in globally and culturally diverse societies (Harvey, 2004). "It provides the individual with a realistic perspective on world issues, problems and prospects, and an awareness of the relationships between an individual's enlightened self-interest and the concerns of people elsewhere in the world" (Harvey, 2004, p. 1). Thus, global education encompasses cognitive (e.g., global awareness), emotional (empathy and respect), and skill (e.g., engagement and participation) development (Lourenço, 2018).

International Education

The term international education is often conflated with global education. Scholars and practitioners typically agree that international education is the "organised efforts to bring together students, teachers, and scholars from different nations to interact and learn" (Epstein, 1992, p. 409). These efforts focus on cross-border mobility programming, such as study abroad and exchange visits. Recently, international education institutions are redefining international education to include virtual and study away programming (IIE, n.d.a). There is also another form of international education which is not to be conflated with cross-border mobility education. International education is also the development of education systems around the world and

spearheaded through international education organizations such as the OECD and United

Nations (Lourenço, 2018). In this study, I use the term international education when referring to

cross-border educational programming.

Intercultural Education

Lastly, intercultural education is the development of cultural competencies necessary for

engagement in a culturally diverse society. Intercultural educations respects learners' culture

identity and "promote respect, understanding, and solidarity among individuals, and among

different ethnic, social, cultural and religious groups and nations" (Lourenço, 2018, p. 65).

Although these are distinct concepts, many scholars and practitioners use and practice

them interchangeably. For example, practitioners often use global education or international

education as umbrella terms for all things global, intercultural, and/or international. In addition,

colleges may describe their internationalization efforts in globalization terms. For example, in

this study, discourse participants interchangeably used the terms "internationalizing the

curriculum" and "globalizing the curriculum." Nonetheless, I attempt to distinguish between

these terms throughout this study. Next, I introduce important terminology related to the

theoretical framework and methodology used in this study.

Discourse and Logic

The meaning of the terms discourse and logic are similar despite stemming from distinct

disciplines/academic movements. Each involve macro social belief systems. This study revolves

around theoretical concepts of logic and discourse. Despite their similarity, I distinguish between

logic and discourse in the following way. I consider discourse as grand narratives developed

through communicative interactions (i.e., speech and writing) and functioning as a form of social

practice (van Dijk, 2016; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Logics are symbolic systems that organize

and pattern activity around certain ideologies (Alford & Friedland, 1985). In this study, I

interpret logics as the shared cognitive structures of discourse[2].

Institutional Plans and Internationalization Plans

The primary data source for this study is institutional plans that communicate

internationalization goals and strategies (i.e., internationalization plans). Colleges use several

types of institutional plans to convey internationalization efforts, such as educational master

plans, strategic plans, DEI plans, and internationalization* plans. I use an asterisk to distinguish

internationalization* plans solely dedicated to the goals and strategies of internationalizing.

Next, I use these terms to present my problem statement and research questions.

<div align="center">

Problem Statement

</div>

The literature suggests CCs grapple with neoliberal and democratic logics (Ayers, 2005;

Baber, et al., 2019; Branham, 2018; Copeland, et al., 2017; Cox & Sallee, 2018; Gonzales &

Ayers, 2018; Levin & López-Damián 2018). However, researchers have not examined the

neoliberal and democratic logics shaping CC internationalization. Advocates of CC

internationalization need to understand how neoliberalism and democracy shape implementation

and practice for two reasons. To begin, many scholars and practitioners celebrate

internationalization as an inherently good practice. For example, some believers think that

internationalization can empower students to tackle global challenges at local levels like global

warming, water pollution, and poverty (Branham, 2018). Other proponents assume it prepares

students to be successful workers in a global economy (Copeland et al., 2017). Despite these

rationales for internationalization, research and practice lacks regard for how internationalization

may reproduce social inequities, especially related to the encroachment of neoliberalism. For

---

[2] I provide an in-depth discussion of logic in Chapter Two and discourse in Chapter Three. I further delineate and discuss my use of the terms discourse and logic in Chapter Three.

example, neoliberalism is widely critiqued for its dehumanizing effects in education. In CC internationalization, neoliberalism may further injustices by othering students as sources of revenue or products meeting the needs of for-profit businesses. Given CCs' public good intentions, understanding how neoliberalism shapes CC internationalization remains an important research endeavor. Lastly, researchers have not examined how to internationalize with democracy in mind, for example, by using social justice pedagogy in global curriculum initiatives. In addition, scholars have not investigated who might be excluded from these democratic aims. Examining how democracy shapes internationalization may offer new insights for aligning internationalization efforts with the CC democratic mission. Therefore, this study develops a critical understanding of how democracy and neoliberalism shape CC internationalization, who participates in the discourse, and who is othered and excluded. I assume neoliberalism and democracy are logics in tension with one another. In addition, I maintain that democracy advances and neoliberalism limits opportunity.

Research Questions

To do this work, I sampled a population of institutional plans and used institutional logics (democracy and neoliberalism) as an analytic lens in a critical discourse analysis (CDA). The following research questions guide this study:

1. What are the democratic and neoliberal discourse themes in CC internationalization plans and related discourse?

   a. What democratic and neoliberal logics underly these themes?

   b. How do plan, internal, and external discourse participants advance these themes?

2. Who is excluded and who is othered in CC internationalization discourse?

Significance of Study

This study is significant for several reasons. While scholars have critiqued neoliberalism in other areas of CC education (e.g., faculty work) (Aguilar-Smith & Gonzales, 2019; Gonzales & Ayers, 2018), scholars have not examined the extent of neoliberalism in CC internationalization. Furthermore, few studies apply a critical methodology, such as CDA, to the study of CC internationalization. By using CDA, I reveal the participants advancing the discourse and those othered in and excluded from the discourse. Using CDA, I also illuminate democratic and neoliberal logics and consider their institutionalization (Powell & DiMagio, 1991) and tension (Ayers, 2009; Levin, 2006). By doing so, this study challenges readers to consider the neoliberalizing effect on internationalization discourse and "strategies of resistance" (Day, 2016, p. 8). Lastly, this study provides useful tools for CC internationalization scholars and practitioners. Scholars have studied CC internationalization for nearly 60 years and found that roughly 36% of CCs engage in internationalization (Raby, 2020). Yet, little is known about these institutions. My study examines several of these colleges' internationalization efforts. However, when generating my sample population, I developed a data set of colleges publicly engaged in internationalization. This resource can help scholars identify and probe CC internationalization efforts. Finally, my study offers a democratic and neoliberal logic framework that practitioners can use to reflect on and critique practice.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I presented the purpose, background, problem, and significance of my study. In Chapter Two, I guide readers through a review of literature on CCs, including their history, missions, and internationalization efforts. Then, I introduce my theoretical framework on institutional logics. In Chapter Three, I introduce my methodology, delineate my research design,

and discuss the trustworthiness of this study. In Chapter Four, I present important contextual

information needed for interpreting the findings. In Chapter Five, I present findings on discourse

themes, the underlying neoliberal and democratic logics, and discourse participants roles. In

Chapter Six, I discuss these findings and offer recommendations for research and practice.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A History of Community Colleges

Even though the first community college (CC) opened in 1901, U.S. CC history really begins in the mid-19th century—with their origin stemming from German and French education systems. The German and French educational models maintained universities as elite institutions for the pursuit of intellectual knowledge, and they extended secondary education with general education and vocational curriculum (Baber; 2019; Brint & Karabel, 1989; McDowell, 1919). In one of the first comprehensive research studies on U.S. CCs, McDowell (1919) wrote that in 1852, Henry Tappan, the University of Michigan president, first discussed this European concept with the university's secondary education department. Similarly, the University of Minnesota president, Col. Folwell (circa 1869), stated that high schools in highly populated areas should extend their curriculum to include freshmen and sophomore college-level curriculum (McDowell, 1919). Similarly, in response to the expansive growth in secondary school enrollments (Cohen, 1989), William Harper, president of the University of Chicago, proposed a European model that would extend high school curriculum with a two-year collegiate curriculum (Cohen, 1989). Like the European education system, this model would advance universities as institutions for "academically minded" individuals and offer general and vocational education for "manually minded" individuals (Cohen 1989; Snyder, 1930). In addition to calls from university presidents to extend secondary curriculum, state governments were implementing policy that would allow tax dollars to fund collegiate curricular changes to secondary schools. For example, the Michigan Supreme Court's 1874 Kalamazoo Decision allowed Michigan school districts to use public funds to offer comprehensive high school curriculum that would extend into collegiate-level studies. With these influential statements and policy decisions, the idea of

creating public two-year colleges was well underway before the turn of the century. In 1901, the first CC, Joliet Junior College, was established (Vaughan, 2006). While the two-year collegiate curriculum created more access and opportunity for postsecondary education, its development was also rooted in an elitist and neoliberal logic that CCs served a population of students with certain abilities, preparedness, and goals (Baber, 2019, p. 205).

The Community College Mission

Higher education scholars, administrative leaders, and policy makers have debated the purpose of Community Colleges (CC) since the early 1900s with little agreement (Bring & Karabel, 1989). For some, the purpose of CC is to democratize higher education through open access admissions and equitable education (Brint & Karabel, 1989; Dougherty, 1994). Rooted in Deweyan philosophy, democratized education includes the commitments to access, personal growth, building the capacity of individuals to solve social problems, and to social transformation (Harbour & Wolgemuth, 2015) For others, the purpose of CC is to improve "social efficiency" (Snedden, 1929) by building an in-demand workforce, preserving class privilege, and maintaining the elitism of university higher education (Brint & Karabel, 1989; Dougherty, 1994; Kliebard & Franklin, 2003). Social efficiency is the belief that individuals have a predicted role in society (largely based on social class) and that schools should train students for "their predicted adult roles" (Kliebard & Franklin, 2003, p. 405). Even though the CC purpose seems contradictory (Dougherty, 1994), most agree that the mission includes three core functions: prepare students for university transfer; provide a vocational curriculum that meets the current needs of the workforce; and provide a community education curriculum that serves local needs and interests (Cohen et al., 2014; Dowd, 2003). Below, I discuss two aspects of the CC mission: the democratic mission and the workforce mission.

16

The Democratic Mission

From its founding, CCs have served an egalitarian social purpose. However, it was not until the 1970s that the CC democratic mission, as articulated in organizational mission statements, developed. This democratic mission has included opening access to higher education for the people of the United States, addressing local needs, preparing students to engage in democratic self-governance, and providing educational opportunity that can lead to upward mobility (Ayers, 2013; Brint & Karabel, 1989; Dougherty, 1994; Franco, 2002; Rhoades & Valadez, 1996). Under this democratic mission, CCs prioritize open-access admissions policy and a general/liberal arts curriculum that prepares students for university transfer. In addition to access and equity commitments, the democratic mission prioritizes local needs, such as civic engagement (Franco, 2002) and citizenship development (Brint & Karabel, 1989); and it prioritizes the use of local resources, such as local governance (e.g., local board of trustees) and local funding (e.g., public funding from local municipalities and counties) (Ayers, 2013). Lastly, the democratic mission is also about self-advocacy and emancipation (Ayers, 2005; Dewey, 1916; Harbour & Wolgemuth, 2015). CCs should have a mission and purpose "represented by a discourse of emancipation. That is, the term 'community college' must come to signify an opportunity for people from all segments of society to realize their full potential" (Ayers, 2005, p. 529). By reaching (or working toward) one's full potential, people can more richly engage in participatory democracy, meaning "individuals of different means have an equal voice in determining their shared future" (Ayers, 2005, p. 546). Thus, the broader social purpose of the CC, as articulated in the organization's democratic mission, is to build and uphold an egalitarian system of education. Another broader social purpose exists for CCs as well. Widely debated and often in contradiction to the democratic mission is the workforce mission.

The Workforce Mission

The workforce mission centers on the development of skilled labor to meet industry and economic needs (Jacobs & Worth, 2019). For example, in a discourse analysis of 165 issues of *The CC Journal* (1965–2011), Ayers (2013) found that "Community colleges were often described as having a mission to serve 'local business and industry'" (p. 113). Similarly, the workforce mission seeks to improve the employability of graduates by offering on-demand skill training through flexible curriculum and delivery systems (Jacobs & Worth, 2019). Colleges often do this by developing long-, medium-, and short-term technical certificate programs (AACC, 2016). In fact, between 2000 and 2014, the number of awarded certificates increased by 236% (AACC, 2016). In addition, a recent study from the Pew Research Center (2016) on "The State of American Jobs" found that most Americans felt they needed continuous training for career success and that CC technical certificates prepared them well for the workforce. Indeed, CCs often invest in vocational, skill-based curriculum and collaborate with industry leaders to meet workforce needs and improve student employability (Brint & Karabel, 1989; Dougherty, 1994; Mann, 2017; O'banian, 1971; Romero & Purdy, 2004). Notably, much of the workforce education discourse emphasizes preparing students for industry demands rather than developing students' skill sets for entrepreneurship or self-employment.

In addition to preparing and developing a workforce, the workforce mission also has a more subversive role in U.S. society. For example, scholars have identified beliefs that the workforce mission serves to reduce the overproduction of baccalaureate degrees by funneling nontraditional students into less privileged educational opportunities (e.g., a CC vocational program)—thus protecting the elite status of universities (Bring & Karabel, 1989; Dougherty, 1994). Similarly, scholars note that the workforce mission protects class privilege by stratifying

people into elite and working-class status—resulting in a reproduction of class inequalities (Dougherty, 1994; Kliebard & Franklin, 2003). Indeed, an income inequality gap exists for students who have earned vocational degrees compared to students who have earned associates and baccalaureate degrees (Dougherty, 1994; Kim & Tamborini, 2019). Overall, however, many scholars agree that the workforce mission centers on developing skilled labor that "smoothly fit[s] into the capitalist enterprise" (Dougherty, 1994, p. 18).

The debate on serving democratic or workforce needs endures, and many scholars have weighed this debate by analyzing CC mission statements—finding that CCs shift between their democratic and workforce missions (e.g., Ayers, 2013; Ayers, 2015). For example, over time, the representation of mission in mission statements has shifted from local democracy to competition in the global economy (Ayers, 2013) to an emphasis on collegiate curriculum and degree completion (Ayers, 2015). However, it remains unclear how internationalization fits within these shifting contexts. In the next section, I review the literature on CC internationalization.

Community College Internationalization

Internationalization is the integration of global, intercultural, and/or international (GII) elements into the purpose and function of postsecondary education (Knight, 2004). Internationalization is often fragmented across departments and units, occurring in isolation (Raby & Valeau, 2016). Recently, however, the American Council on Education's (ACE) assessment of campus internationalization, a survey of 1,664 postsecondary institutions, revealed that colleges and universities were starting to internationalize in comprehensive ways (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017). Helms and Brajkovic (2017) identified seven common internationalization processes: (a) implementing an administrative structure; (b) utilizing a strategic plan and process; (c) expanding on-campus curriculum and co-curricular opportunities; (d) developing faculty

resources and professional development opportunities; (e) building partnerships with postsecondary institutions in other countries; (f) developing education abroad for U.S. students; and (g) increasing international student enrollment (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017). Of these seven processes, colleges and universities prioritized mobility-centered internationalization—that is, education abroad and international student enrollment (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017). Despite these common indicators (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017), internationalization is still a broad concept as contexts vary and constantly change (Knight & de Wit, 2018). Similarly, internationalization in the CC context continues to change.

The Development of Community College Internationalization

For over 60 years, Community Colleges (CC) have implemented cross-border education as part of curriculum and pedagogy in academic and student services (Raby & Valeau, 2016). However, the early development of CC internationalization reveals a top-down form of governance and the establishment of professional organizations. In the mid-20th century, national policy prompted internationalization efforts, specifically the federal government's National Defense Education Act (NDEA of 1958) (Title VI). The original purpose of Title VI was to build global competencies that supported international alliances and enhanced national security (USDE, 2012). By the 1960s, CCs began internationalizing their curriculum at the behest of policy makers (Grant, 1979; Raby, 1996). Soon after, internationalization became a federal priority for the Department of Education, policy makers, and postsecondary advocates, including the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC). In 1971, the AACJC opened an international education office dedicated to supporting international education projects at CCs, and by 1976, the AACJC had its International Consortium of over 60 CCs (Fersch & Green, 1984). At this same time, the Community Colleges for International Development, Inc.

(CCID) started with the mission to further internationalization initiatives at CCs (CCID, 2018).

By the end of the 1970s, CC internationalization was a national priority. In 1979, for example, the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies called for all U.S. citizens to receive international education through increased CC efforts. These national internationalization efforts culminated in 1980 as policy makers amended the Higher Education Act of 1965 to include Title VI, Foreign Language and International Studies (renamed International Education Programs) (Fresch & Green, 1984). By 1982, the AACJC adopted an international education statement recommending CCs develop internationalization strategic plans (Fresch & Green, 1984).

By the 1980s and 1990s, academic scholarship and organizational policy became the driving forces of CC internationalization. Early scholarship focused on international literacy (Raby, 1996) through international and multicultural curriculum (King & Fersch, 1982, 1983; Edwards & Tonkin,1990); administrative leadership (Fresch, 1990; King & Fersch, 1989); and the influence of international education on the electorate (Fersch, 1980). In addition, research was largely concerned with identifying theory, approaches, methodologies, patterns, and challenges (Raby, 1996). In addition to academic scholarship, higher education organizations were busy publishing policy briefs and curriculum guidelines to advance CC internationalization efforts. These included "Integrating the International/Intercultural Dimension in the Community College" (King & Fersch, 1992); "Building the Global Community: The Next Step" (Elsner et al., 1994); and "Educating for the Global Community: A Framework for Community Colleges" (ACIIE, 1996). After a decade of guiding discourse from national organizations, CCs entered a phase of institutionalization whereby pressure increased on CCs to infuse internationalization into their mission (Raby & Valeau, 2007). As demonstrated, the historical development of CC

internationalization seems to reveal concerns for national interest, top-down implementation, and the professionalization of CC internationalization.

However, CC scholars and practitioners continue to examine internationalization in the CC context—exploring the alignment between internationalization and the CC purpose. For example, some CC scholars have expanded the definition of internationalization to include the integration of local elements (Copeland et al., 2017; Branham, 2018). In a recent mix-methods study conducted over two phases, Copeland and colleagues (2017) interviewed 29 internationalization stakeholders from 15 CCs and surveyed 89 CC internationalization administrators from across the United States. They found that CCs often collaborated with local immigrant service organizations (e.g., refugee centers) to offer language training to refugees and/or cross-cultural service learning to local- and foreign-born students (Copeland et al., 2017). These CCs also offered curricular programming that would "increase the global competitiveness" of local businesses (Copeland et al., 2017, p. 370). In addition to identifying a local element in CC internationalization, Copeland et al. (2017) also identified several "operational constructs" (i.e., internationalization processes) (pp. 356 & 367). These included institutional formation, student development, assessment, and the amplification of efforts through faculty practices and curriculum. Unfortunately, research identifying or applying Copeland et al.'s (2017) four operational constructs is limited. Instead, several scholars have recently examined the rationales for CC internationalization.

Rationales for Community College Internationalization

CCs have pursued internationalization efforts using several rationales. Rationales are postsecondary institutions' motivations (de Wit, 1999) and the "driving force" shaping programming, process, and outcomes (Knight, 2012, p. 11). Unlike logics, a rationale can simply

be a reason for something. Logic concerns the beliefs and values that shape reasoning. Although research on internationalization rationales often stems from university contexts (Raby & Valeau, 2016), CC scholars have begun to investigate the rationales unique to CCs.

CCs seem to primarily use student-centered rationales for internationalization. For example, Copeland and colleagues (2017) found that CCs used "student success" rationales specifically geared toward student preparation for the global workforce. Similarly, in a dissertation case study, Branham (2018) found CCs rationalized internationalizing as way to serve students. By interviewing 24 administrators and faculty and analyzing global learning documentation from two distinct CCs, Branham (2018) found that faculty and staff believed global learning prepared their students with the technical skills necessary for local jobs and the soft skills necessary to engage with culturally diverse co-workers. Another student-oriented rationale was that global learning would prepare students to live in a global society (Branham, 2018). Beyond student-centered rationales, CCs also rationalized internationalization for institution-centered purposes (Branham, 2018). For example, Branham (2018) found that CC faculty and staff thought internationalization efforts would increase institutional assessments such as completion and transfer rates and strengthen the institutions' image to prospective students. Furthermore, global learning initiatives would improve the CCs' "institutional climate for diversity" (Branham, 2018, p. 139). Lastly, Branham (2018) found that the CC participants believed internationalization served the local community by building a workforce and developing citizenry. Although limited, the literature on rationales indicates a priority toward student and local development—although these rationales seem largely situated in a global workforce discourse. The approaches CCs use to implement internationalization vary, however.

Approaches to Community College Internationalization

Internationalization scholars have used an approach framework to analyze internationalization in HEIs (e.g., Butler, 2016; Knight, 2004; Hudzik, 2011). Approach(es) reflect what the institution values and prioritizes in global/international/intercultural (GII) education (Knight, 2004). In addition, HEIs may use multiple approaches and may transition between approaches (Knight, 2004). The literature on CC internationalization tends to build from Knight's six approaches to internationalization: (a) rationales, (b) abroad, (c) outcomes, (d) process, (e) activities, and (d) local (2004). In this literature review of internationalization approaches, I include Hudzik's (2011) Comprehensive Internationalization (CI) approach, and like Butler (2016), I do not include rationales. I consider rationales as articulated reasons (Butler, 2016; Knight, 2012) and approaches as the manner of implementation (Knight, 2004).

The Abroad Approach

The least common internationalization approach in the CC context is the abroad approach which is the implementation of bi-national agreements to export educational opportunities, such as the development of branch campuses (Butler, 2016; Knight, 2004). The abroad approach is different from student and faculty exchange which is common in the activities approach discussed later. While there is limited literature on CCs using the abroad approach, there is an emerging body of literature on countries developing a CC system to increase access to postsecondary education (Jaafar & Maki, 2017; Tang & Tsui, 2018; TyndorfJr & Glass, 2017). Like the abroad approach, the next five internationalization approaches were initially developed and applied in university contexts (Knight & de Wit, 1995; Knight, 2004). However, CCs have engaged these approaches with varying degrees of intensity. Next, I discuss the outcomes approach and the relevant CC literature.

The Outcomes Approach

The outcomes approach is the implementation of GII using measurement and accountability mechanisms (Butler, 2016). For example, colleges and universities often articulate their internationalization efforts through numbers such as the number of study abroad programs offered, partnerships developed, and articulation agreements created (Knight, 2004). Institutions engaging this approach often articulate goals such as increasing students' intercultural competencies, increasing institutional ranking, and increasing numbers of international students, for example (Knight, 2004). In the CC context, increasing international student numbers to generate "reliable funding streams" may be the predominant manifestation of the outcomes approach to internationalization (Brennan & Dellow, 2013, p. 30). In addition, as more colleges rely on increasing international student enrollment, Brennan and Dellow (2013) surmise more CCs will engage in this outcomes approach to internationalization. IIE's annual recording and publishing of the "top 40" CCs "leading" international student enrollment exemplifies the demand for this outcomes approach (IIE, 2019a).

CC scholars have critiqued the outcomes approach of increasing international student enrollment because it commodifies students (Viggiano et al., 2018; Yao & Viggiano, 2019). In a study using interviews with 26 CC "decision makers," Viggiano and colleagues (2018) found international students were seen as "economic drivers . . . and not considered to be part of the colleges' target population" nor part of the open-access and social mission (p. 77). Using this outcomes approach, CCs may focus recruitment efforts on international students from affluent backgrounds who can pay high tuition costs instead of international students who need access to postsecondary education (Viggiano et al., 2018). In this sense, international students may become "tools for domestic benefit rather than global equity" (Viggiano et al, 2018, p. 74), and

international student recruitment may function as an exclusionary practice (i.e., excluding international students from lower SES). Despite the critiques of this strategy, CCs continue to implement international student enrollment as part of their internationalization and funding strategy. However, for some colleges, international student enrollment is less of an outcomes approach and more of an activities approach.

The Activities Approach

CC scholars have noted that the activities approach is the most widely used approach in CC internationalization (Branham, 2018; Raby & Valeau, 2016). The activities approach is the implementation of GII education through curricular and co-curricular programming such as area studies, student/scholar exchange, intercultural training, and international student activities and services (de Wit, 2002). CCs have largely used student mobility programs as part of their activities approach, such as international student enrollment and services; and education abroad programs (Branham, 2018; Brennan & Dellow, 2013; Raby & Valeau, 2016).

As discussed previously in the outcomes approach section, international student enrollment is a strategy many CCs prioritize in their internationalization efforts. In fact, in 2017–2018, over 86,000 international students enrolled in Associate's colleges (about 1.2% of total enrollment) (IIE, 2019a). However, from the activities approach perspective, the focus is not on increasing numbers of international students but rather on the cultural value of international students' and how to serve and support them. Research shows that international students add to the learning opportunities of domestic students (Budd et al., 2016)—inspiring domestic students to learn about the world (Deardorff, 2006), even improving domestic student learning outcomes (Brennan & Dellow, 2013). To engage international and domestic students, CCs often hold international festivals that represent the diverse cultures of their international students (Green &

26

Siaya, 2005) and may offer activities such as international buddy and language partner programs (Green & Siaya, 2005; Miller, 2016). More recently, international education scholars and practitioners have focused efforts on international student advising techniques (Zhang, 2016) and international student orientation (Miller, 2016).

Study abroad has been the primary international education practice since the early 2000s for CCs (Brennan & Dellow, 2013; Raby & Valeau, 2016). In fact, from 2000 to 2007, CC study abroad programs increased by 126% (Raby & Valeau, 2007); and since 2003, IIE has recorded and published the "top 20" CCs "leading" study abroad programs (IIE, 2019c). Indeed, there are numerous benefits to studying abroad for CC students. It enhances global competencies such as global thinking, communicating, and collaborating (Thomas, 2016). It is also a high-impact practice (Kuh, 2008). In fact, there is a statistically significant increase in student achievement for CC students who study abroad (Rhoades et al., 2016). Not only do CC students succeed academically, but they also experience transformative learning (Brenner, 2016) and self-authorship (Zamani-Gallaher et al., 2016). In a 2016 study, Brenner interviewed eight CC students who participated in a short-term study abroad program and found that in one-to-two weeks, students confronted physical, social, intercultural, and academic challenges which gave them confidence and enhanced their ability to "examine the world and their position in it" (Brenner, 2016, p. 307). In addition, Brenner (2016) suggests CCs may be able to offer more financial support through short-term programming, increasing accessibility.

Indeed, accessibility is a primary concern for advocates of CC study abroad. Despite the enormous increase in study abroad programs, participation has remained low. According to IIE data reports (2019b), less than 1% of CC students participate in study abroad. In addition, study abroad has been inaccessible to CC students of color (Raby, 2008). For example, in 2017–2018,

60% of CC study abroad students were White (IIE, 2019b); 24% of participating students were Hispanic or Latinx; 9% were Black; and only 4% were Asian, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. The staggering numbers of predominantly White, middle-class participants (Raby & Valeau, 2016) reflects the neoliberal logic that wealth (or capital) gives access to opportunity. To increase underrepresented student participation, Quezada and Cordeiro (2016) offer three best practices: (a) creating promotional materials specifically for ethnic minority students; (b) assisting students with completing financial aid and scholarship applications; and (c) intentionally recruiting ethnic minority students to participate. In addition, to increase study abroad opportunity from an institutional perspective, Bradshaw (2013) recommends institutional partnerships with external organizations and increased faculty engagement.

As this literature review shows, study abroad for CC students has many benefits, and efforts to increase underrepresented student participation has been a primary concern. In fact, the number of underrepresented students studying abroad has modestly increased since 2007–2008 (approximately 12%) (IIE, 2019b). Even so, study abroad curriculum is rife with problems. For example, underrepresented students often experience various forms of microaggressions (e.g., race, gender, language) from peers, faculty, program structure and host country when on study abroad (Córdova, 2019; Green, 2017; Willis, 2016; Phillipson, 2016; Shin & Park, 2016). In addition, study abroad programs often lack a curriculum that interrogates the global histories of White and Western power including orientalism, colonialism, and neoliberalism (Smaller & O'Sullivan, 2018). An inaccessible, non-critical study abroad curriculum furthers ideals of White and Western domination which seems antithetical to the CC democratic mission.

With the activities approach, CC internationalization seems focused on international student activities and study abroad programs. Critics of the activities approach note it causes

singular and decentralized programs that occur in individual units and serves only specific group

of students. With this approach, GII education becomes fragmented, lacking holistic or

comprehensive integration (Raby & Valeau, 2016; Woodin, 2016). For CCs, the activities

approach may be problematic because it often works for a minority of students and faculty and

limits access to GII learning opportunities for all. Thus, CCs interested in a more holistic

approach to internationalization may utilize a comprehensive approach.

The Comprehensive Internationalization Approach

Comprehensive Internationalization (CI) is one approach HEIs use to holistically

integrate internationalization. CI is an institutional "commitment, confirmed through action, to

infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service

missions of higher education" (Hudzik, 2011, p. 6). Through CI, internationalization should

become a part of the institutional culture impacting every aspect of the organization (Hudzik,

2011; Hudzik & Stohl, 2012). There are six pillars to the CI approach: (a) articulated institutional

commitment; (b) administrative structure and staffing; (c) curriculum, co-curriculum, and

learning outcomes; (d) faculty profiles and practices; (e) student mobility; and (f) collaboration

and partnerships. CI has garnered the attention of GII education scholars, practitioners, and

organizations as a way to encourage "more globally oriented and internationally connected"

colleges and universities (ACE, 2020a, para 1). For example, every year the NAFSA:

Association of International Educators (NAFSA) and Association of International Education

Administrators (AIEA) award colleges and universities for their innovative approaches using CI.

In addition, ACE administers a cohort program, called the Internationalization Laboratory, that

trains international educators on how to implement CI (ACE, 2020a). Despite widespread

support for CI, there are several problems with this approach. CI is a top-down approach—

initiated and executed by administrators. In addition, CI places a heavy emphasis on student mobility (e.g., education abroad) (Yakaboski & Perozzi, 2018). Furthermore, the priority to generate revenue through international student recruitment and enrollment dominates the CI framework (Yakaboski & Perozzi, 2018).

Several scholars have investigated comprehensive internationalization (CI) approaches at CCs. In a case study analysis, Cierniak and Ruddy (2016) found comprehensive internationalization was only possible with faculty engagement—particularly hearing from faculty regarding obstacles to successful integration (p. 260). In another case study, Castro-Salazar and colleagues (2016) studied a CC's implementation of an internationalization plan using the CI framework. Castro-Salazar and colleagues (2016) found that the chancellor of the college acted as the catalyst for the internationalization initiative, but by using committees comprised of various stakeholders, the case college enhanced the plan's democratic/inclusivity qualities. The priority of the internationalization plan, however, was international student recruitment (Castro-Salazar et al., 2016). The researchers noted higher tuition rates would serve to benefit all students. Another common CI initiative is the development of global certificate programs open to all students. In conjunction with their regular academic plan, students can earn points or credits toward a global certificate by participating in various courses, projects, or student groups. Rodriquez (2016) found the International Studies Certificate at Santa Fe College not only transformed students but the college itself. This program motivated campus organizations to develop international events and student curiosities. The program also heightened student engagement across campus, increased cross-campus collaborations, and promoted self-authorship and career development (Rodriquez, 2016). While many examples of CI initiatives emphasized inclusion and democratic ideals, the CI framework can be problematic

because it over-emphasizes mobility and economic return, as mentioned previously. In response to concerns over mobility programming, many CCs are exploring a different framework to strategically plan their internationalization efforts—one that furthers the CC's local purpose.

The Local Approach

A repeated criticism of CC internationalization is that it opposes the CC's democratic mission (Branham, 2018; Green, 2007; Raby & Valeau, 2016; Treat & Hagedorn, 2013). Many scholars and educators view the purpose of the CC democratic mission as serving local needs. Thus, for some, internationalization may pose a threat to the local mission and priorities. Indeed, critics argue that CCs are primarily responsible to the local community (e.g., meeting local citizenry and workforce needs) because they are primarily funded by local tuition, property taxes, and state appropriations (Treat & Hagedorn, 2013). Using local resources to meet global needs seems antithetical to the CC's local purpose. This local/global tension has generated a general skepticism toward internationalization in the CC context (Treat & Hagedorn, 2013). To address this concern, GII scholars and practitioners have turned to local approaches to internationalization. Knight (2004) describes the local approach as "the creation of a culture or climate on campus that promotes and supports international/intercultural understanding and focuses on campus-based activities" (p. 19). Moving beyond campus-based activities, local internationalization also emphasizes a commitment to local diversity and preparing students to engage in their own racially, ethnically, and nationally diverse communities (Branham, 2018). One local approach that emphasizes local diversity and campus-based activities is Internationalization at Home (IaH).

Internationalization at Home (IaH) is an internationalization approach that promotes GII learning for all students in domestic learning environments (Yakaboski & Perozzi, 2018). In the

mid-1990's, Bengt Nilsson, a Swedish scholar and administrator of higher education, challenged the traditional concept of internationalization. He wanted to move beyond mobility to focus on curriculum internationalization and comparative international education in domestic contexts (Robertson, 2015). Nilsson recognized that his students, who were mostly of immigrant backgrounds, were likely not to study abroad but that their own international and cultural experiences could contribute to the GII learning environment. In an EAIE position paper titled "Internationalization at Home-theory and Praxis," he proposed and coined the term Internationalization at Home. Although this internationalization approach is dynamic (Beelen & Jones, 2015a), there are common characteristics (Yakaboski & Perozzi, 2018):

1. IaH activities, programs, and policy serve all students.

2. IaH is necessarily a part of the informal/formal curriculum.

3. A central focus is on international, global, intercultural competencies for all students.

4. International education through mobility programs is not possible for everyone.

5. IaH may include short-term outgoing mobility if it is a required part of the curriculum for all students.

In addition, IaH uses a bottom-up approach requiring significant academic engagement and implementation of practice (Beelen & Jones, 2015a; 2015b; Robertson, 2015). Beelen and Jones (2015) argue IaH is a uniquely inclusive internationalization framework that decentralizes internationalization from administrative offices while also building a globally oriented campus culture. Similarly, Copeland and colleagues (2017) found the local approach to be a bottom-up and organically integrated method of internationalization. Indeed, IaH provides a paradigm shift to internationalization (Yakaboski & Perozzi, 2018) which is perhaps necessary for purposeful, mission-based internationalization at CCs.

Unfortunately, there is limited research that considers the role of IaH in CC internationalization. In Robertson's (2015) study on student interest in GII education, she applied IaH as her internationalization framework. She conducted a survey of 68 CC students at a large CC in the southeast United States. Robertson (2015) found that opportunity for GII learning depended greatly on internationalizing curriculum and necessitated faculty engagement. In addition, Robertson's (2015) findings suggest family/peer interactions (e.g., encouragement, immigrant family background) played a statistically significant role in whether students developed an interest in GII learning. In a recent case study analysis of two CCs, Branham (2018) found that both CCs were implementing three IaH strategies to address access limitations in their student mobility programs: global certificate programs; faculty and staff professional development; and campus and community resources. Given the local emphasis of IaH, CC and international education scholars recommend the use of and further research on IaH (Branham, 2018; Robertson, 2015; Yakaboski & Perozzi, 2018).

The Process Approach

A process approach is the integration of GII dimensions into each of the core operations of the institution (Knight, 2004). This typically requires alignment with the college mission, vision, values, and institutional goals (Knight & de Wit, 1995). The goal of the process approach is to articulate institutional commitment, develop an administrative structure, and cultivate an organizational culture supportive of global learning (Knight & de Wit, 1995). This institutional formation occurs through institution-wide planning and strategizing (Copeland et al., 2017; Unangst & Barone, 2019).

Internationalization plans are written commitments that define internationalization goals, inform stakeholders, and stimulate engagement (Childress, 2009; Unangst & Barone, 2019).

Generally, three types of internationalization plans exist in HEI contexts: an institution-wide plan with internationalization components; an institutional plan dedicated to campus internationalization; and an internationalization plan at unit or department levels (Childress, 2009). In her foundational work on internationalization plans, Childress (2009) studied the internationalization plans of 32 member institutions of AIEA and found the most common type of internationalization plan was at the institutional level—imbedded in the institution-wide planning documents. Often, top leadership initiated the internationalization plan, and an internationalization task force executed it (Childress, 2009). Her findings also reveal HEIs used internationalization plans in several ways: (a) as a planning "road map;" (b) as a way to garner approval for internationalization efforts; (c) as a tool for explaining purpose and articulating goals; (d) as a means for stimulating interdisciplinary collaborations; and (e) as a mechanism for fundraising (p. 289). Unfortunately, Childress' (2009) study focused primarily on universities.

Recently, scholars have examined why and how CCs use institutional plans for internationalization. For CCs, internationalization plans articulate the college's commitment to internationalization (CCID, 2018) and demonstrate how they operationalize internationalization (Unangst & Barone, 2019). For example, Copeland and colleagues (2017) found that CCs developed internationalization plans in response to perceived student needs. Unfortunately, they did not examine the content of these plans. In a textual study of three CC internationalization plans, Unangst and Barone (2019) found CCs were especially concerned with optimizing institutional resources (e.g., human, cultural, community and fiscal). In addition, internationalization efforts remained fragmented with initiatives developing in isolation of one another (Unangst & Barone, 2019). Their study also revealed a need for a typology of internationalization plans for CCs—one which fits with their open access mission and allows for

34

emerging, evolving, and fully integrated planning. Unfortunately, Unangst and Barone's (2019) sample was limited to three colleges, and they only examined plans dedicated to internationalization—excluding the broader institutional plan and unit plans such as strategic enrollment or DEI plans. However, their study is useful for analyzing internationalization discourse as they identified common words in internationalization plans, such as "abroad," "global," "international," "internationalization," "multicultural," and "world (p. 184).

Although the use of internationalization plans seems to be increasing (Childress, 2009; Unangst & Barone, 2019), research indicates a small percentage of CCs use them. For example, in a 2001 survey of CC internationalization, Green and Siaya (2005) found that 32% of colleges (n=41) that were heavily engaged in internationalization utilized an internationalization plan. That is, approximately 3% of all CCs in 2001[3] had an internationalization plan. More recently, in the ACE internationalization survey, Helms and Brajkovic (2017) found that 30% of the surveyed CCs had an articulated plan to internationalize[4]. While CCs are engaging in a process approach by utilizing internationalization plans (Branham, 2018; Butler, 2016; Copeland et al., 2017; Unangst & Barone, 2019), there seems to be a general lack of research on internationalization planning discourse and the extent of their use in CCs.

Looking to the Future: Community College Internationalization

Each of the approaches discussed are useful for understanding internationalization in the CC context (see Table 1[5]). As Knight (2004) notes, colleges and universities may use multiple approaches or may transition between approaches depending on the institutions' changing priorities. Given the breadth, depth, and flexibility of internationalization, postsecondary

---

[3] In 2001, there were 1,070 accredited CCs in the United States (Green & Siaya, 2005).

[4] Unfortunately, the ACE report (Helms & Brajkovic, 2017) does not clearly define the sample population, so it is not possible to conclude that 30% of all U.S. CCs have an internationalization plan.

[5] From the review of literature, I list each approach and the common CC practices in Table 1.

institutions have implemented internationalization in ways that benefit stakeholders and fit their organizational structure, mission, and vision (de Wit, 2002; Knight, 2004). However, critics and advocates have debated whether CC internationalization supports the mission and vision to serve local students and communities. On one hand, internationalization efforts can generate revenue for the colleges (Brennen & Dellow, 2013; Knight & de Wit, 1995; Viggiano et al, 2018) and create learning and development opportunities within classrooms and across campuses (Brenner, 2016; Copeland et al, 2017; Green & Siaya, 2005; Rhoades et al, 2016; Rodriquez, 2016). In addition, internationalization can increase job opportunities for students (Dellow, 2007) and impact a CC's global and local economies (Woodin, 2016). On the other hand, critics caution internationalization privileges certain students, shifts institutional focus away from local communities, and positions international students as revenue generators instead of students served by the mission (Brennan & Dellow, 2013; Raby & Valeau, 2016; Viggiano et al., 2016). As such, scholars and practitioners continue to question how internationalization best aligns with the institutional mission and vision of CCs.

As Knight & de Wit (2018) look to the future of postsecondary internationalization, they note an important shift in its foundational concept. For these internationalization scholars, they see internationalization moving beyond relationships between and across nations. Now, internationalization must also be understood as relations between cultures and at local and global levels (Knight, & de Wit, 2018, p. 3). In addition, internationalization is still a "collection of fragmented and unrelated activities" (Knight & de Wit, 2018, p. 3), which is certainly the case for U.S. CCs (Raby & Valeau, 2016). Thus, CCs may need a holistic approach that gives greater emphasis to cultures and relationships at local and global levels.

Table 1

CC Internationalization Approaches and Practices

Approaches to Internationalization	Practices by Approach
The Abroad Approach	None
The Outcomes Approach	Increasing international student enrollment
	Increasing education abroad programs
	Increasing cultural competencies
	Increasing institutional ranking
The Activities Approach	Education Abroad
	International Students Services and Activities (e.g., festivals, language partners, advising and orientation)
	Collaboration with local organizations
	Area studies (predominantly in history and business departments)
The Process Approach	Internationalization Plans
	Administrative structure (e.g., internationalization offices and centers and international education administrators)
The Comprehensive Internationalization Approach	Internationalization Plans
	Global learning certificates
	International student enrollment
Local	Global learning certificates
	Faculty development and engagement
	Cross-campus resources for internationalization
	Collaborations with global community partners

Note. This table lists internationalization approaches in CCs and their associated practices.

Literature Review Conclusion

This literature review examined the history, mission, and internationalization approaches of CCs. From their early history, CCs have tried to balance the democratic mission with an often-contradictory workforce mission (Dougherty, 1994). In addition, scholarship on CC internationalization revealed CCs tend to use one or more of five internationalization approaches: outcomes, activities, comprehensive, local, and/or process. The literature review also revealed that colleges seem to be using institutional plans to internationalize. Interestingly, the literature also hinted at elements of neoliberal and democratic logics within CC internationalization, such

as the desire to increase the global competitiveness of local businesses or to collaborate with local refugee centers (Copeland et al., 2017). Unfortunately, the literature also exposes a lack of research into the examination of logics currently shaping CC internationalization across the United States. Of primary concern to this study are democratic and neoliberal logics. In the next section, I introduce my theoretical framework which applies neo-institutionalism, and outline what I mean by neoliberal and democratic logics.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical tradition of neo-institutionalism suggests that supra-organizational forces, including institutional logics, often influence organizations within a common industry to become more similar over time (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Powell & DiMagio, 1991). I am interested in understanding how the institutional logics, neoliberalism and democracy, manifest in CC internationalization plans and related discourse. To understand the basis of logics though, I first provide a background discussion of neo-institutionalism theory.

Neo-Institutionalism

Neo-institutionalism shows how cultural assumptions, rather than rational assumptions, shape organizational activity (Gonzales & Ayers, 2018). Meyer and Rowan (1977) hypothesized organizations will become more complex by adapting to their environment, which consists of a formal state and other organizations with a similar purpose. Within this scenario, organizations will seek to adapt even if there is a lack of evidence that adapting will lead to greater efficiency (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Legitimacy rather than productivity is the motivation for organizational change (Powell & DiMagio, 1991). As organizations change seeking legitimacy within their sector, the organizations gradually become alike (Powell & DiMagio, 1991). Because of the increasing frequency of internationalization, neo-institutionalism is a useful theory for analyzing

internationalization efforts (Mitchell & Nielsen, 2012). In fact, many scholars have used neo-institutionalism to explore reasons, processes, and outcomes of internationalization efforts especially in developing and emerging countries that seek legitimacy in global higher education (e.g., Ballerini, 2017; Zapp & Ramirez, 2019). I tap into but also extend this body of work by leveraging neo-institutional theory to study CC internationalization.

Institutional Logics

Despite the role of cultural forces shaping organizational change, Alford and Friedland (1985) were concerned neo-institutionalism lacked a connection between organizations and larger social contexts (Alford & Friedland, 1985; Gonzales & Ayers, 2018). To address this concern, Alford and Friedland (1985) developed the concept institutional logics. Institutional logics are "symbolic systems" and "supra organizational patterns of activity" (Friedland & Alford, 1991, p. 232). Institutional logics elicit certain beliefs, behaviors, and institutional forms that "have social functions" (Alford & Friedland, 1985, p. 11). Examples of institutional logics include: 1) capitalism; 2) the state; 3) democracy; 4) family; and 5) [Christian] religion (Alford & Friedland, 1985). As individuals live their "material life in time and space," the symbolic systems (e.g., capitalism or democracy) categorize the activity creating patterns of activity and meaning in daily life (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thornton et al., 2012). Thus, institutional logics are macro-level social forces that structure and influence our cognitive and physical responses—ultimately shaping organizations.

Even though institutional logics shape daily patterns of behavior, they are abstract, intangible objects that perpetually exist through discourse and practice. Thus, institutional logics are "heavy but hard to detect" (Gonzales & Ayers, 2018, p. 462). Institutional logics are heavy because of their impact on everyday behaviors. In fact, they function as "sense making frames"

39

(Guillén, 2001, p. 14) and help us understand what seems legitimate, reasonable, and effective in a given context (Guillén, 2001; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). In this sense, they govern actions and the expectations of action (Gonzales & Ayers, 2018). For example, neoliberal logic impacts expectations of CC faculty as well as the faculty's own expectations of their work (Gonzales & Ayers, 2018). As states decrease funds for CCs and increase accountability policy, states expect CCs to prioritize efficiency and productivity. College administrators in turn expect faculty to maintain their typical teaching responsibilities while also picking up additional tasks, such as inputting student achievement data into institutional tracking systems that standardize student support services (Aguilar-Smith & Gonzales, 2019). As faculty navigate these new expectations, they also navigate the societal and institutional expectations to fulfill a care role for students. For example, Aguilar-Smith and Gonzales (2019) found that CC faculty often serve as institutional agents supporting students outside of the classroom, even in the evenings and on weekends, while using personal resources. As demonstrated in these examples (Aguilar-Smith & Gonzales, 2019; Gonzales & Ayers, 2018), institutional logics are heavy as they shape our daily understandings of what is legitimate. Despite this, institutional logics are also hard to detect because they appear as commonsense notions—"endlessly invoked by name and enacted in practice" (Friedland, 2013, p. 9). In this study, I am interested in how the logics of neoliberalism and democracy manifest in CC internationalization. Next, I provide a background discussion on neoliberalism and delineate neoliberal logic using examples from postsecondary education.

Neoliberal Logic

Neoliberal logic is a socially constructed system of meaning that shapes human activity and material conditions, influencing nearly all aspects of U.S. American life. Although neoliberalism seems omnipresent, it is a manufactured belief system that market governance

leads to economic power and opportunities for freedom. The economists Milton Friedman and Friedrich Von Hayek first developed the economic model in the mid-20th century out of the University of Chicago (George, 1999). In his book, *Capitalism and Freedom* (1962), Friedman argued that markets govern society far better than governments. Even in the case of Friedman's proposition for required and publicly funded K-12 education (i.e., the community effect), he argues government management of public education is unnecessary, and families should receive vouchers for their schools of choice. Similarly, for higher learning, Friedman (1962/2002) notes publicly funded vouchers for private/public postsecondary education may advance community and citizenry; however, such vouchers would necessarily exclude vocational education. Friedman writes, "the adoption of such arrangements would make for more effective competition among various types of schools and for a more efficient utilization of their resources" (Friedman, 2002, p. 990). Thus, according to Friedman, even in the case of public education and community/citizenry development, market activity should be responsible for the well-being of our societies. Following Friedman's development of neoliberal policy, Von Hayek (1994/2014) advanced neoliberal doctrine by theorizing government's role in ensuring the functioning of free markets through deregulatory policy. Subsequently, these architects and their followers built "an international network of foundations, institutions, research centers, publications, scholars, writers, and public relations" to advance and market neoliberal doctrine (George, 1999, para. 8). By the 1980s, the Thatcher (1979–1990) and Reagan administrations (1981–1989) were promoting, utilizing, and imposing neoliberalism broadly.

Traditionally, scholars consider the governance and economic premises of neoliberalism: free-market governance is the best way to manage society, and free-market governance leads to the ultimate good of material or economic well-being and freedom. For example, neoliberalism

proposes that society is advanced through an institutional framework characterized by ownership

rights, free trade, and free-market governance (Harvey, 2007). Within this institutional

framework, neoliberalism functions to "liberate" individual entrepreneurial freedom and skills

(Harvey, 2007, p. 2). The role of the state is to preserve the institutional framework by

deregulating policy and enabling free-market governance (e.g., deregulating industry, removing

public good protections, and defunding public goods to lower corporate taxes) (Giroux, 2005;

Harvey, 2007). In addition, neoliberalism dictates life around the "generalized principle of

competition" (Day, 2016, p. 4; George, 1999). For example, competition between countries,

regions, organizations, and individuals is necessary as it should separate "the fit from the unfit"

and allow for the most efficient allocation of resources (George, 1999, para. 12). While

neoliberalism presumes to advance society through economic means, at the heart of

neoliberalism is a much more unsettling condition, which is the alienation and commodification

of human life (Day, 2016; George, 1999).

To understand the nature and complexities of neoliberal logic, I reviewed a wide range of

literature critiquing neoliberalism and conducted two phases of conceptual mapping (Appendix

A). In phase one, I identified basic structures of neoliberal logic. Whether through a cultural,

ideological, and/or economic lens, scholars tend to agree that neoliberalism is structured on

principles of commodification, production, competition, privatization, and material wealth

(Ayers, 2005; Day, 2016; George, 1999; Giroux, 2014; Petrovic & Kuntz, 2018). The second

phase of conceptual mapping included identifying various neoliberal values, actions, and

outcomes that form each structure (Appendix A). Next, I discuss these five neoliberal structures

and utilize examples from postsecondary education to show how neoliberal logic functions.

Commodification. Commodification is the transformation of tangible and intangible objects into objects of economic value intended for trade (Appadurai, 1988; Eartman & Williams, 2005). In higher education, the opportunity for learning has transformed into an economic service that students (i.e., the consumer) attempt to purchase and HEIs (i.e., the supplier) attempt to sell. In fact, the concept of commodification shapes the way scholars and practitioners understand college choice and access. For example, Hughes and colleagues (2019) proposed the "Dual-Commodification" model which explains how together students and HEIs engage in a marketplace—shopping, selling, and buying. Students seek the best deal and HEIs work to advertise their programs portraying a product that meets the students' needs and desires (Hughes et al., 2019). Indeed, for many people, postsecondary education looks and feels like a commodity because neoliberal logic works to pattern human activity around neoliberal values and actions. Likewise, the value of commodification shapes the value of production.

Production. Neoliberal logic also shapes beliefs and behaviors around production. Production is generally understood as the manufacturing of products and services to be sold and bought. In U.S. higher education, the CC epitomizes a metaphorical transformation toward production ideology (O'Banion, 1971). Scholars identified this shift to production ideology in the mid-20th century when CCs were thought of as the "most useful instrument of our production-oriented society" (O'Banion, 1971, p. 658). In his critique of government influence, O'Banion argued CCs were the United States' "educational factories" that produced technicians for factories to purchase; prepared an assembly line of prepped students for university transfer; and refabricated obsolete workers to be plugged back into the workforce (O'Banion, 1971, p. 658). More recently, scholars have examined the role of faculty as "new economy workers" in the neoliberal CC (Sethares, 2020). In this context, CCs hire faculty for their technical expertise

while exploiting them as low-pay contractual workers with little opportunity for academic governance (Levin, 2007; Sethares, 2020). Indeed, the neoliberal ideologies of production shape the ways U.S. society understands and values educational purpose, students, faculty, and organizational structures.

       Privatization. Privatization is widely thought of as an essential structure of neoliberal logic as it supports the belief that markets govern society best. Generally, privatization is understood as the transfer of ownership from a public entity to a private entity. Within this process, defunding of public resources is a necessary action and downsizing the public sector is a desirable outcome (George, 1999). However, critics of neoliberal privatization are quick to point out the duplicity of privatization. Privatization is more so about the redistribution of the majorities' wealth to a small private minority. George (1999) poignantly states that privatization is really the "alienation and surrender of the product of decades of work by thousands of people to a tiny minority of large investors" (para. 23). In postsecondary education, privatization takes on many forms but often involves outsourcing functions and services such as curriculum development and instruction (e.g., OPM); and reimagining students as consumers and faculty as disposable labor. As neoliberal logic shapes human life around commodification, production and privatization, another neoliberal structure emerges.

       Competition. Competition is another fundamental structure of neoliberalism. In fact, some scholars argue that competition is the central value of neoliberalism (George, 1999). In simplified terms, competition is the independent rivalry to gain resources over others. As a symbolic social system, neoliberal logic shapes beliefs and values around the idea that competition is a virtue because it allocates resources in the most efficient way possible (George, 1999). As such, neoliberalism holds that social spheres function better when they act as

competitive free markets (Gonzales & Ayers, 2018). Inherent in the values of competition are beliefs that inequality is natural and that those with the most resources win (George, 1999). Lastly, because competition is virtuous, the results of competition are inherently right and good (George, 1999). With the basic understanding of commodification, production, privatization, and competition, I next turn to the fifth structure of neoliberalism: material well-being.

Material Well-Being. Neoliberal logic shapes human beliefs and values around the ideas that material and economic well-being should be desired and rewarded. Material well-being is satisfaction with one's income, employment benefits, wealth, and ability to consume (Sirgy, 2018). In addition, material and economic well-being reflect social class status. Capitalism (or neoliberal logic) holds that through production and profit individuals can acquire higher social class status, or "economic position" (Alford & Friedland, 1985, p. 137). Further, economic position is power (Alford & Friedland, 1985) and a means toward freedom (Friedman, 1965/2002). This neoliberal logic resembles notions of the "American Dream" whereby if one works hard enough (producing something) and makes enough money (profit), they can move up the social class latter (economic position) and achieve economic power. Essentially, wealth is progress (Day, 2016). Unfortunately, the "American Dream" scenario is an idealization of neoliberal logic.

Neoliberalism does not build wealth—it rewards wealth. Neoliberal logic propels privatization which redistributes public wealth to already wealthy individuals and entities (Day, 2016; George, 1999). Instead of redistributing wealth back to the public, wealthy, and even middle-class individuals, grow their wealth by reinvesting it into stock markets at the detriment of people laboring to produce commodities (George, 1999). The wealthy, however, continue to disproportionately gain more wealth while those without wealth lose (Bratanova, Laughnan,

Klein, & Wood, 2016; Campbell, Ramadori & Ranish, 2019; George, 1999; Jiang & Probst, 2017). In fact, the lower that someone begins on the income scale "the more they lose proportionally" (Bratanova, et al., 2016; George, 1999, para. 23; Jiang & Probst, 2017). As a result, the structure of rewarding wealth "eclips[es] hope itself through untold forms of disparities and inequities" (Day, 2016, p. 4). Overall, neoliberal logic shapes human beliefs, values, and actions around the idea that rewarding wealth is good, perhaps even virtuous (George, 1999). In Chapter Three, I introduce critical discourse analysis as way to interrogate neoliberal discourses. To do this, I use the structures discussed in this section, as well as additional neoliberal facets, as a way to initially code my data. Before moving on to Chapter Three, however, I provide a background discussion on democracy and then delineate democratic logic using examples from postsecondary education.

Democratic Logic

In contrast to neoliberal logic, democratic logic is a political and social belief system emphasizing participation and governance through popular control and representation (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Hammer, 1990). Like neoliberalism, democracy is socially constructed (Moran & Parry, 2015, p. 2). For example, although democracy has roots in ancient Greek history, it was not until the French Revolution (1789-1799) that modern liberal democracy took form (Moran & Parry, 2015), "proclaiming that all public authority derives from the consent of the governed" (Blaufarb, 1995, p. 608). In the 1800s, post-French Revolution, Marx advanced the concept of democracy by theorizing that if "the rule of the people" entailed equal opportunity to participate in decision making, emancipation for all people would occur (Moran & Parry, 2015, p. 4). Today, similar ideals of equal opportunity and emancipation underpin democratic social beliefs

as well as the "practices and principles" that "institutionalize and protect freedom" (The

Economist Intelligence Unit, 2020, p. 50).

Democratic logic proposes that societies are liberated and advanced through principles of

free opportunity (Dahl, 1971) and practices of deliberation and representation (Shah, 2016). For

example, democracy concerns ideologies of free opportunity to formulate and articulate

preferences, to take individual and collective action, and to have preferences "weighted equally

in the conduct of the government" (Alford & Friedman, 1985; Dahl, 1971, p. 2). Although

democracy in the United States encompasses egalitarian ideals, U.S. democracy has always been

flawed and particularly exclusionary. For example, while the United States government was

founded on the principle of 'for the people, and by the people,' communities of color,

particularly Indigenous and Black communities, and women have been excluded from full

participation in democratic governance through, for example, racialized voter suppression tactics

(Newkirk, 2018). Some critics of democracy also argue that it is not only flawed but

fundamentally idealistic and dependent on "structures of colonial and racial dispossession"

(Baker, 2017, p. 145). For example, the U.S. was founded as a democratic society, yet the nation

was built on stolen land from Indigenous people and built through the forced labor of enslaved

Black people (Baker, 2017). Thus, in this study, I consider democratic logics as places of

tension, resistance, and hope.

To better understand the nature and complexities of democratic logic in education, I

reviewed a wide range of education literature on democracy and conducted two phases of

conceptual mapping (Appendix B). In the first phase, I identified the basic structures of

democracy. Whether through a political or ideological lens, scholars tend to agree that

democracy is structured on idyllic principles of opportunity, empowerment, community, and

47

emancipation. The second phase of conceptual mapping included identifying the various democratic values, actions, and outcomes that form each of the structures (Appendix B). Next, I discuss these four democratic structures.

Opportunity. Democratic logic in education shapes beliefs and behaviors around opportunity. In fact, in U.S. higher education, the institutional logic of democracy is a "manifestation of opportunity" (Gonzales & Ayers, 2018). In the CC context, the democratic logic of opportunity shapes beliefs and practices around issues of access (Everette, 2015), equity, (Dowd, 2003) and social mobility (Rhoades & Valdez, 1996). For example, it is a common belief that a CC education may lead to social mobility for historically marginalized students (Rhoades & Valdez, 1996). As such, faculty may feel compelled to work beyond their articulated job responsibilities and emotionally invest in students (Gonzales & Ayers, 2018). While opportunity is fundamentally hopeful, opportunity logic also creates tension as it often excuses other exploitations such as the emotional labor of faculty. Overall, however, logics of democracy are structured on principles of opportunity which seem to form the essence of the U.S. CC. Another democratic logic manifest in postsecondary education is empowerment.

Empowerment. Democratic logic shapes beliefs and behaviors around empowerment. Generally, empowerment refers to the power to exert control over decisions impacting a person's own life, organizational functions, and community well-being (Zimmerman, 2000, p. 1). As Zimmerman (2000) notes, empowerment is also a conscious orientation toward making change in community (Zimmerman, 2000). In education, logics of empowerment often shape behaviors and practices around equipping students to deliberate, exercise voice, and participate in civic engagement (Flores & Rogers, 2019; Shaffer & Longo, 2019). Like opportunity, empowerment is hopeful, however, it may also be a site of harm. For example, logics of empowerment may

work to disempower minoritized people and cultures. For example, spaces of democratic deliberation often normalize Standard American English and thus delegitimize minoritized voices (Chowdhury & Le Ha, 2014). In addition, citizenship engagement often imposes White, western values and governance systems at the expense of marginalized cultures (Lee, 2014). Overall, however, democracy seems structured on principles of empowerment which shape behaviors and practices intended to lift and equip historically marginalized voices—although research is limited. Another democratic logic manifest in postsecondary education is community.

  Community. Democratic logic shapes beliefs and behaviors around community, including how individuals participate and live together (Dewey, 1916). Similarly, democratic logic shapes beliefs and behaviors around critical empathy (Morrell, 2010) and relationship building (Franco, 2002). For example, Dewey (1916) writes that an individual should refer their "own action to that of others, and to consider the action of another to give point and direction to his own . . ." (p. 101). For Dewey (1916), practicing empathy and relationship building is "equivalent to the breaking down of barriers of class, race, and national territory which keep men from perceiving the full import of their activity" (p. 101). In the CC context, colleges often build relationships with regional K–12 systems and universities to break down barriers and create pathways for marginalized student communities (Franco, 2002). While Dewey's philosophical work on democracy and education is widely cited and useful for considering principles of community, it does not go far enough to problematize democracy and community in education. Like the United States' history of voter suppression, who excludes and who is excluded from participation in the CC context? Overall, however, logics of democracy are structured on principles of community which seem to shape behaviors and practices around participation,

empathy, and relationship building. Another democratic logic manifest in postsecondary education is emancipation.

      Emancipation. Finally, democratic logic shapes beliefs and behaviors around emancipation. Lissovoy (2015) writes that emancipation in education means constructing education as a "human encounter" which means looking for the human being in everything (p. 83). In addition, emancipation requires challenging the very nature of power (Lissovoy, 2015). For Ayers (2005), the mission and purpose of CCs must be one of emancipation whereby people come to recognize CCs as a place of "opportunity for all segments of society to realize their full potential" which includes a "broad range of human capacities" (p. 529). Thus, to understand emancipation, people must re-center on humanity. However, as cautioned by Baker (2017), emancipation should not be a matter determined by White people in positions of power as this would ask marginalized communities to wait for the "U.S. settler-master society" to voluntarily breakdown their oppressive power regimes (Baker, 2017, p. 151). Overall, however, logics of democracy seem structured on principles of emancipation that seem to shape behaviors and practices around human and power relations.

      As discussed in this section, democratic logic seems structured on four principles. In the literature on democratic governance and political systems, scholars referred to these principles as opportunity, deliberation, participation, and emancipation. These same principles were evident in literature on education and democracy. However, instead of deliberation, the term empowerment was widely used, and instead of participation, the idea of community was widely used. Apart from Ayers (2013) and Gonzales and Ayers (2018), research examining and critiquing democratic logics in CCs is limited. Overall, in this theoretical framework, I introduced neo-institutionalism and institutional logics. I also provided a background discussion of how

neoliberalism and democracy have shaped U.S. society. Following these discussions, I delineated

the structures upholding neoliberalism and democracy and provided examples of how these

logics do or could function in the CC setting.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I reviewed several bodies of literature to help make sense of the neoliberal

and democratic contexts in which CCs are situated. First, I reviewed literature on CCs, including

their history and mission. From there, I reviewed literature on internationalization in

postsecondary education and CCs specifically. Lastly, I presented my theoretical framework of

neo-institutionalism and the institutional logics neoliberalism and democracy. In the next

chapter, I discuss my methodology and research design.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

In this study, I examined community college (CC) internationalization using critical discourse analysis (CDA). The primary data source of this study was 11 internationalization plans from 11 colleges across the United States. These plans included institutional strategic plans, educational master plans, DEI plans, and internationalization* plans. In addition, I examined related external policy and internal practice statements. Like the internationalization plans, the external and internal texts were publicly available on the organizations' websites. Using democratic and neoliberal logics as my theoretical framework and the sociocognitive approach to CDA (van Dijk, 1983; 2004; 2006; 2009; 2016), I analyzed the texts' discourse themes, underlying neoliberal and democratic logic, and participants. The sociocognitive approach includes three analytic components of discourse: social structures, cognitive structures, and discourse structures. Next, I introduce CDA and the rationales for using the sociocognitive approach. I also discuss my data sources, selection criteria, and methods of analysis.

A Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is an examination of ideology and power using semiotic data. CDA stems from the field of critical social sciences, and the work of critical linguistics (e.g., Voloshinvov, Fowler, Hodge and Kress), Western philosophers, and critical theorists of the Frankfurt School (e.g., Habermas) (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). As economic and social transformation occurred across the globe in the late 20th century, CDA became a way to critique and understand power dynamics in these transformations (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). In the early 1990s, a "network of scholars" (i.e., Fairclough, Kress, van Dijk, van Leeuwen, Wodak) advanced the CDA academic movement (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Now, CDA is generally understood as a "multi-disciplinary and multi-methodical approach" to

the critical study of complex social phenomenon using semiotic data (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Furthermore, CDA is concerned with the way power manifests in language and text.

Discourse: A Socially Constructed Way of Representing the World

While discourse is a linguistic and semantic object, it is also a multi-dimensional social phenomenon (van Dijk, 2009). For example, discourses represent social practices and beliefs/values of various aspects of the world (van Dijk, 2016). One dimension of discourse is social construction. According to van Dijk (2009), social construction is a form of social interaction, social practice, beliefs/values, cultural product, or even an economic product that has lasting effects. Another dimension of discourse is that social construction continuously shapes the way people make sense of their social reality. Some discourses become institutionalized and commonplace to the point that they construct imaginaries—ways people make sense of the world—which can in turn impact material realities. As a result, discourse becomes a way of representing the world (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2011).

Because discourse is a complex social phenomenon, not all CDA researchers view discourse in the same way or apply the same overall research strategy (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Attempting to address inconsistencies in CDA research, Fairclough and Wodak (1997) synthesized a definition of discourse and CDA, which is still widely cited:

> Critical discourse analysis sees discourse—language use in speech and writing—as a form of social practice. Describing discourse as a social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive unit and the situations, institutions, and social structures, which frame it: the discursive event is shaped by them, but it also shapes them (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p. 258).

Thus, CDA views "language as social practice" (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997), and the discursive context is essential to the analysis. Finally, van Dijk points out CDA goes beyond analysis to incorporate theory and application, which is what I attempt to do in this study. The social nature of discourse means that logics will shape what discourse is and how it functions. CDA works to expose the inherent logics and structures of power within discourse and material life.

Uncovering Ideologies and Latent Power Structures

CDA is problem-oriented and focused on "de-mystifying ideologies and power through a semantic" and re-traceable examination of discursive data (visual, spoken, or written) (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 3). In other words, CDA is the linguistic and semiotic analysis of a social wrong (e.g., inaccessible public education) that uncovers the ideologies shaping those wrongdoings (Fairclough, 2009; Fairclough, 2013; Ayers, 2005). A social wrong can be understood "as aspects of a social system, forms, or orders which are detrimental to human well-being" (Fairclough, 2009, p.167). Apart from Ayers' influential work, there is very little research that identifies patterns of discourse that normalize injustices occurring in CC contexts, let alone CC internationalization. In this study, for example, I am concerned that CC educators employ neoliberal logics in internationalization communications, and that internationalization plans may manifest neoliberal logics that reproduce social inequities (e.g., social stratification and marginalization). For example, how do internationalization plans and policies represent the economic wellbeing of colleges and business industry? How do these texts represent students in internationalization goals and metrics? In addition to social wrong doings, CDA focuses on issues of power.

CDA illuminates "the relations between discourse, power, dominance, and social inequality" (van Dijk, 1996, p. 249). van Dijk (2016) argues that powerful social groups control

discourse which creates a social system favoring the interests of those in power. Group power is based on material resources, such as capital and property, and symbolic resources, such as status and access to public discourse. Groups/people with such power can control (knowingly or unknowingly) action and cognition (van Dijk, 1996, p. 254). For example, people with power can require and control certain genres of discourse, such as strategic planning which often excludes content knowledge experts (e.g., faculty), standardizes processes (e.g., accountability using quantification), and institutionalizes certain knowledges (e.g., rationales for internationalization). As a result, our individual communicative interactions, and thus our own thoughts and beliefs, often become similar to other members in our social groups. These similarities generate related communicative interactions, resulting in shared discourses that often legitimize the interests of groups with power and perpetuate social inequities. Thus, there is a hierarchal structure to the reproduction of dominating discourses. That said, there are also discourses of resistance which challenge the legitimacy of powerful groups (van Dijk, 2016).

In addition to illuminating how discourses perpetuate or obscure social wrongdoings, CDA researchers also identify discursive paths past such power-laden obstacles—an alternative discourse (Fairclough, 2009; van Dijk, 2001). Holding the assumption that the democratic mission is a hopeful pursuit of an egalitarian system of education, I expect that some CC educators draw on democratic discourses in internationalization texts, and that internationalization plans manifest elements of opportunity, community, empowerment and emancipation. For example, how do these texts represent (or not) student participation in a globalized world or curricular justice initiatives? Or, as discussed in the theoretical framework, do democratic logics further colonization and racial dispossession? To investigate these types of questions, I examined CC internationalization texts using the sociocognitive approach to CDA.

The Sociocognitive Approach

CDA scholars have developed several different approaches to CDA. These approaches

include Discourse-Historical, Corpus-Linguistic, Social Actors, Dispositive Analysis,

Sociocognitive, and Dialectical-Relational (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). In this study, I use van

Dijk's sociocognitive approach (SCA). SCA theorizes that discourse structures (e.g., talk and

text) and society (e.g., everyday interactions and group relations) can only be related through

language user cognition (e.g., logic and individual beliefs/values/actions) [6]. For example, social

actors engaged in communication rely upon shared beliefs which shape ways of behaving

(Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 25). Thus, SCA researchers examine the interactions of discourse

structures, society, and cognition (van Dijk, 2009); I delineate these analytic components later in

this chapter. Although there are nuanced differences in terminology between SCA, other CDA

approaches, and institutional logic theory, there is alignment between core concepts, which is

why I chose SCA as my specific methodology[7].

I chose SCA for three main reasons. First, SCA emphasizes the communicative

interaction of discourse participants (the social component) and exposes dominating, excluded,

and othered participants. In this study, I used a critical theory perspective and sought to identify

domination, exclusion, and othering of/by discourse participants. Second, it emphasizes an

examination of cognition and reveals dominating logic that may perpetuate social inequities.

Third, SCA posits that logic perpetuates certain discourses and thus certain behaviors and

beliefs. This reasoning is similar to the theoretical concepts of institutional theory where

---

[6]SCA uses unique terminology such as mental representation and ideology. For reader accessibility, I use slightly different terms that have similar meaning. Instead of mental representations, I use the terms beliefs/values/actions; and in place of ideology, I use the term logic.

[7] In this study, I use the terms discourse, discourse structures, beliefs/values/actions, and logic. These terms are related but distinct. *Discourse* (macro) is a grand narrative built on repeated *discourse structures* (micro talk and text and linguistic features). Discourse structures reveal individuals' *beliefs/thoughts/actions* which, together, illuminate the macro-logics in a discourse. Thus, *logics* (macro) are the shared cognitive structures of the discourse.

organizations gradually become more alike through the influence of institutional logics. Overall, SCA's methodological priorities are particularly helpful in answering this study's research questions:

1. What are the democratic and neoliberal discourse themes in CC internationalization plans and related discourse?

    a. What democratic and neoliberal logics underly these themes?

    b. How do plan, internal, and external discourse participants advance these themes?

2. Who is excluded and who is othered in the CC internationalization discourse?

Data Collection

Data Sources

The primary sources of data are publicly available institutional planning documents that include internationalization efforts. I also refer to these types of planning documents as internationalization plans. Scholars and practitioners use different language and have different understandings of what an internationalization plan is[8]. For example, some may define an internationalization plan as a comprehensive institutional plan with embedded internationalization goals (e.g., Childress, 2009). Others may define it as an isolated document solely dedicated to the goals and strategies of internationalizing[9] (e.g., Unangst & Barone, 2016).

---

[8] Childress' (2009) mapping project of university internationalization plans found universities were internationalizing with a variety of plan types, including academic department plans and university strategic plans. In contrast, Unangst and Barone's (2019) limit their sample to plans solely dedicated to internationalization efforts. While internationalization* plans would provide the richest data for this study, these plans are limited either because they do not exist, or colleges prefer not to publicly share them (Unangst & Barone, 2019). Scholars have not identified the types of plans CCs commonly use to internationalize.

[9] To distinguish this form of internationalization plan, I use an asterisk (e.g., INT* plan).

Therefore, I collected a wide range of institutional plans based on document titles[10]. I found that CCs used three types of internationalization plans: educational master plans (EMP), strategic plans (SP), and focus area/functional plans (e.g., DEI or INT*)[11]. Next, I present my sample population selection criteria.

Sampling Frame Parameters

To determine my sample frame, I used two parameters. First, the plans needed be from CCs. Even though this may seem straightforward, scholars often classify CCs differently. I used the Carnegie Classifications and defined CCs as public two-year (Associates) and public Baccalaureate/Associate (Associate's Dominant) (Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research, n.d.). The second parameter was CCs engaged in internationalization. There are 1,050 CCs in the United States (AACC, 2020a) with nearly 36% of colleges offering some international education programming (approximately 378 colleges) (Raby, 2020).

To identify CCs likely engaged in internationalization, I used publicly available information from six U.S. international/higher education associations cited widely in the literature (see Table 2). These organizations support/recognize CC internationalization through awards, rankings, resources, and training opportunities. In total, I identified 352 references to CCs and 247 distinct CCs engaged in internationalization—approximately 24% of CCs (Appendix C)[12]. Next, I introduce each organization and the sources I used.

---

[10] I collected educational master plans, strategic plans, internationalization* plans, strategic enrollment plans, workforce development plans, and DEI plans. I collected enrollment plans as they could have included discourse related to international student recruitment. I collected workforce development plans in case of global workforce planning discourse. DEI plans might have included intercultural education language.
[11] A standard model for CC planning does not exist and may depend on of accreditation requirements.
[12] This is not a complete list of all CCs engaged in internationalization.

Table 2

International/Higher Education Organizations Recognizing CC Internationalization

U.S. International/Higher Education Organizations
American Association of CCs (AACC)
American Council on Education (ACE)
American International Educators Association (AIEA)
Institute for International Education (IIE)
NAFSA: The Association of International Educators (NAFSA)
U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education

Note. This table shows the organizations used in this study to identify CCs engaged in internationalization.

AACC is a national membership association for CCs in the United States. Recently, the AACC published a CC global education case studies report (AACC, 2020). The report discussed two consortia leading CC internationalization efforts: California Colleges for International Education (CCIE) and Community Colleges s for International Development (CCID). 75 CCs are members of CCIE, and 110 U.S. CCs are members CCID (CCIE, 2020; CCID, 2020). Another leading higher education association is ACE (ACE, 2020, para 1). ACE offers a two-year cohort program called the Internationalization Laboratory, where international education administrators learn how to implement comprehensive internationalization (CI) (ACE, 2020a). Since 2003, seven CCs have participated (ACE, 2020a). AIEA is another organization that supports HEI international education administrators. AIEA recognizes HEI internationalization efforts with their Innovation Award in Internationalization (AIEA, n.d.a, para. 3). One CC has received this award. Another organization dedicated to supporting international educators is NAFSA. NAFSA awards universities and colleges with the Senator Paul Simon Award for Comprehensive Internationalization (NAFSA, n.d.c). Since 2004, five CCs have received this award. Founded in 1919, the IIE is a leading international education organization that "helps

people and organizations leverage the power of international education" (IIE, n.d.). Since 2003/2004, IIE has publicly ranked CC internationalization efforts based on international student enrollment (2019a) and study abroad (2019c). From 2003/04 to 2017/18, IIE ranked 77 CCs for "top" number of international students and 72 colleges for "top" number of study abroad programs. In addition, since 2009, IIE has awarded the Heiskell Award for CC Internationalization to 17 CCs (IIE, n.d.a). Lastly, the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Postsecondary Education administers the International and Foreign Language Education (IFLE) program (Higher Education Act, Title VI), which offers several grants through their Fulbright-Hays and Title VI funding. Three CCs received a Fulbright-Hays Group Projects Abroad grant and two CCs received an International Studies and Foreign Language award (OPE, 2020). Next, I explain how I identified the colleges with a publicly available internationalization plan.

Population Parameters: Current and Publicly Available Plans

The parameters for my sample population included several criteria. First, the plans needed to be publicly available. Second, the plans needed to be current (as of 2020). Third, the plans needed to include internationalization-related language. Using the list of CCs from the sampling frame (Appendix C), I searched the websites of each college for the following terms and word forms: "strategic plan/s/ing," "college plan/s/ing," "master plan/s/ing," and "internationalization plan/s/ing" This search often led to several types of college planning documents (e.g., EMP, SP, DEI, enrollment, INT*) and institutional planning webpages, often for a college's institutional effectiveness office. Of the 247 colleges, 128 colleges (52%) had one or more publicly available institutional plans, totaling 225 planning documents.

Population Parameters: Institutional Plan Discourse

At this stage of data collection, I had collected a variety of institutional planning documents from colleges likely engaged in internationalization. From there, I used Voyant discourse analysis software and identified the plans with common internationalization terms (*abroad, global, international, multi-cultural,* and *world*) (Childress, 2009; Unangst & Barone, 2019). Of the 225 plans, 46 used at least three of these words *(abroad, global, international, multi-cultural,* and *world).* Next, I introduce my sample population.

Sample Population

This study examined the neoliberal and democratic logics in CC internationalization. The examination of logic through discourse analysis is a theoretical endeavor (van Dijk, 2004) requiring the researcher immerse themselves in the discourse, using deep levels of analysis. Therefore, I selected 12 institutional plans with the largest number and range of common internationalization terms (*abroad, global, international, multi-cultural,* and *world*) (Childress, 2009; Unangst & Barone, 2019). Several of the plans with the largest number and range of common internationalization terms were internationalization* plans. Unfortunately, these plans were outdated by nearly 10 years, and therefore not included in the sample. Another parameter for inclusion was a current mission statement in the plan (i.e., matching the website). Unfortunately, one of my 12 sampled plans had a mission statement different from the website. Board meeting minutes confirmed the plan's mission statement was out of date. Therefore, I eliminated this plan from the sample, resulting in a total of 11 sampled plans. Although CDA does not necessitate a certain sample size, it does require collecting and adding data until saturation is reached (Mautner, 2016). CDA research meets saturation when adding new data does not produce new discursive representations (Mautner, 2016). Therefore, if new discourses

or discourse structures had emerged after analyzing 11 institutional plans, I would have selected

an additional plan until saturation was met. However, this was not necessary.

Similar to Childress' (2009) findings, CCs incorporate internationalization discourse into

a variety of institutional planning documents. Of the sample, six plans were Educational Master

plans, two were Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion plans (DEI), two were Internationalization*

plans, and one was a strategic plan (SP) (Table 3).

Table 3

Sample Population by Plan Type

Sample Population	# of Plans	Total Plans	%
Educational Master Plan (EMP)	6	11	55%
Strategic plan (SP)	1	11	9%
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion plan (DEI)	2	11	18%
Internationalization* plan (INT)	2	11	18%

Note. This table shows the type of internationalization plan and the number/percentage for each

type used.

Furthermore, I used pseudonyms for each of these plans/colleges. The pseudonyms are based on

state and type of plan (see Table 4 for the list of pseudonyms).

Table 4

Sample Population Pseudonyms in Alphabetical Order

Pseudonyms
1. **AZ-DEI**
2. **CA-EMP-1**
3. **CA-EMP-2**
4. **CA-EMP-3**
5. **CA-EMP-4**
6. **CA-EMP-5**

Table 4 (cont'd)

7. **IL-SP**
8. **MD-EMP**
9. **MN-INT***
10. **NY-DEI**
11. **WA-INT***

Note. This table includes the college/plan pseudonyms (by State-Plan Type-Number) used throughout this study.

Limitations of Data Collection

Although this study attempts to define a specific sampling frame and identify a comprehensive population, the data collection approach had several limitations. First, I used information from U.S. international/higher education organizations to try and build a representative population of CCs with internationalization plans. Most of these organizations require institutional membership which would likely require a considerable amount of investment for a participating CC. By relying on membership organizations to build my population, I may have excluded CCs who are engaged in internationalization but, perhaps, do not have the resources to participate in these organizations' international initiatives. This type of 'pay-to-play' requirement seems to embody neoliberal logics of commodification. Similarly, I used award recipients and rankings to discern the sample population. Award recognition and rankings seem to be a manifestation of competition—a neoliberal logic. Thus, I am aware of this potential bias in my sample population.

<div align="center">

Data Analysis

</div>

The sociocognitive approach (SCA) to CDA is useful for this study because it entails methodological priorities and analytic techniques which illuminate participants, discourses, and

logics and their role in maintaining social inequities. To identify discourse participants, discourse

themes, and democratic and neoliberal logic in CC internationalization, I engaged in an iterative

process of analysis—examining discourse structures, social structures, and logic structures.

SCA theorizes that discourse and society can only be mediated through cognition (logic).

van Dijk (2016, p. 64) writes:

> Social interaction, social situations and social structures can only influence text
>
> and talk through people's interpretations of such social environments. And
>
> conversely, discourse can only influence social interaction and social structures
>
> through the same cognitive interface of mental [representations], knowledge,
>
> attitudes, and ideology.

In addition, SCA assumes that cognition forms the bases of our individual, everyday

beliefs/values/actions in communicative interactions (van Dijk, 2016). Thus, our individual

beliefs/values/actions may be similar to members of the same social group allowing

"cooperation, interaction, communication, and hence discourse" (van Dijk, 2016, p. 67).

SCA Analytic Approach

To capture the intersections of discourse, society, and logic, SCA uses three analytic

components: discursive, social, and cognitive. An SCA researcher engages in each component

simultaneously, continuously revisiting them (van Dijk, 2016). In the discourse component, the

researcher examines linguistic features to identify and understand how the social and cognitive

structures interface (Table 5). For the social component, the researcher identifies discourse

participants and their relations revealing who controls, who is excluded, and who is othered in

the discourse (Table 6). Finally, the cognitive component is the examination of individual and

shared thoughts and beliefs which illuminates the logics in discourse (Table 7). In this section, I

provide a summary and describe how I analyzed each component in the study. I begin with the

discourse component, followed by the social and cognitive components. I also include a table for

each component which outlines and illustrates its principles and artifacts (Tables 5, 6, and 7).

The Discourse Component

The discourse component of SCA includes an analysis of discourse structures. Discourse

structures are the linguistic features of talk and text. According to SCA, three types of discourse

structures exist: super-, macro-, and microstructures[13] (Table 5). S*uperstructures* control

schematic organization of a text. Artifacts of superstructures include text sections, text features,

and cohesive devices. *Macrostructures* are the topics which comprise larger discourse themes.

Lastly, *microstructures* exist at the "linear level" of the text and include lexicon and syntax (van

Dijk, 2004, p. 5). Most importantly, microstructures reveal meaning (van Dijk, 2016). For

example, negative/positive word meanings and propositions signal polarization; pronoun use

signals collaboration, polarization, and competition; indexical relations, such as pronouns or

clauses, signal membership (e.g., *As a…*); verb choice can signal certain interests and activities;

evaluative statements, particularly in goal statements, can signal certain norms and values; and

references to resources can signal discourse participants' interests. Because microstructures

reveal meaning, SCA researchers analyze microstructures to uncover the macrostructures

(topics). Overall, in this component, the SCA researcher identifies patterns of micro, macro-, and

superstructures to identify and understand how the social and cognitive structures interface.

---

[13] van Dijk refers to these structures as textual grammar (van Dijk, 2004).

Table 5

The Discourse Component

Discourse Structure	Analytic Components	Artifacts
Superstructures	Document sections Common features Cohesive devices	Schematic organization
Macrostructures	Topics (revealed through microstructures) (e.g., propositions, points of view)	Discourse themes
Microstructures	Linguistic features such as: • word order (semantic structures) • word meaning • propositions • indexical relations (pronouns, phrases) • pronoun polarization (e.g., us vs them) • recurring document terms and collocations	• Polarization: negative/positive word meaning and propositions • Norms/values: evaluative statements in goal statements • Interests: references to resources • Collaboration/polarization/competition • Identification (e.g., *As a….*)) • Self/other descriptions • Activities

Note. This table shows the analytic elements of the discourse component of SCA.

In this study, I analyzed each plan for its super-, macro-, and microstructures—identifying patterns across the sample. Regarding superstructures, I looked for common overarching features or sections of the planning documents, such as mission statements, goal statements, and/or assessment frameworks. To identify macrostructures (topics), I analyzed reoccurring microstructures that revealed meaning, such as word order, word meaning (e.g., verbs, nouns), propositions, indexical relations (pronouns, phrases), and pronoun polarization (e.g., us vs them) (van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983). Next, I summarize and describe the social component of analysis. As a reminder, SCA aims to capture the intersection of discourse, society, and cognition using a layered analytic approach. Identifying patterns of discourse is one

layer of analysis that helps illuminate the social members (or participants) in discourses and their shared beliefs/values/actions.

The Social Component

The sociocognitive approach theorizes internal and external social groups (i.e., discourse participants) control discourse, and the control of discourse is evident in the communicative interactions and relations between discourse participants. The social component is essential because it illuminates who is maintaining hegemony by controlling a discourse that potentially perpetuates social inequities. The social component is especially important for this research because I am interested in the participants of CC internationalization.

In this component of analysis, an SCA researcher identifies participants and their interactions, revealing dominant social group chains (Table 6). In this study, I classified discourse participants as institutional plan, internal, and external participants. First, to identify plan participants, I read through each plan and noted offices, administrators, and/or faculty leading planning efforts and individuals on the planning committees[14]. Second, to identify internal/external discourse participants, I looked for communicative interactions, namely references to internal/external social groups[15]. Then, I collected internal/external participants' internationalization-related texts[16].

To assess connections between plan/internal/external participants, I compared the discourse structures of the internal/external texts to the sampled plans. For example, the MD-EMP plan included the topic of global workforce development, and the MD-EMP plan

---

[14] When plan participants were not clearly stated, I identified indexical expressions (e.g., *our office, my classroom*).
[15] For example, a plan participant referenced the Institute of International Education (IIE) (IL-SP). In this case, I coded IIE as an external participant.
[16] These texts included internal/external organization descriptions, programming efforts, policy briefs, and position statements. I list these texts in Chapter Four, Tables 13 and 14.

participants referenced AACC and the college's global education institute. Therefore, I compared the discourse of global workforce development in the MD-EMP plan, the global education website, and AACC's global education policy brief. Based on these comparisons, I drew conclusions about participants' roles in the discourse.

Table 6

The Social Component

Social Structures	Analytic Components	Artifacts

• Internal/External social groups that control discourses or are controlled through discourses
• Group power: material power resources (e.g., capital) and symbolic power resources (e.g., knowledge, status, access to public discourse)
	• Discourse participants
	  ○ Plan (e.g., administrators, faculty, committees)
	  ○ Internal/External (e.g., students, faculty, administrators, accreditation agencies, business industry, state policy makers)
	• Interactions between internal/external participants
	• References to internal/external participants
	• Comparison of internal/external and plan discourse structures
		• Discourse chains revealing control of or resistance to dominant discourses

Note. This table shows the analytic elements of the social component of SCA.

The Cognitive Component

Most CDA approaches include an analysis of social and discourse structures (van Dijk, 2016; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). The sociocognitive approach is unique, however, because it incorporates a cognitive analysis, stemming from the field of cognitive linguistics[17]. The

---

[17] SCA is especially useful in this study because I interpret the analysis of cognition as an analysis of logic.

cognitive component addresses the importance of mind, memory, and cognitive processes in

relation to discourse production and interpretation. The cognitive component maintains two

broad assumptions. One, socially shared cognition, such as logic, exists at the macrolevel (Table

7). Two, at the individual level/microlevel, we have our own every day cognitive experiences

(beliefs/values/actions) which manifest in our everyday communicative interactions (Table 7).

The everyday beliefs/values/actions often resemble larger socially logic[18] [19].

Table 7

The Cognitive Component

Cognitive Structures	Analytic Components	Artifacts
Micro-cognition: Beliefs/values/actions (i.e., individual cognition in everyday interactions)	Discourse structures: • word order • meanings of words • coherence • opinion • themes • speech acts • ideology polarization • indexical relations • evidentials	• Time • Place • Discourse participants: identity, role, relationship • Objectives: actions (interactions, events, norms, emotions, polarization) • Purpose: goals (plans, opinions, beliefs, values)
Macro-cognition: Shared knowledge/belief/ideology (i.e., logic)	• Topics/Concepts/Schema of everyday beliefs/values/actions • Generalization of everyday discourse, action, knowledge expressed through discourse (e.g., policy by powerful social groups)	• Schematic organization of identity, actions, goals, relations • Shared norms, beliefs, attitudes- negative/positive, domination, competition, cooperation

Note. This table shows the analytic elements of the cognitive component of SCA.

---

[18] SCA uses unique terminology for to the cognitive component (e.g., mental representations, long-/short-term mental models, ideology, shared knowledge). For reader accessibility, I use *beliefs/values/actions* instead of *mental representation*. I use the term *logic* to account for macro-level cognition (e.g., ideology or shared knowledge).
[19] For further reading on SCA, I suggest van Dijk (1996; 2004, 2006; 2009, 2016).

Lastly, because I am interested in neoliberalism and democracy in CC internationalization discourse(s), I maintained an analytic lens of neoliberal and democratic logic when examining data (see codebook, Appendix D). In Table 8, I provide examples of data that I coded using neoliberal and democratic logic.

Table 8

Representations of Neoliberal and Democratic Logic by SCA Component

SCA Component	Example of Democratic Beliefs/Values/Actions	Example of Neoliberal Beliefs/Values/Actions
Discourse Component	"Justice-oriented internationalization is critically self-reflective. It cultivates internationalization that is anti-colonial, anti-racist, and globally and locally inclusive." (Code: emancipation)	"The 21st century's global economy will value transnational leadership skills, fluency in multiple languages, and respect for and understanding of other cultures." (Code: market governance)
Social Component	An internationalization plan developed by faculty aimed at building community with local diaspora community (Codes: community)	A reference to the American Association of Community Colleges' (AACC) policy statement that global education is fundamentally a national economic development endeavor (Code: competition)
Cognitive Component (Micro and Macro)	The practice of publicizing internationalization plans (Code: opportunity) The belief that internationalization should increase access for underrepresented students (Code: opportunity)	The use of numeric measures of success and accountability (e.g., increasing number of programs, students, etc.) (Code: production) The belief that internationalization develops a competitive global workforce for business industry and national economic prosperity (Code: competition)

Note. This table illustrates coded representations of democratic and neoliberal logic by each SCA component.

Next, I briefly discuss my process of data analysis.

Iterations of Data Analysis

To manage this multi-faceted analytic approach, I used MAXQDA software to store, organize, and code my data. MAXQDA is a "software program designed for computer-assisted qualitative and mixed methods data, text and multimedia analysis" (VERBI Software, 2019, para. 1). Using MAXQDA, I used my neoliberal/democratic logic codebook (Appendix D) to code discourse, social, and cognitive structures. I also used analytic memos extensively throughout each iteration of analysis. My process for examining the 11 plans included six iterations of analysis. First, I familiarized myself with the 11 sampled plans. I printed and read each plan in its entirety, taking notes on initial impressions of the text. I then uploaded a pdf of each document into MAXQDA. Second, I spent roughly one week analyzing and coding each plan separately, following the tenents of SCA (see Tables 5, 6, and 7). This included documenting references to internal/external participants. In the third iteration of analysis, I collected and analyzed internationalization-related texts[20] from the referenced internal/external participants. Using MAXQDA, I uploaded the internal/external texts and coded each using the tenents of SCA. In the fourth iteration, I read through my analytic memos and compared the discursive, social, and cognitive structures of the internationalization plans and internal/external texts. Fifth, I read through each internationalization plan again, repeating the SCA analysis. During this iteration, I wanted to ensure I had not missed important talk and text from the previous analyses. Finally, in the last iteration of analysis, I began writing out my findings,

---

[20] Internal documents included CC international/global education center and program descriptions from colleges' websites. External participant documents included organization/program descriptions, policy briefs, and position statements from organizations such as the Institute for International Education (IIE), the CC International Development organization (CCID), and the American Council on Education (ACE). See Tables 13 and 14 in Chapter Four for a list of internal/external documents.

which required processing and confirming findings. In this iteration, I regularly engaged with my analytic memos, original data sources, and existing literature to substantiate my findings.

Study Boundaries

This study is bounded in several ways. First, I selected a sample population of institutional plans based on common internationalization words (Childress, 2009; Unangst & Barone, 2019). That is, I did not code plans to determine a set of words for sampling the population. Furthermore, I did not select or analyze plans based on the five internationalization approaches discussed in Chapter Two (i.e., the outcomes, activities, comprehensive, local, and process approaches). Second, I did not analyze scholarly research on CC internationalization, which likely informs policy and practice. Third, I did not conduct interviews with discourse participants. All analyses were based on discourse produced in publicly available texts. Fourth, although an analysis of institutional plans should have implications for practice, this study did not attempt to correlate internationalization plan discourse to actual international/global education practices taking place. Lastly, I examined current institutional planning documents and did not examine changes in discourse over time.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness is the credibility and soundness of qualitative research. To ensure trustworthiness, qualitative researchers follow a deliberate, transparent, and ethical process, which adheres to the "norms of practice determined by a relevant professional community" (Rossman & Rallis, 2018. P. 51). Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a rigorous and challenging methodology that requires in-depth knowledge and precision from the researcher. At its foundation, CDA seeks to emancipate and advance change through the examination of discourse and the way discourses function toward uneven power relations. However, findings are not

generalizable. Instead, findings should resonate with or transfer to the reader. To do this work, CDA researchers must be methodical in their scientific research as they set goals, utilize and construct theory, employ methods that strengthen trustworthiness, and apply research to social and political problems (Van Dijk, 2009). CDA researchers are also self-reflective and explicit in their research process (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 3). Thus, the role of the researcher, who is a partial subject, is quite important to the trustworthiness of the study. My goal, as I discuss further in my trustworthiness statement, was to meet these high standards. Next, I outline several strategies I used to enhance the trustworthiness of this study.

CDA Strategies for Enhancing Trustworthiness

CDA researchers can enhance the trustworthiness of their research by using multiple strategies, such as a variety of analytic techniques, rich description, audit trail, and debriefing. As demonstrated in the methods section, CDA uses multiple forms of rigorous analysis across several stages. In addition, CDA methods focus on "capturing' through rich descriptions rather than measuring or "operationalizing" logics (Real & Jones, 2016, p. 442). In my data analysis, I aimed to provide rich or thick descriptions of data, which included multiple and lengthy excerpts from internationalization plans. To ensure trustworthiness, CDA also requires a thorough audit trail of practice as ideological discursive representations must be re-traceable. In this study, I used detailed note taking of my codes and processes. As for analyzing institutional plans, I uploaded each data source and manually code for patterns, using MAXQD software and documenting all steps in analytic memos. Lastly, to enhance trustworthiness, debriefing and engaging in sustained discussion with colleagues over ideas, questions, and data findings is important (Rossman & Rallis, 2016). Throughout this process, I discussed my work with trusted colleagues in my PhD program.

Researcher Positionality

A CDA researcher should consider their research paradigm and positionality as a way to enhance the trustworthiness of a study, especially given their partial role in this type of research. I often adhere to a critical theorist research paradigm. Aligned with CDA is the critical theorist research paradigm which assumes discourse and power are intertwined (Sipe & Constable 1996). CDA sets out to examine power enmeshed in discourse and offer alternative forms of discourse that are just. For critical theorists, examining, understanding, and/or changing power relations that limit freedom, democracy, and human rights is also important (Glesne, 2016). By using a critical theory paradigm, I am upholding beliefs that "reality is subjective and constituted on the basis of issues of power," and that discourse has political and rhetorical purposes (Sipe & Constable, 1996, p. 155). I also believe there are inherent social wrongs within power dynamics, and these social wrongs are advanced and broken down through discourse (Fairclough, 2009)[21]. Because I value social justice in education, investigating and illuminating social inequities existing within and advanced by our public institutions of education is important.

My beliefs and values shape several biases in this study. To begin, I hold to the belief that neoliberalism may limit freedom, democracy, and human rights. Indeed, scholars across disciplines have studied the harmful effects of neoliberal logic including the disempowerment and dispossession of various marginalized communities by powerful, private, and individual entities (e.g., Ayers, 2005; Baber, et al., 2019; Bratanova, et al., 2016; Cox & Sallee, 2018; Day, 2016; George, 1999; Gonzales & Ayers, 2018; Jiang & Probst, 2017; Levin & López-Damián

---

[21] Fairclough (2009) describes a social wrong "as aspects of a social system, forms, or orders which are detrimental to human well-being" (p.167). Here, it is important to note that the examination of social wrongs includes moral judgment, which can be problematic. Our affective responses often drive our moral reasoning (Stanley, Dougherty, Yan, Henne, & De Brigard, 2018). According to Stanley, et al., (2018), people making moral judgments are often evaluating reasoning that in fact affirms their affective reaction. This dynamic can limit individuals' abilities to revise and challenge their own thinking (Stanley, et al., 2018). Certainly, I am aware that my bias and motivation to critique neoliberalism limits the objectivity of my evaluation.

2018; Osei-Kofi, et al., 2010; Sethares, 2020). In this study, I am especially interested in the harmful effects of neoliberalism, and I do not attempt to understand or reason its potential benefits. That said, I also take the position that economic power and well-being for marginalized communities is important. For example, students should have the opportunity to gain knowledge and skills that empower them to engage in fruitful work that uplifts themselves, their families, and communities. Thus, I am more focused on where and how neoliberal ideology potentially excludes, others, or disempowers people from such opportunities. Lastly, I also hold the belief that democratic logic can advance empowerment, opportunity, emancipation, and community in our everyday practices. In this study, I lean into a bias that the democratic mission of community colleges is a pursuit worth prioritizing and advancing. Nonetheless, I am cognizant of the idealistic nature of democratic logic and the fact that democracy has been dependent on "structures of colonial and racial dispossession" (Baker, 2017, p. 145). Given I engage critical theory as my epistemology, I am sensitive to the potential social wrongs perpetuated by democratic logic as well. Overall, the bias toward democratic and neoliberal shaped how I approached this study. For example, the scholarship I used to inform my literature review and theoretical framework largely critiqued neoliberal logic. I also viewed neoliberalism and democracy as opposing logics in tension with one another and this shaped how I developed my codebook. However, as my findings will show, these logics are often intertwined. In my interpretation of these findings, I consider the neoliberalization of democratic aims which is also shaped by my critical perspective.

These beliefs and values contrast with parts of my identity and my own international experience. I come from a privileged background, and I have experienced multiple international education opportunities. I am a White woman from a middle/working-class family. I attended a

prestigious public university for my undergraduate degree—where I had my first education abroad experience. I have worked, lived, and studied in multiple countries. My first language is English, which is the only language I use fluently. These privileges have afforded me relatively unchallenged access to the world. Therefore, I was cognizant and vigilant of the power my privilege affords me and the danger it poses in clouding my analysis of the logics manifest in internationalization planning discourse.

Despite these aspects of my identity and experience, my professional experience is rooted in international education—serving international and immigrant students in their English language development. For 10 years I taught English as a Second Language (ESL) and administered ESL programming in postsecondary education. Within this experience, I taught as a part-time adjunct faculty at a CC. I was inspired by the stories of my students. I had a student from Venezuela who was distraught by the political system in her country. She vowed to go back to make change. The mother from Yemen wanted to learn English so that she could advocate for her children. The grandfather from Iraq was determined to return to his profession as a dentist—despite a long road ahead of training and certification. Because of these students, I was inspired to study the social purpose of CCs and global/international education. Lastly, for four years, I served as a research assistant in an HEI executive administration office. In this experience, I observed actions and decision-making processes of institutional leadership. This experience paired with my CC teaching experience, my work in international education, and the values I hold about the purpose of education, influenced how I approached this study and interpreted my data. Therefore, I remained open and reflective about how my values and biases shaped my analysis and presentation of data.

Conclusion

This study applies a critical discourse analysis of institutional plans to understand how democratic and neoliberal logic shape CC internationalization. Using publicly available information from international/higher education organizations, I discerned a population of CCs likely engaged in internationalization. While the study uses several CDA techniques to enhance trustworthiness, there remain several limitations, particularly in the methods of data collection. Furthermore, I bound this study in several ways. For example, this study largely took a theoretical and conceptual approach to the study of CC internationalization.

CHAPTER FOUR: CONTEXT

The purpose of this study was to examine internationalization plans for democratic and neoliberal discourse and the underlying logics. In addition, I aimed to identify discourse participant roles and who was being othered and excluded. As a reminder, I define internationalization as the integration of GII into the purpose, functions, or delivery of CC education to meet local needs influenced by global forces (Copeland et al., 2017; Knight, 2004). In this study, I used institutional plans as the primary source of internationalization communication. Institutional plans are useful texts because they demonstrate conceptual understanding and articulated commitments to internationalization at practice, institution, and external levels. They also delineate ways in which stakeholders attempt to achieve or meet their internationalization goals. To examine the themes, logics, and participants of internationalization discourse, I used the sociocognitive approach to CDA (van Dijk, 1983; 2004; 2009; 2016), which includes three integrated analytic components: discourse, society, and cognition.

SCA considers the interface of discourse structures, society and cognition as way to explain how discourses and logics perpetuate social wrong doings (Fairclough, 2009). Certain contextual elements can help an SCA researcher make sense of this interface. During my analysis, I compiled data related to the participants, actions of the text, timing, and place[22]. All of these elements provided important context for identifying and interpreting the shared logics that perpetuates social wrongdoings through discourse (Fairclough, 2009).

Discourse Participants

As part of the social component of SCA, researchers identify discourse participants and their roles. Doing so illuminates participants controlling, excluded, and absent in the discourse.

---

[22] van Dijk (2016) suggests assessing timing, place, and action of talk and text.

First, I list and describe plan participants. Then, I list the internal and external participants[23]. Of

the internal/external groups, participants were primarily external international education

organizations (e.g., IIE, CCID), CC districts, and state government.

Plan Participants

Plan participants were similar across the various plan types—with some exceptions. I

begin by listing and describing plan participants (Table 9). As Table 9 shows, plan participants

included committees with institutional effectiveness administrators, deans, faculty, staff, and

global/international education faculty and staff representatives. In addition, most plans had

messages from college presidents. As for the INT* plans, discourse participants were primarily

staff and/or faculty from global/international programs and academic units. Overall, plan

participants were mostly administrators and staff.

Table 9

Discourse Participants by Plan Type

Plan Discourse Participants
• Committee (chair-institutional effectiveness; global office representation)
• DEI Councils
• College president
• Student Service Program Staff (e.g., International Student Office; Global Initiative Office)
• Academic Departments and Divisions (Deans and Faculty)
• Faculty-administrators of programs
• Faculty
• Academic Departments and Divisions

Note. This table shows discourse participants in internationalization plans.

---

[23] For this study, I distinguished the various internal (e.g., International/Global office) and external (e.g., accreditors) participants in each planning document (Tables 10 and 11) by identifying references to these groups.

Internal Participants

Plan participants referenced campus offices/centers when communicating

internationalization efforts. As Table 10 shows, these internal communicative interactions were

with academic departments, institutional effectiveness/planning offices, global/international

programs and services, and workforce development centers. Of these internal references, the

most prominent was international/global offices and service centers.

Table 10

Internal Discourse Participants

Referenced Internal Groups with Internationalization Topics	Internal Participants	Internal Data Source
Administration of Justice	Academic Departments-Faculty	Department Plans
American Indian Studies		
Anthropology		
Art		
Aviation		
Automotive Technology		
Biology		
Black Studies		
Business		
Career & Technical Education Division		
Communications		
Conflict Resolution & Mediation		
Dance		
Economics		
English as a Second Language		
English Language & Literature		
Geography		
Heating & Cooling		
History		
Hospitality		
Humanities		
Liberal Arts		
Mortuary Science		
Peace Studies		
Political Science		
Sociology		
Sustainable Energy		
World/Foreign Languages		

Table 10 (cont'd)

Office of Institutional Planning & Effectiveness	Institutional Effectiveness Administrators	About us statements and international-related policy on office website
Global Humanities Institute World Languages-International Experience Center	International/ global faculty leaders	About us statements and international-related policy on office website
Global Initiatives Office International Student Programs and Service Offices International Education & Development Office Study Abroad Office World Cultures Program	International/Global Education Staff	About us statements and international-related policy on office website
Innovation Center Project HigherEd	Workforce Development Staff	Program description on website

Note. This table shows internal discourse participants and the name of the internal data source.

External Participants

Interestingly, the number of references to external groups exceeded the number of internal references. In addition, the variety in external participants was greater. For example, external participants ranged from local community to international education membership associations to state government. The greatest number of external references was to international education membership organizations (e.g., IIE, CCID), state government, state international education consortiums, and CC districts (Table 11).

Table 11

External Discourse Participants

Referenced External Social Groups	External Participant	External Data Source
College Districts	• San Diego CC District • North Orange County CC District	• SDCCD Plan • NOCCCD Plan
State Education Systems	• State University of New York (SUNY)	• SUNY Diversity Plan • SUNY Global Initiatives Office
	• California CC System (CCCS)	• CCCS strategic plan/website
	• Minnesota State Colleges and Universities organization	• Strategic Framework • Transfer Goals
Higher Education Industry	• Accreditors (Higher Learning Commission (HLC) • Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)	• Accreditation standards
	• American Council on Education (ACE)	• Internationalization/ Global Education program descriptions and policy briefs
	• American Association of CCs (AACC)	• Internationalization/Global Education program descriptions and policy briefs • Empowering CCs, Implementation Guide
	• American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU)	• Internationalization/ Global Education program descriptions and policy briefs
International Education Regional Consortiums	• Foothills Study Abroad Consortium • California Consortium for International Education • Illinois Consortium of International Studies and Programs	• About Us Statements (purpose/mission/ vision/initiatives) • Internationalization/Global Education program descriptions and policy briefs

Table 11 (cont'd)

International Education Non-Profit Membership Organization	• **Institute for International Education (IIE)** • **NAFSA: Association of International Educators** • **CC for International Development (CCID)** • **Association of International Education Administrators**	• **About Us Statements (purpose/mission/ vision/initiatives)** • **Internationalization/Global Education program descriptions and policy briefs** • **Award Competition Descriptions**
International Education Corporations	• Bridge USA • EDU USA • STUDY in the USA	• About Us Statements (purpose/mission/vision/initiatives)
Local Community	• Local diaspora community • Historically marginalized local community members • Underrepresented community members	• No direct reference to a source
Business Industry*	• Industry/ Industry Partners • Labor market	• No direct reference to a source
State Government	• California •	• Department of Education budget and policy
	• Illinois	• State budget
	• New York	• Gubernatorial higher education policy statement
Federal Programs	• Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs (ECA) • International and Foreign Language Education (IFLE), Department of Postsecondary Education	• About Us Statements (purpose/mission/vision/initiatives) • Internationalization/Global Education program descriptions and policy briefs
World Organization	• United Nations	• International policy article

Note. This table shows the external discourse participants and the name of the external data source.

Overall, internationalization plans included a variety of plan, internal, and external participants. Plan participants were administrators, staff, and faculty responsible for institutional

planning, leadership, and internationalization. Of these groups, administrators were the primary discourse participants. Administrator discourse included topics of environmental scanning, policy and regulations, budget and finance, enrollment management, and institutional-student success indicators. Another dominant category of discourse participants was staff in global/international education offices. Discourse topics included descriptions of GII education services and practices. Furthermore, in the institutional plans, participants referenced internal and external actors (or discourse participants). Internal participants were primarily international/global education center staff. External participants were primarily international education organizations, higher education organizations, college districts, and state government. In Chapter Six, I discuss the roles and alignment of discourse across these various participants. In the next section, I describe the objectives of these various plans.

Actions in Internationalization Plans

Assessing the action of texts provides useful context for interpreting the interface between discourse, participants, and logics (van Dijk, 2016). As I collected data, I considered questions such as "what is the text meant to do?" To identify such actions in the EMPs, SP, and DEI plans, I examined the whole documents as well as their internationalization sections. Table 12 lists each type of plan and its action(s). Overall, text actions varied across and within each plan type. Therefore, I present the plan actions according to plan type.

Table 12

Action by Plan Type

Type of Plan	Action of Whole Document	Action of Internationalization Section
Educational Master Plan (EMP)	• Serve as a road map for long-range planning • Inform other college planning documents	• Communicate globally oriented mission/vision/values • Present globalization factors to which the institution responds • Present GII oriented institutional learning goals • Present GII oriented institutional strategies • Present GII oriented practices • Present GII oriented rationales for department support • Present GII oriented pedagogy
Strategic Plan (SP)	• Serve as a road map for long-range planning • Operationalize goals	• Present globalization factors to which the institution responds • Present GII oriented practices • Present GII oriented institutional strategies
Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (DEI)	• Establish an infrastructure • Operationalize diversity goals • Connect to university-system DEI goals • Serve as agent for change	• Explain how GII is an element of diversity • Explain how GII diversity is not a substitute for local diversity • Explain how GII supports the success of local students and community • Present GII oriented goals to expand global representation and global awareness • Present GII oriented strategies to increase representation and learning opportunities
Internationalization* Plan (INT*)	• Establish/communicate international/global education infrastructure • Define campus internationalization goals and outcomes • Highlight current practice • Operationalize internationalization goals • Inform and generate buy-in with faculty, students, and administrators • Serve as a model for CC internationalization	• NA

Note. This table lists the actions of internationalization plans according to plan type.

EMPs and SP

In general, the EMPs and SP included similar actions. For the EMPs and SP, the stated action

was to serve as a "roadmap" for institutional actors, including faculty and staff, by informing and

supporting unit/department-level strategic planning. Some EMPs also stated the document served

to maintain continuous accreditation. In addition, the internationalization sections communicated

ways the institution could respond to globalization factors and achieve institutional effectiveness.

In addition, only the EMPs and SP integrated and/or aligned GII elements into institutional

mission/vision/value/goal statements (Table 13). Only four plans integrated GII elements into

their college mission and/or values statements, and six plans integrated GII elements into their

institutional goals statements. Of these colleges, only three aligned GII elements across their

mission, values, and/or institutional goals statements. Surprisingly, the colleges with DEI and

INT* plans did not integrate/align GII elements into their institutional mission/vision/values/goal

statements. Lastly, another action specific to the EMPs was the integration of GII elements into

department curriculum plans.

Table 13

Plans with GII Integration and Institutional Alignment

GII Integration and Alignment of Institutional Strategic Statements		
Place of GII Integration	**Percentage of Integration in Sample**	**Type of Plans with GII Integration**
Integration into Mission, Vision, and/or Values Statements	4/11 (36%)	EMPs
Integration into Institutional Goals	6/11 (55%)	EMPs, SP
Alignment across Statements and Goals	3/11 (27%)	EMPs

Note. This table shows then number of plans with GII integration and/or institutional alignment.

DEI Plans

The two DEI plans included similar actions including establishing a DEI infrastructure,

operationalizing diversity goals, and serving as an agent for change. In addition, the

internationalization sections compared diversity with GII—stating GII was an element of

diversity but not its substitute; GII education would support local, underrepresented student development while also increasing representation and engagement of international students.

INT* Plans

Although the actions of the INT* plans differed in several ways, both plans were all about internationalization and the work of the respective units leading the effort. To begin, both INT* plans presented an infrastructure for internationalization. The WA-INT* plan was a strategic "roadmap" for operationalizing campus-wide internationalization—focused on goal setting, strategy, and assessment. In addition, the WA-INT* plan emphasized actions such as generating resources for and management of internationalization efforts. In contrast, the MN-INT* plan described the existing infrastructure for internationalization showcasing a local purpose. Another action of both INT* plans was to inform stakeholders about the college's internationalization efforts and generate buy-in from stakeholders. For example, WA-INT* included a letter from the director that "invited" website visitors to read the plan. MN-INT* included a video message, alongside its plan, from staff, faculty, and the college president about the importance of internationalization. Lastly, both INT* plans mentioned the intent to serve as a model for CC internationalization.

Overall, the actions of these various plans differed. For example, the INT* and DEI plans were about communicating an infrastructure of goals, strategies, and outcomes and an operational plan. Even though the EMPs and SP had strategic goal and initiative content, the main action was to serve as a road map for planning and rationalize certain strategic directions.

<div align="center">

Timing of Internationalization Plans

</div>

In my analysis, I took note of the timing of each plan and possible alignment between timing, discourse, and logics. Overall, similarities in timing were evident across the various plan

types[24]. To begin, it seemed the CC internationalization plans aligned with important events around federal immigration policy and accreditation timelines. For example, the plans in this study were developed during the Trump presidency, and plan participants noted the impact of Trump's anti-immigration policy (Redden, 2017 & 2020) on internationalization efforts. Two excerpts below highlight this:

- Other major challenges facing higher education leaders across the country include the following higher education agendas: Adapt to a reduction in state and federal funding coupled with increases in unfunded mandates from government agencies, *especially those related to immigration, undocumented students, and international students* [emphasis added] (CA-EMP-3, Environmental Scan, 2018).

- The International Students program (ISP) has provided services to an increasing number of students in recent years. This rise in the number of F-1 visa students attending the College is against *a backdrop of a larger national debate about immigration. Federal policies and international political and economic incidents have a profound impact on the College's work related to compliance, oversight, and provision of appropriate services to international students* [emphasis added] (CA-EMP-3, ISP Section, 2018)

Although these observations seem to fall outside the parameters of my theoretical framework—aligning more closely with nationalist/populist logic—the context of timing highlights the alignment of internationalization planning and federal immigration policy.

The timing of the plans also aligned with accreditation processes. Most plans were in effect for a five-to-ten-year period and nearly all plans (90%) aligned with the institution's

---

[24] Due to the similarities in timing, I present this section as summary of the plans rather than by individual plan types—as I did in the previous section.

accreditation timeline. In other words, colleges likely produced these plans as part of their accreditation planning and implementation. For example, CA-EMP-1 aligned with the school's re-accreditation process. Similarly, in CA-EMP-5's introductory section, discourse participants noted "one foundation this plan is built upon is the essential element of the continuous accreditation ...." As a strategic objective, IL-SP discourse participants aimed to "exceed the accreditation requirements of the Higher Learning Commission and the other program specific accreditations and certifications." As illustrated in the examples above, the observation of accreditation timing was not explicitly connected to the plans' internationalization efforts. However, discourse participants' interests and attitudes toward internationalization, as expressed in these plans, could be geared toward receiving/maintaining accreditation. Next, I share context related to the place.

<div align="center">**Place of Internationalization Plans**</div>

Another contextual element of the social, discursive, and cognitive interface is place (van Dijk, 2016). Colleges (and their text participants) situated internationalization plans in different and multiple places. The majority of plans were located on the colleges' institutional planning and effectiveness webpages. These plans were largely the EMPs and the SP. The DEI plans were located on the respective colleges' diversity office webpages. Interestingly, the two INT* plans were quite different in "place," revealing possible differences in internationalization attitudes and norms/approaches. The MN-INT* plan was created by faculty and staff in a World Languages department and was accessible on the department webpage. On the other hand, the WA-INT* plan was an initiative led by a central office for global/international education and was accessible on the center's homepage. Overall, the "location" of the sampled plans was in centralized and administrative offices. Lastly, the texts used in this study were publicly available on college

websites. These plans did not limit access through institutional credential requirements, nor did they merely reference a planning document title. Each of the colleges made these plans easily accessible to internal and external stakeholders. Nonetheless, publicly available plans may be a requirement or best practice of accreditation agencies, or it may be an accountability effort geared toward the colleges' external stakeholders (e.g., state/federal government, business industry, or community members). With the context of plan participants, actions, timing, and place, I next present my findings.

CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to examine internationalization plans for democratic and neoliberal discourses and their underlying logics. In addition, I aimed to identify discourse participant roles and who was being othered and excluded in the discourse. As a reminder, I define internationalization as the integration of global/intercultural/international (GII) dimensions into the purpose, functions, or delivery of CC education to meet local needs influenced by global forces (Copeland et al., 2017; Knight, 2004). To examine the participants and logics of internationalization discourse, I used the sociocognitive approach to CDA (van Dijk, 1983; 2004; 2009; 2016), which includes three integrated analytic components: discourse, society, and cognition.

In this chapter, I answer the research questions guiding this study. In the first section, I present findings for the first set of research questions:

1. What are the democratic and neoliberal discourse themes in CC internationalization plans and related discourse?

   a. What democratic and neoliberal logics underly these themes?

   b. How do plan, internal, and external discourse participants advance these themes?

In the second section of this chapter, I present findings for the second set of research questions.

2. Who is excluded and who is othered in CC internationalization discourse?

Through a critical discourse analysis using the sociocognitive approach (SCA), I identified democratic and neoliberal discourse themes in CC internationalization. I also identified the salient logics underlying these discourses and the roles of the external, plan, and internal discourse participants. In this section, I first present the democratic discourse themes: *expanding*

access to global education and *preparing students for global citizenship*. These themes were shaped largely by democratic logics and were evident across external, plan, and internal texts. Then, I present the neoliberal discourse theme: *leveraging internationalization for institutional effectiveness*—a discourse shaped predominantly by neoliberal logics. Each group of participants played a similar role in the different discourse themes.

<div align="center">

Democratic Discourse Themes

</div>

Theme One: Expanding Access to Global Education

Expanding access to global education was a prominent democratic discourse theme in CC internationalization. Shaped by logics of opportunity and community, this theme emphasized expanding study abroad and internationalizing curriculum for local, underrepresented students. This theme spanned across different texts (e.g., internationalization plans, CC global education websites, and HEI policy briefs) and was produced by various discourse participants (e.g., CC plan participants, CC international education staff, and HEI organizations). In addition, each of the participant groups had a particular role in the discourse. I present these findings by participant group, starting with external participants.

Setting Expectations: External Participants

The analysis revealed external discourse participants' beliefs, values, and actions around expanding access in CC global education. To begin, external discourse participants seemed to believe college administrators were responsible for expanding access in global education (Appendix E). This was evident in the reoccurring usage of words such "institutional barriers" and "obstacles." In addition, external participants indicated a shared belief that the action of expanding access rests on the colleges. For example, external discourse participants often used

predicates[25] with college institutions as the subject. For instance, in CCID's vision statement, discourse participants wrote, "That all community, technical and vocational institutions integrate international perspectives and experiences into their curricula and campus culture in order to develop globally competent students, faculty, and staff" (CCID, n.d.). Similarly, IIE's Heiskell award noted recipients would be colleges that "remove institutional barriers and broaden the base of participation in international teaching and learning on campus" (IIE, n.d.a). Indeed, these external participants share some beliefs that the college/institution broadens the base, removes institutional barriers, integrates internationalization, and expands access (see Appendix E). That said, several of the external participants used language indicating their own responsibility in reducing barriers in global education. For example, a CC district international education committee and the Department of Education's IFLE program had their own mission and vision statements which aimed to "expand access" and "increase opportunity" (Appendix E). Overall, however, there seems to be a shared external belief that colleges should address access in CC global education.

Second, external participants seem to value access initiatives for "traditionally underrepresented" domestic students. For example, external discourse participants frequently used the adverbials "only" and "especially" paired with the noun phrases "all students," "traditionally underrepresented students," "diverse cross-sections of students and faculty," and "the base" (Appendix E). These noun phrases are reminiscent of discourses from internationalization literature that describes "underrepresented students" as domestic students diverse in income, race, ethnicity, age, and ability (de Wit & Jones, 2018; Engle, 2017).

---

[25] Verbs that refer to a subject.

therefore, external discourse participants likely believed access initiatives should be geared toward domestic students and not international students.

Finally, external discourse participants seemed to believe two actions could increase access: internationalizing the curriculum and addressing study abroad opportunities. To begin, the use of prepositional phrases indicated an external belief that internationalization efforts should be integrated *into* the curriculum (Appendix E). External discourse participants directed colleges to "broaden the base in teaching and learning;" "integrate. . . into their curricula;" "integrate internationalization into the curriculum; and "increase internationalization of curriculum". In addition, external discourse participants used recurring phrases such as obstacles "preventing study abroad" and "increase study abroad opportunities" revealing an understanding that barriers to study abroad exist for CC students and educators should expand opportunity (Appendix E).

Overall, external discourse participants set expectations that colleges were responsible for "expanding access" for local, underrepresented students—especially by increasing study abroad opportunity and internationalizing the curriculum. Here, democratic logics of opportunity (i.e., expanding access, reducing barriers) and empowerment (i.e., increasing underrepresented student participation) underly external participant discourse. Next, I present access-related findings from the CC internationalization plans.

Directing Operations: Plan Participants

Like external participants, plan participants seemed to believe expanding study abroad and internationalizing curriculum could increase access for underrepresented domestic students (Appendix F). However, in contrast to the external discourse, which was broad and contextual, plan participants articulated operational directives and specific outcome measurements. To

94

begin, most plan participants directed internal units to operationalize accessible global education for underrepresented students. For example, plan participants used imperative verb tenses and sentence structures (e.g., "identify and address barriers", "increase underrepresented student participation", "expand global partnerships") which indicated a directive, command, or request toward a second-person subject (you). In addition, in the EMPs, SP, and DEI plans, participants identified the internal unit or office responsible for executing the directive. For example, in the NY-DEI plan, "increasing the internationalization of curriculum" was the "responsibility" of the "Global Initiatives" office. In contrast, the INT* plan participants did not identify the responsible person or group in their directive statements. Therefore, the INT* plan directives were likely internal and directed at a lateral "us" or "we." Lastly, in all cases, directives focused on local and underrepresented students (e.g., "all of our students", "diverse students", "underrepresented minority students", "non-traditional groups").

In addition to directives, plans included outcome discourse (Appendix F). However, the specificity of the outcome varied based on plan type. In the EMPs, SP, and DEI plans, discourse participants used vague numerical outcomes. For example, AZ-DEI discourse participants aimed to design global experiences by increasing connections—measuring success by the number of connections, experiences, and participants (see Figure 1). Here, AZ-DEI discourse participants did not the specify quality of connections, experiences, or student participants.

Figure 1

Numeric Outcomes in CC Internationalization

Objective	Action	Unit(s) of measurement
Design multicultural, global learning and social justice experiences for students	Increase connections between PCC and appropriate community partners	Numbers of community connections, student experiences, student participants
Design multicultural and global learning experiences for faculty and staff	Increase connections between PCC and appropriate community partners	Number of community connections; number of faculty and staff experiences

Note. Figure 1 shows the vague and numeric outcomes matrix for AZ-DEI's internationalization strategy.

Furthermore, EMP, SP, and DEI plan participants often used noun phrases starting with an undefined adjective or noun (e.g., increased internationalization of curriculum, increased student participation, number of student participants). In contrast, outcomes in the INT* plans were tangible outputs (e.g., tool kit, inventory file, learning community) that could function as resources for faculty/staff. These differences in word choice reveal aspects of the discourse participants' beliefs, values, and knowledge. For example, EMP, SP, and DEI discourse participants may believe access is numeric and quantifiable—disconnected from a human element and the actual work of making internationalization more accessible. In contrast, the INT* plans' units of measurements functioned as resources for faculty, revealing discourse participants' knowledge of how to operationalize access and their value for supporting and involving faculty.

Overall, internationalization plan discourse participants used imperative and outcome statements to direct access-related internationalization efforts. Similar to the external discourses, democratic logics of opportunity (e.g., increase access) and empowerment (e.g., provide faculty

resources) were evident. Next, I present the discourse, logics, and roles of internal participants (e.g., CC global education website).

Action in Progress: Internal Participants

The imperative to make internationalization more accessible for underrepresented domestic students was evident in internal participant texts as well (Appendix G). However, unlike the external discourse, which was broad and contextual, and the plan discourse, which directed operations, the internal discourse participants specified action in progress. To begin, internal discourse participants promoted three types of actions that increase access for local students[26]: 1) affordable study abroad, 2) domestic study away, and 3) virtual global learning experiences. For example, internal discourse participants wrote on their websites: "Our programs are one of the most affordable options;" "exceptional global experiences for domestic students via our evolving study away offerings;" and "virtual exchange. . . offers an accessible, equitable, and sustainable alternative or supplement to global offerings" (see Appendix G for more examples). In addition, internal discourse participants from global/international offices operationalized internationalizing curriculum by "helping" and "providing" resources for faculty, such as "tool kits" and "resources for opening up conversations" in the classroom.

Overall, internal discourse participants communicated 'actions in progress' related to increasing access through curriculum and study abroad and supporting faculty development in these areas. Democratic logics of opportunity (e.g., accessible practices such as study away) and empowerment (e.g., faculty development/resources) underlie this internal discourse.

---

[26] Data is from the sampled CCs' international/global office websites.

Summary of External, Plan, and Internal Access Discourse

A dominant discourse theme in CC internationalization was *increasing access for global education* through expanding study abroad and internationalizing curriculum. External, plan, and internal discourse participants shared beliefs that increasing opportunities in study abroad and internationalizing curriculum were important access initiatives. Democratic logics of opportunity were most prominent in this discourse (118 coded instances, see Appendix H, Table H1). In addition, these access initiatives were particularly important for local underrepresented students. Here, democratic logics of community were evident (76 instances, see Appendix H, Table H1). In addition to serving local students, community logic was also evident in discourse participants' beliefs that internationalization efforts contribute to students' global awareness and ability the to empathize, respect, and embrace cultural diversity. Discourse participants also connected local internationalization to a global community—highlighting our interconnectedness and interdependence. Overall, democratic logics of opportunity and community were heavy across external, plan, and internal access discourse.

Despite similarities in logic across discourse participants, there were differences in how the external, plan, and internal discourse participants advanced this discourse. The external discourse participants set expectations that access for underrepresented students was an important issue and that colleges should work to reduce barriers. Plan participants issued directives and measurable targets for internal units and staff to increase study abroad opportunities and internalize curriculum. At the internal level, discourse participants promoted their operations aimed at increasing access, such as study away, virtual global classrooms, and faculty professional development. In addition to expanding access, *preparing*

students for global citizenship was a prominent discourse theme shaped by democratic logic.

Next, I present this theme, the salient democratic logics, and roles of discourse participants.

Theme Two: Preparing Students for Global Citizenship

Another democratic discourse in CC internationalization was around preparing students

to be global citizens. According to AZ-DEI, a global citizen is "someone who understands

interconnectedness, respects and values diversity, has the ability to challenge injustice, and takes

action in personally meaningful ways." In addition, the purpose of education for global

citizenship is to empower "students to understand and exercise their human rights in ways that

demonstrate solidarity with human beings everywhere and make a positive impact in the world"

(AZ-DEI). Similar beliefs/values/actions related to global citizenship, such as

"interconnectedness," "awareness," "respect," "action," "responsibility," and the ability to

"challenge" power and "injustice" in a global context, were evident across the external, plan, and

internal texts. In addition, each of the participant groups had a particular role in advancing this

discourse theme. I present these findings by participant group, starting with external participants.

Setting Expectations: External Participants

Global citizenship was a present but vague theme in the external texts (Appendix I). Like

in the previous theme, external discourse participants indicated colleges should prepare their

students for global citizenship. To begin, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC, 2020)

included a mission standard that required institutions provide opportunity for engagement in "a

globally connected world." Using sub-bullet points, discourse participants expressed that this

type of opportunity should prepare students for informed and engaged "citizenship" (HLC,

2020). Although the HLC does not use the term "global citizenship," the cohesive structure

reveals that these accreditation discourse participants shared some belief that citizenship can be

global and that institutions have a mission-centered responsibility to prepare students for this form of citizenship. Lastly, HLC discourse participants connected global civic engagement opportunities with workplace success through bullet point structure and the use of the conjunction "and." For example, as illustrated in Figure 2, "preparing students for informed citizenship and workplace success" is a supporting point to the standard of providing "civic engagement" opportunities in a "globally connected world" (HLC, 2020).

Figure 2

HLC Standard showing Global Citizenship Discourse

1.C. The institution provides opportunities for civic engagement in a diverse, multicultural society and globally connected world, as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

1. The institution encourages curricular or cocurricular activities that prepare students for informed citizenship and workplace success.
2. The institution's processes and activities demonstrate inclusive and equitable treatment of diverse populations.
3. The institution fosters a climate of respect among all students, faculty, staff and administrators from a range of diverse backgrounds, ideas and perspectives.

Note. Figure 2 shows HLC's Mission Criterion 1, Core Component 1.C. regarding global citizenship.

In addition to the HLC, discourse participants from the organization, Community Colleges for International Development (CCID), used their Mission, Vison, Values, and Impact Statements to express that member institutions had a responsibility to "facilitate global citizenship" (CCID, n.d.). CCID discourse participants went further and described what they hoped CC global citizens would do: "embrace all nationalities and cultures" (CCID, n.d.) Here, CCID discourse participants revealed the belief that CCs play a role in developing inclusive global citizens. In addition, like the HLC, CCID discourse participants connected global citizenship with work. As a subpoint of the CCID's About Us statement, discourse participants

stated their beliefs that *"global understanding, cultural competence, and engagement promote student success, business productivity, and healthier communities"* (CCID, n.d.). The bulleted structure indicates CCID discourse participants believed global citizenship included "global understanding, cultural competence, and engagement" which can result in "business productivity."

Overall, democratic logics of opportunity (e.g., create opportunity) and empowerment (e.g., skills of a global citizen) were present in the external organizations' global citizenship discourse. Unfortunately, the discourse lacks any emancipatory logic, such as the importance of challenging power structures or injustices. Thus, these external participants presented global citizenship as an uncritical knowledge and skill-based outcome for student and business success. Next, I present global citizenship discourse from the internationalization plan participants.

Guiding Outcomes through Goal Setting: Plan Participants

Global citizenship discourse was also evident in most of the internationalization plans' goal and purpose statements (Appendix J). These goal and purpose statements then guided the intended action of strategic initiatives or actions. Interestingly, the intention of global citizenship discourse varied across the plans—either as a knowledge or action outcome. For example, CA-EMP-1 discourse participants emphasized global citizenship as a form of knowledge. CA-EMP-1 included a global citizenship institutional learning goal targeting global understanding. This goal was followed by a guiding question for academic departments on how to "prepare students" to be "globally aware." This articulated goal and guiding question further controlled semantic representations of "global citizenship" as a knowledge initiative throughout the text—thus

building coherence[27] (van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983). Like CA-EMP-1, other colleges in the sample connected the topic of global citizenship to global understanding/awareness (Appendix J).

In contrast, other plan participants revealed beliefs that the goal of global citizenship was action oriented. For example, in goal and purpose statements, CA-EMP-5 discourse participants described global citizens as being active, engaged, and responsible in a global community. Similarly, AZ-DEI discourse participants described their purpose to build a community of global citizens who "respect diversity," "challenge injustice," and "take action." MN-INT* discourse participants described the goal of their internationalization efforts as developing global citizens who could "work with people from different cultural backgrounds" to "innovate and solve local and global problems." Indeed, language use, such as the predicate verbs *challenge injustice*, *solve problems, work with* indicate beliefs that students should be able to *act* as global citizens*.

Overall, plan participants' beliefs differed regarding the goal of preparing global citizens. In some cases, the goal of global citizenship was to develop students' global understanding/awareness. Other plan participants seemed to believe preparing students for global citizenship should be more action or ability focused, including developing engaged and responsible citizens for a global community, or teaching students how to solve problems in a global environment. Despite these differences, democratic logics of empowerment (e.g., developing skills and abilities) and community (e.g., empathy, respect) were prominent. Next, I present the global citizenship theme from the internal participants.

Specifying Student Outcomes: Internal Participants

Global citizenship discourse was also evident in internal texts. Whereas plan participants guided college/department goals around knowledge or action outcomes, internal discourse

---

[27] For example, discourse participants repeated ideas of preparing students to be global citizens with "*global understanding*" (e.g., *understand* global interconnections, global issues, and global responsibility).

participants specified qualities or specific outcomes of their global citizenship initiatives (Appendix K). The most notable similarity across internal texts was the connection between global citizenship and work. Word meaning, word order, and indexicals indicated some discourse participants believed global citizenship was valuable for work purposes. For example, in two cases, the adjectives "productive" and "employable" preceded "global citizens" (MN-INT* and NY-DEI). In another example, discourse participants wrote, "strategic partnerships advance student learning, as global citizens and as future members of a global workforce" (WA-INT*). Here, the use of the conjunction "and" and the prepositional phrase/indexical relation "of a" revealed a belief that the center's strategic partnerships should develop students as global citizens who are *also members* of a global workforce. Overall, it was evident that internal discourse participants shared some beliefs that global citizens are productive members of a global workforce, and that their units should develop such global citizens.

In contrast to the productive global citizen, discourse of a critical global citizen was evident. In two examples (Appendix K), internal discourse participants used adjectives and verbs to describe what "conscious and ethical" global citizens do (rather than what they are). One college described a "conscious" citizen with a global perspective as a person who engages and becomes culturally perceptive (CA-EMP-5). The other discourse participants described global citizenship as understanding abuses of power and injustices; the ability to critically examine global interdependencies; and the ability to examine and develop solutions (CA-EMP-1). Interestingly, both examples did not include references to employability or productivity.

Overall, internal participants provided more specific terms of how/why global citizenship would matter to students—either preparing them to be critically engaged or productive members of their global community. As such, democratic and neoliberal logics were evident in the internal

participants' global citizenship discourse. Logics of empowerment and emancipation underlie the discourses of the engaged critical, conscious, and ethical global citizen, whereas neoliberal logics are more prominent in the discourse of the productive and employable global citizen. Of these two internal global citizenship topics, it seems the "productive global citizen" is more prominent.

Summary of External, Plan, and Internal Global Citizenship Discourse

Preparing students for global citizenship was a prominent discourse theme in CC internationalization. External, plan, and internal discourse participants shared beliefs that global citizenship is an important student outcome for CCs, student development, and student employability. Democratic logics of empowerment (107 instances, see Appendix H, Table H2) and emancipation (28 instance) were heavy in this discourse (see Appendix H, Table H2). From this analysis, it seems CC internationalization discourse participants shared beliefs and values that internationalization efforts would lead to empowered students. For example, discourse participants emphasized the importance of student and faculty participation in global learning and developing students' skills and abilities to engage, thrive, and contribute to their local and global communities. In addition, some discourse participants shared beliefs that internationalization efforts could include critical approaches and develop critical, conscious, and justice-oriented students. For example, plan participants articulated internationalization efforts (e.g., goals and initiatives) that were human/student-centered rather than institution- or industry-centered. Internal participants articulated programmatic outcomes that aimed to prepare students to be critical, reflective, and action-oriented global citizens. Interestingly, internal participants' discourse was heavy with neoliberal logics of production with a prominent topic of developing "productive" or "employable" global citizens.

The roles of external, plan, and internal discourse participants varied. The external discourse participants set expectations that community colleges should develop students as global citizens—often for work purposes. Plan participants set institutional and department goals for global citizenship development—as a knowledge or skill-based outcome. At the internal level, discourse participants connected their practices to post-graduation contexts. That is, their global/international education practices would prepare students to be critical, problem solvers in a global community as well as productive and employable global citizens.

Expanding access and preparing global citizens were two discourse themes shaped by democratic logics of opportunity, community, empowerment, and emancipation. External, plan, and internal participants' roles varied. Overall, external participants set expectations for colleges to expand access and develop global citizens. Plan participants directed and guided internationalization efforts through purpose, goal, and strategy statements. Internal participants specified and connected student outcomes to post-graduation contexts. In the next section, I present the neoliberal discourse theme in CC internationalization, the salient neoliberal logics, and roles of discourse participants.

<div align="center">**Neoliberal Discourse Theme**</div>

Theme One: Leveraging Internationalization for Institutional Effectiveness

Internationalization discourse went beyond the democratic ideals of a global community and the commitment to developing global citizens. For many colleges, internationalizing also meant leveraging internationalization efforts for institutional effectiveness. This was the prominent neoliberal discourse theme in CC internationalization which expanded across different texts and discourse participants. Not surprisingly, each of the participant groups had a particular role in advancing the discourse theme. Overall, neoliberal logics of production, competition, and

commodification dominated this discourse. Next, I present these findings by participant group, starting with external participants.

Setting Expectations: External Participants

External participants set expectations that CCs should leverage internationalization efforts for institutional effectiveness by responding to external global forces, using internal resources, and being entrepreneurial (Appendix L). To begin, some external participants used verbs and adjectives indicating a belief that college leaders needed to anticipate and be responsive to global external factors. For example, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC, 2020) included an institutional effectiveness standard that required institutions "anticipate" external factors, such as "globalization, the economy, and state support." Discourse participants from the American Council on Education (ACE, 2020) associated internationalization with an institution's ability to be "agile" "in time of crisis." ACE discourse participants also advocated for the comprehensive approach to internationalization, which they stated aligns, integrates, and positions colleges as "globally oriented and internationally connected" (ACE, 2020). Discourse from these influential higher education organizations indicated a shared belief that internationalization is an institutional effectiveness strategy for responding to global factors.

External participants also connected internationalization to an opportunity to leverage resources and entrepreneurship. Some external participants were explicit and used the term "leverage," which indicated interests in maximizing resources. For example, in the Institute for International Education's (IIE, n.d.) purpose statement, discourse participants described their services as helping "people and organizations leverage the power of international education to thrive in today's interconnected world." Advocating for internationalization, ACE (2020) described data-driven internationalization as way for colleges and universities to "make sense of

106

actual strengths and barriers to learner and organizational success." The clause, "make sense of actual strengths," is similar in meaning to "maximize resources." In addition to leveraging internal resources, external discourse participants likely believed that internationalization could help colleges be more entrepreneurial, given their repeated use of the term "*entrepreneurial*[28]." For example, ACE described institutions using comprehensive internationalization as having the ability to "leverage current resources along with innovative, entrepreneurial thinking to explore creative solutions in time of crisis." Overall, from the sample of external texts, it seems discourse participants may share a belief that colleges experience "times of crisis" and must be able to respond to external factors to achieve institutional effectiveness. Internationalization is one way to leverage resources and be entrepreneurial.

Perhaps the most prominent topic in external participant discourse was responding to global workforce demands as part of institutional effectiveness; the most "active" participant of this topic was the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). In their global policy brief, AACC discourse participants introduced the topic of global education by stating:

> Our world and workplace are rapidly changing, becoming more diverse and globalized. For CC leaders and other decision makers, the importance of global education is an urgent need that is deeply rooted in economics—student employability, our ability to live and work successfully in diverse environments, and the prosperity of local communities. As the largest and most diverse sector of U.S. higher education, CCs are essential and uniquely situated to ensure America's future economic prosperity (AACC, 2020b).

---

[28] The external discourse participants (in this study) do not specify how institutions can be entrepreneurial; although the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) notes the necessity for CCs to develop institutional "*brokers for educational opportunity*."

In the second sentence, discourse participants connected the noun phrase "importance of global education" with the noun phrase "urgent need" in an independent clause. Then, they used the adjective phrase "that is deeply rooted in economics" to describe the idea of 'the importance of global education as an urgent need." In the third sentence, discourse participants described CCs as "essential" and "unique" in their opportunity (i.e., situation) to "ensure"/guarantee American "economic prosperity." Thus, from this example, we can see that these AACC discourse participants likely believed CCs/CC leaders have a unique position to advance U.S. economic prosperity through global education and that college leaders should understand global education as an urgent initiative. Interestingly, the external discourse participants start this chain of ideas with the premise of an ever more diverse and globalized world and workforce—indicating the urgent need is associated with global demographic and workforce changes.

In the AACC global education policy brief (AACC, 2020b), discourse participants developed the role of CCs further by stating CC's advanced society by "facilitate[ing] the free of forces necessary for economic development." Using predicates and prepositional phrases, AACC discourse participants advanced the idea that CCs are "facilitators" for "economic development." In addition, AACC discourse participants explained further that such facilitation and economic development is for global economic purposes. For example, participants stated, "foreign subsidiaries" are looking for "globally competent and competitive workers," and that CCs have a "crucial role to play" in "helping local communities attract foreign investment." Indeed, it seems AACC discourse participants share a belief that global education advances American wealth because CC global education prepares a pipeline of workers for the global economy and makes local workers/communities more attractive to foreign companies. As the AACC policy brief

notes, "CCs have a direct and immediate impact on ensuring American prosperity by preparing a future workforce that can live and work successfully in a global economy."

The topic of preparing a workforce *for* industry or the global economy is evident in other external groups as well. For example, the Community College International Development organization (CCID, n.d.) described its history as having helped "members further their internationalization initiatives and develop globally competent workers for the past 40 years." The use of the noun form "worker" indicates the individual functions/works *for* an entity (e.g., corporation). Furthermore, the U.S. Office of Post-Secondary Education's International and Foreign Education program (IFLE) stated its grants "contribute to developing a globally competent workforce…" (OPE, 2020). The noun form "workforce" represents the sum of workers or potential workers. The adjective phrase "globally competent" indicates IFLE discourse participants valued workers *for* the global economy.

At the state level, state organizations also connected the concepts of global education/learning with meeting workforce and industry needs. For example, the Minnesota State Colleges and University (MSCU) system has a transfer student learning goal of developing "global perspective" (MSCU, n.d.). In MSCU's strategic framework, discourse participants described the organization's "essential role in growing the Minnesota economy" and being "a partner of choice to meeting workforce and community needs." Given MSCU's strategic framework should align with its curricular goals, MSCU discourse participants likely shared some belief that developing students' global perspective meets workforce/industry needs and is important for growing the economy. Similarly, in the California Community College System's purpose statement for contract education, discourse participants described an aim to develop students who can compete in the global economy (i.e., "to prepare" students "to be competitive

with the workforce of other countries")—so to "propel" the state economy (CCC, n.d.). As illustrated in these excerpts, there seems to be a shared knowledge that CCs are responsible for developing students into a competitive global workforce for state and national economic growth.

Another topic evident in external participant discourse was around skills gaps and completion mandates. Discourse participants used word meanings related to increasing credentials for "in-demand jobs"—jobs that require "knowledge and skills" for the "global economy." For example, in the AACC implementation guide for "Empowering Community Colleges to Build the Nation's Future" (AACC, 2014), discourse participants recommended colleges "sharply focus career and technical education on preparing students with the knowledge and skills required for existing and future jobs in regional and global economies." The state of California also mandated CCs to "increase by at least 20 percent the number of California CC students annually who acquire associate degrees, credentials, certificates, or specific skill sets that prepare them for an in-demand job." Although not explicit, these examples indicate some CC education leaders valued increasing completion of credentials that prepare students for in-demand jobs for the global economy.

Overall, external discourse participants seem to share a belief that CCs should play an important role in developing an in-demand global workforce (a neoliberal logic of free-market governance and privatization of public goods). In addition, global education can function to meet these skills gaps/completion mandates for the global workforce. Neoliberal logics of production (e.g., skills gap mandate), competition (e.g., competitive global workforce), and privatization (e.g., facilitating the private industry's global workforce) are heavy in the external groups' institutional effectiveness discourse. Next, I present neoliberal discourse from the internationalization plan participants.

Directing and Rationalizing: Plan Participants

Leveraging internationalization for institutional effectiveness was a neoliberal discourse theme in the sampled plans as well (Appendix M). To begin, this theme included the topic of responding to decreasing state funding through global entrepreneurial efforts and international student enrollment. For example, WA-INT* included a strategic initiative to "pursue" external funding sources "to reduce dependency on state funding." MD-EMP also articulated a strategic initiative to "fund programs" by "expanding" global partnerships that would allow them to "export" their knowledge and "leverage" entrepreneurial efforts: "In light of shrinking state funding, we must be willing and able to export our knowledge and leverage entrepreneurial efforts to fund programs for our own students." For another college, an entrepreneurial effort was to "market" their study abroad programs as "value-added education" (IL-SP). Through these action-related verbs, it seems plan participants strategized market-driven actions in response to decreases in state funding.

Another subtle yet prominent topic was institutions' leveraging of international students for institutional effectiveness. Although research has documented CCs' strategic recruitment and enrollment of international students to generate revenues, this analysis reveals several nuances in the discourse. For example, plan participants associated international student enrollment with Fulltime Equivalency Status (FTES) reporting and state funding. In CA-EMP-1, the International Students Program description noted, "there is a clear financial incentive in hosting and enrolling international students at {CC}." In addition to using the noun phrase "financial incentive," plan participants described the strategic enrollment of international students as way to manipulate Fulltime Equivalent Student (FTES) numbers. For example, CA-EMP-1 participants stated, "due to the direct link between FTES and funding from the state, FTES trends are important to

111

examine and serve as a key indicator for college planning." Here, participants revealed "FTES trends" were "important" for "college planning." In addition, discourse participants noted, "increasing the… FTES number is…important…to obtain the necessary funding" (CA-EMP-1). Through the reoccurring use of the FTES topic, participants connected college planning with obtaining funding. Lastly, CA-EMP-1 participants noted, "[international students] are required by Federal law to enroll in a minimum of twelve units per semester in a credit program." Given "a minimum of twelve units per semester" meets the requirement of a Full-Time Equivalent Student (FTES), it seems CA-EMP-1 participants associated international student enrollment management with FTES management and state funding. Lastly, other colleges noted the FTES status of international students allowed for "innovative" institutional capacity building, such as in the expansion of residential halls (CA-EMP-2). From these excerpts, it seems plan participants may value international students as tools for generating revenues and manipulating FTES enrollment (a neoliberal logic of commodification).

Plan participants also communicated the topic of responding to completion mandates (Appendix M). In most cases, participants used this language in the plans' introductions, environmental scans, and goal and strategy statements. For example, CA-EMP-3 participants stated the completion agenda aimed to meet "current and projected workforce needs" and offered a "global comparison" for which the U.S. ranked rather low. In addition, they noted that the "state's urgency" to address the completion agenda had already "driven a number of initiatives" including "study abroad" programming. Similarly, MD-EMP participants referenced the need to "improve completion rates and align programs with workforce needs." To do this, they suggested initiatives to "expand global partnerships and international opportunities," such as "study

abroad." Thus, from these excerpts, it seems some plan participants associated "study abroad" with a "completion agenda" aimed at "workforce needs."

In addition to associating internationalization with a "completion agenda," other colleges used "skills gap" language when presenting internationalization efforts. In these examples, plan participants identified a skills gap in students' intercultural competencies. For example, AZ-DEI participants presented an "internationalization plan" which would "develop students' global awareness and sensitivity to cultural differences" and "align" with "workforce needs" (see Appendix M). Likewise, MN-INT* participants emphasized the importance of intercultural competency as a skill needed for work—however, they did not directly tie intercultural competency to a skills gap. Instead, MN-INT* participants aimed to develop "global ready" students who would have the "intercultural competence" to "work with people from different cultural backgrounds to innovate and solve local and global problems." These examples indicate a shared belief that intercultural competency is a skills gap; and internationalization efforts (such as expanding study abroad) could develop these skills, which not only meet industry demands but support student completion. Here, neoliberal logics of privatization (e.g., facilitating industry demands) and production (e.g., producing a skill set/increasing completion rates) underlie this internationalization discourse. Next, I present discourse, logics, and roles from the internal plan participants (e.g., a college's global office website).

Meeting External and Institution Expectations: Internal Participants

Neoliberal institutional effectiveness discourse was largely absent from internal participant texts. However, like the external and plan participants, some internal discourse participants connected practice to institutional success, generating resources/entrepreneurship, and meeting industry needs (Appendix N). For example, discourse participants at the global

initiatives center at WA-INT* stated the institution supported a comprehensive approach to internationalization that would have "campus wide significance" and situate the college as a regional source for international/global education. Here, the noun phrases "campus wide significance" and "regional source" indicate some interest in institutional effectiveness. The same college's "entrepreneurial efforts" included developing global strategic partnerships that would "generate revenues" and "institutional capacity building." The use of predicates "generate revenues" and "generate institutional capacity building" indicate some internal WA-INT* participants may believe the college can generate revenues and enhance institutional capacity by developing global partnerships. Lastly, participants from the MN-INT* international experience center described their international experience certificate as a way for students to communicate to employers that they "are ready to work." The use of the adjective "ready" conveys the idea of being suitable—i.e., suitable for industry needs. This intention is further substantiated in an MN-INT* college briefing where a college PR representative described the certificate as supporting the college's "ability to respond to the needs of the community and its industry partners." Again, neoliberal discourse was minimal in the internal groups. That said, the concepts of "meeting industry needs for global competency skills" and being "entrepreneurial" were present, indicating a belief in the importance of meeting external and institutional neoliberal expectations.

Summary of External, Plan, and Internal Institutional Effectiveness Discourse

From the discourse analysis, leveraging internationalization for institutional effectiveness was a prominent neoliberal discourse. External, plan, and internal participants shared beliefs that internationalization efforts were useful for responding to external forces such as globalization, state funding decreases, completion/skills gap mandates, and workforce/industry demands. Neoliberal logics were heaviest in this discourse as participants seemed especially concerned

114

with producing an interculturally competent workforce and advancing state and national capacity to compete in the global economy. Although all five neoliberal logic categories were evident in the discourse, production logics predominated (144 coded instances, see Appendix H, Table H2). Most of the production discourse manifested in plan participant discourse. For example, most internationalization plans had goals to *increase* opportunities by *increasing* the number of programs offered. In addition, beliefs and actions related to production management were evident, such as centralized inventories, databases, and standardized practices. In addition, these production goals and practices were situated in a production context, emphasizing the production of global-oriented credentials to meet industry demands. Similarly, discourse participants commodified knowledge and students in response to decreasing funding (commodification, 70 instances, see Appendix H, Table H2). For instance, internationalization practices included the "exporting" of knowledge and the utilization of international students as revenue streams and tools for FTES strategic enrollment.

Competition was another neoliberal logic underlying CC internationalization (90 instances). For example, plan participants articulated goals to be the "leading" institution for internationalization and "the best" in advancing state and national economic prosperity. Similarly, competition logics manifested in external participant discourse. For example, colleges needed to compete in the global economy; colleges needed to prepare a competitive workforce for the global economy; and colleges needed to contribute to the nation's ability to compete in the global economy. Lastly, plan and external participants described a need to compete in an environment of decreasing state funding (i.e., competing for state and external resources). When considering the heaviness of production and competition logic, colleges may be internationalizing as a way to compete for resources.

The discourse of competing for resources was largely shaped by two neoliberal logics—privatization (31 instances) and economic prosperity (41 instances) (see Appendix H, Table H2). Discourse participants, especially in the external groups, described the role of CCs as facilitators of state and national economic prosperity. To facilitate economic prosperity, colleges needed to strategize how to "work with" business industry to meet their demands and the global economy's needs. Here, the purpose and outcome of CC education, including internationalization, was metaphorically privatized. This concept is further substantiated by the findings that economic prosperity was in terms of the corporation, the state, and/or the nation. Although external, plan, and internal participants used language around student- and work success, students' economic power or prosperity was not an articulated outcome of internationalization efforts. Given the overall analysis of discourse and neoliberal logics, it seems the prominent neoliberal logics of production and competition were most prominent.

Discourse participants advanced the institutional effectiveness theme in different ways. External participants set expectations that CC's needed to be prepared to respond to global, fiscal, and workforce external forces. Plan participants directed internal actions, such as enrollment management, entrepreneurship, and skills-gap/intercultural competency curriculum. Plan participants also rationalized these actions with pressures from external forces. Although institutional effectiveness discourse was largely absent from internal texts, some internal participants noted their practices met institutional expectations and external pressures to be entrepreneurial and meet workforce demands. Next, I answer the final set of research questions: Who is excluded and who is othered in CC internationalization plan discourse?

Exclusion and Othering in Community College Internationalization

I have presented the prominent democratic and neoliberal discourse themes in CC internationalization, the underlying logics, and the roles of discourse participants play. SCA is also concerned with identifying the structures of discourse that (re)produce power abuse/domination. According to van Dijk (2016), ideological discourse structures such as polarization, pronoun use, identification, activities, norms and values, and interests "tend to exhibit underlying attitudes and ideologies of dominant social groups," which re(produce) social inequities (p. 73). As discussed in Chapter Two, neoliberalism presumes to advance society through economic means. Yet, at the heart of neoliberalism is the alienation and commodification of human life to benefit private entities and wealthy individuals (Day, 2016; George, 1999). Likewise, democracy holds egalitarian ideals, yet marginalized groups of people are often excluded from participation to the benefit of actors in power (see Baker, 2017). In the next section, I present the ideological discourse structures that reveal beliefs/values/actions in excluding international students and othering international/domestic students in the democratic and neoliberal discourse themes.

Excluding International Students in Democratic Discourse

In the democratic discourse themes of increasing access and preparing global citizens, the intended participants were domestic students, and international students were excluded (Appendix O). To begin, in the discourse of making global education more accessible, discourse participants identified students who should have increased access using noun phrases such as "traditionally underrepresented students." As mentioned previously, in the U.S. CC context, "underrepresented students" are typically domestic students diverse in income, race, ethnicity, age, and ability (de Wit & Jones, 2018; Engle, 2017). Similar to these noun phrases, discourse

participants also used the pronoun "our" to describe student and community membership as local and domestic. For example, in IL-SP, the possessive pronoun "our" refers to the college, and "students" refers to the dominant student population—local/domestic students. This was exemplified in the plan's mission discourse which associated "their students" with "district residents" (IL-SP). Similarly, CA-EMP-5 discourse participants described "their students" as coming from the "urban core" and surrounding communities of [city]. In addition, when analyzing internal discourse participant texts (Appendix N), the topic of global citizenship was not included on international student facing websites (e.g., office of international student programs and services), only on domestic student facing websites (e.g., study abroad office or an international experience office). Overall, discourse participants identified students in (and benefitting from) global education as domestic—thus excluding international students. That said, instances occur where international students are included as "others."

Othering International Students in Democratic Discourse

In the democratic discourse, international students were othered as tools and sources of supply (see Appendix O). This othering of students occurred primarily by external and plan participants. Discourse participants revealed a belief that increased access and student preparation in global education can occur by "exposing" "our students" to "different worldviews" and "other countries" by "increasing international student enrollment" (Appendix O). Reoccurring lexicon included *increase, enhance, and expose*—words often associated with quantifiable objects, not humans or human relations. In addition, language that othered international students included certain actions and interests. For example, plan participants strategized the use of international students to "enhance" campus diversity and "expose" domestic students to cultural diversity. Action related to exposing and enhancing centered on

"increasing" the number of enrolled international students and increasing the number of international students in cross-cultural activities. While using the action-oriented language of "increasing," "enhancing," and "exposing," discourse participants objectified international students as tools for domestic student learning. Another discourse structure that othered international students was pronoun use. For example, discourse participants used the pronoun "other" to represent international students—who are different and separate from "our students." As discussed previously, the possessive pronoun "our" refers to the college, and "students" refers to the dominant student population—local/domestic students. Overall, these discourse structures revealed a reoccurring activity and a norm for using international students as tools. In this discourse, the neoliberal logic of production is heavy as discourse participants set to achieve goals by using a "supply" of international students. The othering of international and domestic students occurred in the neoliberal discourse as well.

Othering Students in Neoliberal Discourse

In the neoliberal discourse theme, domestic and international students were othered as tools and metrics (see Appendix P). The othering of students occurred primarily by external and plan participants. Primarily in the internationalization plans, participants othered international students as enrollment metrics and revenue streams. Discourse participants did not directly state international students were numbers or metrics; however, lexicon and word meanings across texts created a cohesive discourse that international students functioned as an important "FTES number" and "financial incentive." For example, CA-EMP-3 discourse participants stated, "increasing the Full Time Equivalent Student (FTES) number is…important in order to obtain the necessary funding" and suggested outreach and recruitment target international students since international students "are required by Federal law to enroll in a minimum of twelve units per

119

semester in a credit program" (CA-EMP-3). In addition, CA-EMP-3 participants stated, "there is a clear financial incentive in hosting and enrolling international students at CC" (CA-EMP-3). Unfortunately, such discourse that "others" international students as numbers and revenue streams perpetuates dominant beliefs and practices that place the value of international students in economic terms, rather than in terms of their intrinsic human and community value.

Discourse participants, primarily in external groups, also othered domestic students as "workers" for the U.S.'s "global workforce" and described CCs as a "facilitator" of U.S. economic development and global competitiveness (AACC, 2020b). "If CCs take bold action to improve college completion, they not only will better serve their students, but they also can help rebuild the U.S. workforce and improve its global competitiveness" (AACC, 2014). In this example, "improving completion" is associated with building a workforce that improves the U.S.'s ability to compete globally. In another example, CCID discourse participants emphasized their role in helping CCs develop globally competent workers (see Appendix P). Indeed, many external discourse participants omitted the word "student" from the texts (e.g., AACC, 2020b) and instead identified students in relation to their economic value using nouns such as "worker," "workforce," and "force." In addition, plan participants referred to their role in preparing students as globally competent and competitive workers for the "global workforce" (Appendix P). As mentioned previously, the noun forms "worker" and "workforce" associate an individual/group's identity, role, and value with functioning *for* an entity (e.g., a corporation, nation), not for oneself. Not surprisingly, neoliberal logics of production and competition are heavy in the othering of students. In the next chapter, I interpret these discourse and logic findings through the lens of neo-institutional theory and internationalization approaches. I end Chapter Five with recommendations for scholars and practitioners.

CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Summary of Findings

This study builds on the literature of CC history, mission, and internationalization. Using democratic and neoliberal logics as my analytic framework and the sociocognitive approach (SCA) to critical discourse analysis, this study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the democratic and neoliberal discourse themes in CC internationalization plans and related discourse?

    a. What democratic and neoliberal logics underly these themes?

    b. How do plan, internal, and external discourse participants advance these themes?

2. Who is excluded and who is othered in CC internationalization discourse?

Below, I provide a summary of my research findings.

Two broad democratic and neoliberal discourse themes exist in CC internationalization. The democratic discourse themes centered on the shared beliefs that CC internationalization should make global education more accessible and prepare students for global citizenship. In this discourse, participants valued increasing opportunity for underrepresented domestic students by internationalizing/globalizing curriculum and making study abroad more accessible. In addition, global citizenship was interpreted differently both as a knowledge outcome and as an ability to act in just and ethical ways. The prominent democratic logics underlying this discourse were opportunity and empowerment and evident in the beliefs/values/actions of reducing barriers, increasing access, enabling participation, supporting action and expression, fostering civic engagement, and developing agents for change. However, these beliefs/values/actions were

geared toward domestic students. Using a critical lens, my analysis revealed that discourse participants believed global education was intended for domestic students—excluding international students. In addition, to increase access for domestic students and develop domestic students as global citizens, discourse participants conceptualized and othered international students as a supply of tools for intercultural competency training. Here, neoliberal logics of production and commodification seemed to shape these participants' beliefs and actions. Overall, however, the democratic discourse in CC internationalization is about creating opportunity for domestic students to engage in global learning and develop as global citizens.

The primary neoliberal discourse theme centered on leveraging internationalization for institutional effectiveness. In this discourse, participants believed internationalization would enable CCs to respond to external factors such as globalization, funding decreases, completion mandates, and market demands. Participants also revealed beliefs that international student enrollment management, entrepreneurship through global partnerships, and intercultural competency training for in-demand global jobs were internationalization efforts worth leveraging. Unfortunately, in this discourse, the concept of the student was transformed (or othered) into that of the worker. For example, the texts were essentially void of the term "student," and instead, discourse participants conceptualized students as a competent and competitive workforce for the global economy—a workforce that would ensure national competitiveness and U.S. economic prosperity. As such, this discourse was heavy with neoliberal logics of production and competition as evidenced through the beliefs/values/actions of free-market governance, redistribution of wealth, credentialling, efficiency, revenue generation, accountability through quantification, and top-down management. Overall, the neoliberal discourse theme emphasized leveraging internationalization to advance institutional effectiveness

and national economic development. Lastly, within the democratic and neoliberal discourse themes, discourse participants played similar roles. External discourse participants set expectations for college leaders; plan participants directed operations through institutional goals and strategic initiatives; and internal participants executed or operationalized institutional directives.

In this chapter, I first discuss the neoliberalization of CC internationalization through the lens of neo-institutional and SCA theory. This includes a discussion of participant roles, neoliberal logic, exclusion and othering, and the neoliberalization of democratic aims. Second, I consider tensions and opportunities for resistance. Lastly, I discuss the alignment of neoliberal and democratic logic with internationalization approaches. Following this discussion, I share several limitations to this study which can be helpful for future research on this topic. I end this chapter by offering opportunities for future research and practice.

Institutionalizing Neoliberalism

Neo-institutional theory emphasizes the role external environments play in shaping organizational change (Powell & DiMagio, 1991). As discourse participants seek legitimacy, they align their values and actions with external interests. As a result, organizations within a sector may become similar over time (Powell & DiMagio, 1991). The influence of neoliberal logic is not a new phenomenon for CCs. After the west's political and economic neoliberal agenda took hold in the 1980's (see Chapter Three), CCs became more aligned with neoliberal ideology as evidenced in organizational behaviors, such as pursuing competitive external funding and offering employability credentials (Levin, 2001; Mars, 2013). Even though neoliberalism is a documented phenomenon in CCs, scholars continue to question the perpetuation of neoliberalism, its impact on the technical core (e.g., faculty, students), and how to resist it (see

Baber, et al., 2019; Cox & Sallee, 2018; Gonzales & Ayers, 2018; Levin & López-Damián 2018). This study offers new insight into neoliberal logic in CC internationalization. To begin, findings show the heavy forces of neoliberalism pressing down from external organizations, to institutional leaders, to international/global education staff. SCA and neo-institutional theory help explain why these discourse participants sought legitimacy with their external stakeholders.

The Role of Discourse Participants

The examination of discourse participant roles revealed participants advancing CC internationalization discourse. Discourse participants included influential external organizations such as the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), Community College International Development (CCID), California community college districts, state governments, and the Institute for International Education (IIE), to name a few. Plan participants were largely college administrators from centralized offices, global/international education staff, and faculty in World Languages and Humanities disciplines. Internal participants were predominantly global/international education staff. Furthermore, it seems external organizations set expectations for college leaders regarding expanding access, global citizenship, and leveraging internationalization; plan participants directed related goals and initiatives; and internal participants executed and operationalized institutional goals/initiatives.

Discourse across participant groups often aligned and reflected the logics of external groups. This finding contradicts critiques that institutional planning is often disconnected from day-to-day operations (Gordan & Fischer, 2015). As mentioned previously, neo-institutional theory helps explain why human beliefs and behaviors may become more similar over time as individuals and social groups seek legitimacy. In addition, SCA theory makes clear the alignment of logics across various social groups. According to van Dijk (1996; 2016), groups

124

with material and symbolic power often control (knowingly or unknowingly) action and cognition (van Dijk, 1996; 2016). For example, people with power can require and control certain genres of discourse. In this study, the genre of discourse is strategic planning which is often controlled by administrators and functions as an accountability measure for accreditors and external stakeholders (Gordan & Fischer, 2015). As a result of controlling discourse, our individual communicative interactions, and thus our own thoughts and beliefs, often become similar to other members in our social groups (van Dijk, 1996). These similarities generate related communicative interactions, resulting in shared discourses that often legitimize the interests of groups with power (van Dijk, 1996).

In this study, plan participants (e.g., college administrators) likely sought legitimacy in the eyes of powerful external organizations that set policy. For instance, the HLC required accredited institutions to account for external factors in their institutional planning. The AACC stated CC leaders should respond to global economic factors and prepare students for the global workforce through internationalization efforts. Such external policy statements may have resulted in plan directives to expand access and intercultural training for employability purposes, for example. Similarly, internal participants likely sought legitimacy in the eyes of college administrators/plan participants. On their public webpages, for example, internal participants revealed how they operationalized directives through faculty development programs and curricular initiatives, such as study away (e.g., WA-INT*). According to SCA and neo-institutional theory, as groups seek legitimacy, their beliefs, values, actions likely become increasingly similar in discourse—reflecting the interests of those with material and symbolic

power (van Dijk, 1996; 2016)[29]. In this discussion, I refer to this phenomenon as the institutionalization of neoliberal logic (or neoliberalization).

A prominent discourse exemplifying neoliberalization in CC internationalization was the development of students' skills to meet the needs of the global workforce and economy. Although research has documented the alignment of CC curriculum with workforce needs (Ayers, 2013; Gonzales & Ayers, 2018; Levin, 2007; Sethares, 2020), this study shows how this pressure manifests in internationalization efforts. For example, external discourse participants, such as AACC and CCID, set expectations that CC institutional leaders were responsible for building a competitive global workforce and internationalization was one way to do this (Appendix L). Then, in the institutional plans, we see college leadership use similar language and direct goals and initiatives toward production and competition. For example, AZ-DEI plan participants stated, "The 21st century's global economy will value transnational leadership skills, fluency in multiple languages, and respect for and understanding of other cultures" and the "internationalization plan" would "develop students' global awareness and sensitivity to cultural differences" and "align" with "workforce needs" (Appendix M). Indeed, as powerful external organizations employed neoliberal logic in their expectations of community college workforce development, community college leaders used similar logics in their institutional directives for internationalization. Neo-institutional theory helps explain why these discourse participants sought legitimacy with their external stakeholders when modeling an internationalization that developed a global workforce.

---

[29] This study did not attempt to offer statistically significant or generalizable findings on the influence of discourse participants. In addition, this study is not a complete analysis of discourse participants—which I discuss later in my limitations section.

Perpetuating Social Wrongs through Discourse

As discussed previously, SCA considers the interface of discourse structures, society and cognition as way to explain how discourse and logic perpetuates social wrongs (Fairclough, 2009). A social wrong can be understood "as aspects of a social system, forms, or orders which are detrimental to human well-being" (Fairclough, 2009, p.167), such as inaccessible public education. In this next section, I consider the social wrongs of excluding and othering international students and neoliberalizing democratic aims for historically underrepresented and marginalized students.

Excluding and Othering International Students

Findings from this study indicate colleges continue to recruit and enroll international students for revenue generating purposes. One might think the democratic ideals of access, representation, participation and justice would inspire CC educators to recruit international students from underrepresented and oppressed countries for the purposes of expanding access to postsecondary education and uplifting marginalized communities. Instead, as scholars have clearly identified, international student recruitment is a revenue generating initiative (Brennan & Dellow, 2013; Raby & Valeau, 2016; Viggiano, et al., 2018). For example, Viggiano and colleagues (2018) found that colleges recruited international students from privileged backgrounds, justifying high tuition fees because of the students' privilege. In this study, international student recruitment and revenue generation was a prominent part of the discourse. With the exception of one college (IL-SP[30]), the colleges in this study excluded non-traditional international students from their recruitment strategies. In addition, my study adds to the literature on the othering of international students—revealing the strategic planning of

---

30 IL-SP participates in the State Department's CC Initiative Program which aims to bring students from underrepresented countries to U.S. CCs.

international student tuition dollars and FTES status for institutional capacity building, such as

dormitories (e.g., CA-EMP-2, see Appendix P). The dominant practice of recruiting and

enrolling international students as a revenue generating population reinforces the

neoliberalization of CC internationalization. In addition, the continuous exploitation of

international students in strategic discourse likely has some bearing on international student

experiences—for example, affecting oppressive policies that financially benefit the institution,

such expensive and high stakes language proficiency requirements and probationary rules that do

not meet the needs of international students[31]. Certainly, more research is needed in this area.

Next, I offer insights into the neoliberalization of democratic aims and how this perpetuates

inequities for historically underrepresented and marginalized postsecondary students.

Perpetuating Social Wrongs through Neoliberalized Democratic Aims

Because logics function as "sense making frames," shaping what we think are reasonable

and legitimate actions (Guillén, 2001, p. 14; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008), the neoliberalization of

democratic aims, such as opportunity or emancipation initiatives, may seem reasonable and

legitimate to some. According to Osei-Kofi and colleagues (2010), the neoliberalization of

democratic aims likely occurs when discourse participants attempt to align goals with external

interests. As a result, democratic logics, such as opportunity or emancipation, end up supporting

a neoliberal agenda. The convergence or hybridization of logics is a theoretical phenomenon

scholars are examining in practice (e.g., Ayers, 2009; Gonzales & Ayers, 2018; Ayers &

Gonzales, 2020; Greenwood, Diaz, Li, & Lorente, 2010; Levin, 2006; Osei-Kofi, Shahjahan, &

---

[31] Although this study did not examine the perceptions and experiences of traditional international students in U.S. CCs, my own ESL teaching experience provides some insight. As a college ESL teacher, I recall international students expressing anger and sadness that the university only wanted them for their money. This was especially true when students experienced lengthy ESL course requirements (e.g., years of ESL before entering academic programs), external and punitive summative assessments, and/or university dismal due to low academic ESL performance. Indeed, the commodification of international students is pervasive in U.S. higher education. Continued research into the perceptions and experiences of traditional international students is needed.

Patton, 2010; Reay & Hinnings, 2009). In the next section, I consider the convergence of democratic and neoliberal logics in community college internationalization.

Neoliberalizing Community, Opportunity, Empowerment, and Emancipation

Neoliberalizing democratic aims was evident in CC internationalization discourse. In this study, discourse participants paired the democratic logic of community with the neoliberal logic of competition[32]. For example, IL-SP discourse participants set a goal to offer "value-added education" and to be "known for providing exceptional educational and cultural experience to students." One such offering was the college's "Global Perspectives" concentration which allowed students to "meaningfully and deliberately choose courses to expand [their] worldview by understanding the interconnectedness of peoples and systems, investigating the contributions of culture on your field of study, and exploring the influences of cultural diversity on the global community." Here, discourse participants touted the curriculum as giving students a value-added choice in what they want to learn about the global community so that it could be applicable to their field of study. Indeed, beliefs in *relevance*, *application*, and *choice* fit within the neoliberal discourses of individualism (Saunders, 2007), "market-driven curriculum" and "learners as economic entities" (Ayers, 2005, pp. 539, 542).

The pairing of community and competition logics is concerning. Competition centers on individualism which, in education, empowers people "only to meet the needs of employers and to promote their own self-interest" while failing to develop critical thinking, self-awareness, and empathy, for example (Ayers, 2005, p. 543). "Under such circumstances," Ayers writes, "a naive

---

[32] The democratic logic of community encompassed concepts such as the association of action and ideas between diverse people. Artifacts of community logic included developing intercultural competencies, respecting diversity, and developing an awareness of our global interdependence/interconnectedness (Appendix H, Table H1). The neoliberal logic of competition—centering individualism and self-interest—shaped concepts such as a global education that would a) create value for students and meet their consumer interests, b) increase individuals' earning potential, and c) improve U.S. rankings in the production of educational credentials (Appendix H, Table H2).

and acquiescent society may develop, deferring political decision making to an elite class of politicians who claim to act in the universal interest of a homogenous populace" (2005, p. 542) Similarly, scholars have found that individualistic extrinsic goals, such as increasing one's human capital, may allow for a student to get a higher paying job, but that such extrinsic self-interested goals are "less personally satisfying and associated with excessive social comparisons and unstable self-esteem" (Saunders, 2007, p.5). Essentially, neoliberal logics of competition have the potential to develop students as extrinsically motivated but ill-equipped to participate and exercise their voices—deferring to elite classes who dominate and homogenize society for their own interests.

In addition, this study offers insight into the neoliberalization of opportunity[33], empowerment, and emancipation by commodification and production logics. To begin, findings show discourse participants used the democratic logics of opportunity to make sense of the neoliberal logics of commodification and production. For example, plan participants showed concern that diverse students gain access to global education to be more "employable" and "productive" global citizens. Similarly, democratic logics of empowerment[34] and emancipation[35] were intertwined with the neoliberal logics of production and commodification. Logics of production and commodification transformed the student into the employable worker through credentialing and skills gap discourse. In addition, these logics seemed to compel colleges to produce a "worker pipeline" for private industry and national economic prosperity under the guise of individual skill development and employability (Appendix M).

---

[33] Opportunity logic encompassed concepts such as expanding access and reducing barriers to GII education for underrepresented domestic students (Appendix H, Table H1).
[34] In this study, empowerment included encouraging participation, civic engagement, and developing students' intercultural skills, knowledge, ability, and attitudes (Appendix H, Table H1).
[35] Logics of emancipation included centering the human experiences and equipping students to recognize power imbalances and challenge injustices (Appendix H, Table H1).

The pairing of opportunity, empowerment, and emancipation logics with commodification and production logics is concerning. Neoliberal production logics advance beliefs and actions around defunding public resources and using efficiency measures to improve the economic conditions of powerful entities, often at the expense of oppressed communities (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). As mentioned previously, access discourse in CC internationalization is geared toward local, underrepresented and historically marginalized student populations, thus targeting these students for market exploitation. In this sense, democratic logics of opportunity may be working to advance the neoliberal dispossession of marginalized CC students. This dynamic aligns with the historical and fundamental flaws in democratic ideals, which have been structured on the dispossession of marginalized communities (Baker, 2017). While this study reveals internationalization discourse and participants likely perpetuating these injustices, additional empirical research is needed on the impacts of this discourse on students and college educators. In addition, research is needed to understand how/why these discourse participants conceptualize and reconcile democratic ideals with a neoliberal agenda.

Converging democratic and neoliberal logics for access aims. As discussed above, the convergence of neoliberal and democratic logics can compel discourse participants to act out a neoliberal agenda under the appearance of democratic ideals. In addition, this study highlights where neoliberal logics may work to advance democratic aims. However, I interpret these findings with caution. For example, the beliefs/values/actions regarding international student enrollment as a means for revenue generation may actually create opportunities for international students to participate in postsecondary education—experiencing new pathways to four-year colleges/universities. That said, my findings indicate colleges seek traditional international

131

students who tend to come from countries with established higher education systems and advanced economies (e.g., China, South Korea, Saudi Arabia). In addition, it seems democratic and neoliberal logics may converge in the discourse of global entrepreneurship for increased access. Several colleges (e.g., MD-EMP and WA-INT*) discussed behaving entrepreneurially in response to decreases in state funding. One action was to export the community college curriculum. This neoliberal-induced response may advance accessible postsecondary opportunities in countries where access is limited. This aligns with an emerging body of literature on countries developing community college systems to increase access to postsecondary education (Jaafar & Maki, 2017; Tang & Tsui, 2018; TyndorfJr & Glass, 2017). As mentioned, however, I caution readers. The exportation of the U.S. community college system/curriculum may further advance neoliberal ideology which often works to redistribute public wealth and well-being to a few private entities through privatization, commodification, production, and competition.

Conflict, Tension, and Opportunities for Resistance

The heavy presence of neoliberalism in CC internationalization does not necessarily indicate discourse participants value the neoliberal agenda over ideals of the CC democratic mission. In the next section, I present conflicting beliefs/values/actions, tensions, and opportunities for resistance.

Discourse Participants' Conflicting Beliefs/Values/Actions

Neoliberal pressures from above can challenge college educators' values causing educators to succumb to and endure neoliberal efforts (Ayers, 2009). For example, Osei-Kofi and colleagues (2010) described the challenges of developing a social justice concentration and maintaining their commitment to justice work in a neoliberal institution that upheld competition

132

and difference over solidarity and unity (p. 25). The faculty scholars recognized the impact of working within a neoliberal institution on their program development, such as needing to compete for resources with other social justice programs. Attempts to advance democratic aims in a neoliberal institution, such as a U.S. CC, is a contradictory endeavor rife with neoliberal obstacles that can potentially force capitulation. Branham (2018) found CC international education educators "personally" believed the most important motivation for internationalization was the development of students' intercultural competencies, such as "tolerance" and "awareness"—empowering students to engage in diverse local settings. However, the educators felt they had to tow "the company line" that, most importantly, internationalization prepared students for the global economy (Branham, 2018, p. 50).

With neoliberal discourse emanating from powerful social groups, my study sheds light on why CC GII educators align democratic and neoliberal discourse: social groups seek legitimacy and thus perpetuate the discourse of groups in power (e.g., the company/institution)—thus preserving power (van Dijk, 2016). No matter the good intention of college educators, seeking legitimacy and the preservation of one's power is problematic when it perpetuates harm and injustice. Succumbing to neoliberal forces is not the only option for college educators. Ayers (2009) found that some college educators, when confronted with managerial pressures that conflicted with professional or educational values, resisted through refusal of participation and advocacy. Further research is needed on how college educators and students make sense of democratic logic in a neoliberal institution, and how they resist such neoliberal pressures.

Tension and Opportunities for Resistance

Given my assumption that neoliberalism and democracy are "oppositional cultures" (Levin, Kater, & Waganor, 2006, p. 100) which shape our beliefs and practices and form

tensions between and among groups (Ayers, 2009; Levin, et al., 2006), it was no surprise that democratic and neoliberal tensions existed in CC internationalization. Scholars have revealed intra-ideological tensions between administrators' managerial and educational values (Ayers, 2009) as well as the economic and educational values of faculty work (Levin, et al., 2006). In addition, scholars have identified ways college educators make sense of these tensions, often in the form of resistance or capitulation to certain ideological forces from above (Ayers, 2009; Canhilal, Lepori, & Seeber, 2015). This study offers insight into the important role academic departments can play in resisting neoliberal logic by centering humanity and community in their campus-wide internationalization efforts.

In several of the sample plans, neoliberal and democratic logics were in tension. That is, certain discourse participants (e.g., administrators) used a neoliberal logic while other discourse participants (e.g., faculty) from the same institution used democratic logic. For example, the MD-EMP plan was heavy with neoliberal logics and discourse of leveraging internationalization for institutional effectiveness. Meanwhile, MD-EMP's internal discourse was predominantly shaped by democratic logics emphasizing a faculty-led, humanity-centered internationalization approach. Although the purpose of this study was to examine democratic and neoliberal logics using SCA, findings point to the power of faculty in resisting neoliberal discourses in internationalization. Indeed, academic units are typically decoupled from centralized, administrative offices which may explain why democratic logics were more prominent in faculty-led internationalization efforts. Therefore, a bottom-up approach to internationalization through an academic unit may be a promising way to advance anti-neoliberal (anti-commodification, anti-individualism) discourse. Overall, current scholarship on academic units

134

leading campus internationalization efforts is limited. One area for further research is on how academic units and their faculty resist neoliberal institutionalization in CC internationalization.

Throughout this chapter, I have interpreted findings in relation to neo-institutional theory and possibilities for resisting neoliberalization in CC internationalization. These interpretations may be especially useful for scholars interested in neo-institutionalism, critical discourse analysis, and internationalization. In the next section, I consider democratic and neoliberal logic in relation to internationalization approaches[36]. The following section also provides important insights for CC internationalization practitioners, leaders, and scholars.

Democratic and Neoliberal Logics in Internationalization Approaches

Scholars have identified six approaches to internationalization: process, outcomes, abroad, comprehensive, local, and activities. Colleges and universities may use a variety and/or shift between approaches (Knight, 2004). In this next section, I interpret my findings through the lens of internationalization approaches and consider how neoliberal logic is more prevalent in certain approaches. I also consider which approaches are more favorable to democratic logic.

Process Approach

Supporters of CC internationalization advocate for the process approach (Brennan, 2017; Copeland et al., 2017; Raby, 2020; Unangst & Barone, 2019). The process approach integrates and aligns GII dimensions with the college mission, vision, values, and institutional goals, resulting in an institutional commitment, administrative structure, and organizational culture supportive of global learning (Knight & de Wit, 1995). Given this institutional formation occurs through institution-wide planning and strategizing (Copeland et al., 2017; Unangst & Barone, 2019), I expected a clear integration and alignment of GII elements in the sampled

---

[36] In Chapter Two, I reviewed literature on six approaches to internationalization in CCs.

internationalization plans. Surprisingly, integration and alignment were limited. Instead, the plans with integrated GII elements across their mission/vision/values/goals, and initiatives were heavier with neoliberal logics. For example, CA-EMP-2's mission statement was to "serve the local, regional, and global communities by promoting comprehensive learning, success, and lifechanging opportunities" yet the only institutional goal that referenced the "global community" was institutional capacity building by enrolling full-time international students (presumably for their FTES status and tuition dollars). Indeed, scholars have critiqued strategic plans as an inherently neoliberal technology (Jankowski & Provezis, 2014; Lynch, 2017; Lynch & Grummell, 2018). Thus, a process approach, absent of neoliberal logic, may not be possible. Further research is needed on the opportunities to develop an organizational culture without neoliberal technologies (such as strategic plans and a top-down administrative structure).

Outcomes Approach

Given the strategic nature of these planning documents, the outcomes approach was evident in nearly all plans. Institutions engaging in this approach often articulate measurable goals such as increasing students' intercultural competencies, increasing institutional ranking, and increasing numbers of international students (Knight, 2004). Apart from the common critique that outcome approaches are rooted in neoliberal logic basing success in quantifiable terms (Pike, 2015; Ramlackhan, 2020; Zepke, 2015) that ignore diversity of teaching and learning needs (Byslma, 2015; Milner, 2018; Trumbell & Lash, 2013), this study revealed an opacity in outcomes discourse, especially in relation to numeric outcomes of "cultural diversity training." The use of abstract and vague language reveals a lack of knowledge of the subject matter and a perpetuation of power-laden discourse (van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983). That is, such discourse is often produced and disseminated by powerful social groups, removed from the lived

experiences of people engaged in the action (e.g., students, faculty, and staff in global education). Further research is needed on how faculty and practitioners participate in planning processes and influence the alignment of outcomes with day-to-day practice and needs.

Abroad Approach

From the review of literature on CC internationalization approaches, it seemed CCs were not engaged in the abroad approach which includes implementation of bi-national agreements to export educational opportunities, such as the development of branch campuses (Butler, 2016; Knight, 2004). My study confirms that this is an uncommon practice in CCs. However, given the power of logics, such an approach could take hold as exemplified in MD-EMP's goal to "Offer [CC] Curriculum and Credentials Globally" by "export[ing] our knowledge and leverage[ing] entrepreneurial efforts to fund programs for our own students." Similarly, my analysis revealed the topic of strategic entrepreneurship through global partnerships, including the "exporting of knowledge" to fund programs and raise institutional prestige (see Appendix M for examples). Neoliberal logics of commodification, production and competition were heavy in this topic. However, given the abroad approach is a relatively new phenomenon in CC internationalization, scholars, administrators, and practitioners have an opportunity to examine, propose, and lead institutional aboard efforts that challenge neoliberalism.

Comprehensive Approach

The purpose of the comprehensive approach (CI) is campus internationalization where GII learning becomes a part of the institutional culture (Hudzik, 2011; Hudzik & Stohl, 2012). There are six pillars to the CI approach: (a) articulated institutional commitment; (b) administrative structure and staffing; (c) curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes; (d) faculty profiles and practices; (e) student mobility; and (f) collaboration and partnerships.

Cierniak and Ruddy (2016) found CI was only possible with faculty engagement—particularly

hearing from faculty regarding obstacles to successful integration (p. 260). My study sheds light

on the efforts some CCs are doing to engage faculty in internationalization efforts, and found that

in this regard, CI can be heavy with democratic logics of participation. For example, WA-INT*

discourse participants shared their CI approach and were most explicit in how they would engage

faculty—offering professional development opportunities to lead study abroad and

internationalize the curriculum. However, given CI's dependence on administrative structures

(Yakaboski & Perozzi, 2018), the plans using CI were also heavy with neoliberal logic. For

example, even though WA-INT* discourse participants focused efforts on faculty development

and participation, they also utilized managerial techniques such as standardized courses and

centralized inventories.

Scholars caution against the neoliberal practice of standardizing curriculum because it

excludes the learning approaches of marginalized students (Carnoy, 1989). Because college

educators often develop standardized curriculum based on "the values, beliefs, and knowledge

associated with White, middleclass, English-dominant America," underrepresented students may

feel "stripped of their respective cultures, ideologies and languages, and feel obligated to

assimilate into the dominant culture" (Reeb-Reascos & Serniuk, 2018, p. 8). Indeed,

underrepresented students often experience various forms of microaggressions (e.g., race,

gender, language) in GII education (Córdova, 2019; Green, 2017; Willis, 2016; Phillipson, 2016;

Shin & Park, 2016), and education abroad programs often lack a curriculum that interrogates the

global histories of White and Western power including orientalism, colonialism, and

neoliberalism (Smaller & O'Sullivan, 2018). This study reveals the neoliberal practices of

standardizing global education curriculum. Further research is needed to critically examine

standardized global/international curriculum, its link to the comprehensive approach, and how

such curriculum may perpetuate inequities for faculty and students.

Local Approach

The local approach emphasizes a commitment to local diversity and preparing students to

engage in their own racially, ethnically, and nationally diverse communities (Branham, 2018).

Similarly, many colleges and universities practice Internationalization at Home (Iah) which

promotes GII learning for all students in domestic learning environments (Yakaboski & Perozzi,

2018), especially through internationalizing/globalizing curriculum. Similarly, my study shows a

democratic discourse of creating access for underrepresented local students through actions such

as internationalizing the curriculum and creating accessible virtual and study away programs.

However, as discussed previously, discourse participants are neoliberalizing such democratic

aims. Practitioners and administrative leaders must be careful and willing not to capitulate to

neoliberal pressures and especially not to rationalize neoliberal efforts with democratic

intentions. More research is needed that uplifts the discourses exemplifying anti-neoliberalism

toward students, faculty, practitioners, and leaders. One focus area may be on how college

educators include and humanize international students within a local approach.

Lastly, my study did not confirm several findings from other studies interested in the

local approach. Copeland et al. (2017) found CC's internationalization efforts were locally

oriented through partnerships with local immigration organizations, such as refugee centers. My

study did not confirm these findings. In only one sample, MN-INT*, discourse participants

referenced partnering with local immigrant and diaspora communities as part of their GII

learning efforts. In addition, scholars have noted a local approach geared toward meeting local

business industry needs (Branham, 2018). Similarly, my findings could not confirm this. Meeting

the needs of industry and business was a prominent topic. However, discourse participants did not specify the geographic region, unless referring to national or state workforce development. This is an interesting departure from the scholarship on CCs serving local business needs and warrants further research.

Activities Approach

Scholars have noted the most common approach in CC internationalization is the activities approach (Branham, 2018; Raby & Valeau, 2016). The activities approach is the implementation of GII education through curricular and co-curricular programming such as area studies, student/scholar exchange, intercultural training, and international student activities and services (de Wit, 2002). In addition to being the most common, it is also the most critiqued approach because it generates singular and decentralized programs that occur in individual units and serve only specific group of students. Critics argue internationalization efforts become fragmented, lacking holistic or comprehensive integration (Raby & Valeau, 2016; Woodin, 2016).

In this study, most of the plans incorporated the activities approach, which was especially heavy with democratic logics. Findings show activity-based access initiatives included study away, virtual study abroad, and a variety of financial aid including grants, scholarships, and loans. Indeed, CC scholars have examined the accessibility of study abroad, finding the importance of robust financial aid and short-term program offerings (Brenner, 2016; Quezada & Cordeiro, 2016). In addition, plan participants explained that accessible GII opportunities would empower students to engage in their global communities as global citizens. For example, several EMPs included department plans with curricular objectives to develop students as ethical, self-reflective, oriented toward change, and able to challenge power and injustices. In addition, the

140

activities approach may give more autonomy to faculty and staff to develop GII programs that meet the unique needs of diverse students. Although emancipatory findings were limited, this study highlights language that can serve as a model for advancing emancipatory aims in global learning and shows that the primary discourse participants are faculty. Thus, scholars and administrators should not dismiss the activities approach simply because it does not necessitate an administrative structure for campus internationalization. Additional research is needed on how the activities approach can empower faculty and meet diverse students' learning needs.

Approaches Conclusion

Neoliberal logics were likely most prevalent in the process, outcomes, and comprehensive approaches. The process approach entails strategic planning that accounts for neoliberal external factors and integrated GII elements into institutional mission/values/goal statements. These statements emphasized meeting student/consumer demands and preparing students for employability in a global society. The outcomes approach revealed neoliberal logics in vague numeric outcomes, even when attempting to measure enrollment increases and student engagement. Such opaque outcomes reveal a lack of knowledge of practice by administrative discourse participants (van Dijk, 2016). Finally, the comprehensive approach was heavy in neoliberal logic. Despite increasing access and engagement for students and faculty across a campus, CI operations are part of a top-down administrative structure that emphasizes central management and standardization—limiting the opportunity for pedagogy that serves the unique needs of diverse students. Colleges are attempting a local approach to internationalization and democratic logics seem to undergird this approach. Yet, this study reveals a pattern in the discourse of preparing local, underrepresented students for a global workforce and excluding and othering international students. Interestingly, democratic logics were most prevalent in the

141

activities approach which is perhaps because this approach is decentralized, removed from the influence of institutional interests and campus-level management, standardization, and accountability practices. While critiqued for its lack of comprehensive impact, perhaps the activities approach affords more opportunity for democratic processes; leadership from faculty; intentional anti-neoliberal, anti-racist, and anti-colonial pedagogy; and accessible and inclusive GII education and curricular integration.

Limitations of Study

As with any study, this research comes with limitations and assumptions. In Chapter Three, I noted a potential bias in my sampling technique. By relying on membership organizations to build my population, I may have targeted institutions that were more likely to engage in neoliberal discourses. While this potential bias is a limitation, the findings are still important as they reveal the nuances of neoliberal discourse—including dominant neoliberal logic. Without this understanding, it is difficult to identify and challenge neoliberal institutionalization. In addition, I mostly read literature that critiqued neoliberalism and advocated for democratic ideals. Again, this lends to a particular bias in the study, but one that I am forthright about to my readers. Further influencing my assumptions and ability to do critical discourse analysis was my experience in the methodology. As I have mentioned previously, I was relatively new to critical discourse analysis. Although I had studied linguistics and engaged in critical studies in global higher education, CDA and specifically SCA were new to me. I approached this dissertation to learn CDA/SCA so that I could lay a foundation for continued research. Thus, this study is useful for others learning about SCA but may not offer the methodological precision of an expert SCA researcher. Third, I only used publicly available texts from CCs and external organizations. I did not interview discourse participants or ask

142

representatives from these colleges to provide relevant internal strategic planning documents. Similarly, I did not include scholarly articles on CC internationalization or strategic planning in my sample, even though scholars are important discourse participants. Thus, important perspectives and, perhaps, relevant planning documents were left out of my sample. While this does not reduce the integrity of my findings, it offers a new opportunity for researchers to further explore CC internationalization discourse.

Recommendations

This research illuminates democratic and neoliberal logics in CC internationalization from external, institutional, and internal levels. This study offers macro-level socio-cultural perspectives based on publicly available documents, showing multiple discourse participants engaged in democratic and neoliberal discourses. Findings implicate neoliberalization of democratic aims which likely shield and perpetuate the harmful effects of neoliberalism. This study also offers insight into the neoliberal and democratic logics manifest in particular internationalization approaches. Because this study exposes broad neoliberal and democratic discourses and their participants, opportunities abound for researchers to examine how discourse participants makes sense of neoliberal and democratic tensions. The findings of this study are not generalizable and instead are intended to resonate with the reader (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). With this in mind, I offer recommendations for further research and CC internationalization practice.

Recommendations for Further Research

One area needing further investigation is how discourse participants makes sense of the neoliberalizing effect on democratic aims and the manifest tensions. Scholars have examined similar issues in the CC setting (e.g., Ayers, 2009; Gonzales & Ayers, 2018; Ayers & Gonzales, 2020; Levin, et al., 2006). As for CC internationalization, scholars might investigate how

institutional leaders, mid-level administrators, and/or faculty make sense of neoliberalized democratic aims, such as increasing access to GII education while developing a global workforce. In addition, how do students make sense of GII education for employability, social justice, or self-empowerment? Similarly, how do these different stakeholders respond to the neoliberal pressures identified in this study? Like other recent studies (e.g., Desierto & De Maio, 2021; Tett & Hamilton, 2021; Wright-Mair & Museus, 2021), this study points to opportunities to resist institutional neoliberal pressures, such campus internationalization through academic units and decoupled practice approaches with faculty leadership. What practical strategies do CC stakeholders use to resist institutional neoliberalism in internationalization and what are their outcomes? These questions warrant interview and focus group techniques which would elicit motivations, experiences, and beliefs of discourse participants and offer an opportunity to observe collective or divided views (Gill, Stewart, Treasure & Chadwick, 2008).

In addition, case study qualitative research offers another promising methodology for examining CC internationalization (see Branham, 2018 for an example). Case study research allows researchers to garner in-depth knowledge of key areas in a broader/macro phenomenon (Gerring, 2006), such as the democratic and neoliberal discourses of CC internationalization. This study pinpoints opportunities for case study research around internationalization approaches and type of plans. For example, scholars might examine neoliberal resistance strategies in programs that use the comprehensive or local approach. This study also reveals the variety in plan type that CCs use to internationalize (e.g., EMP, SP, DEI, INT*). Scholars may choose to investigate internationalization in institutions that plan through a DEI framework, for example. Indeed, this study offers several paths for linking the discourses identified in this study to micro-level practice through, for example, interview and focus group techniques and case study

methodology. In Appendix C, I provide my data set of CCs with publicly available internationalization planning documents. This data may be a useful starting point for scholars interested in CC internationalization case study research.

This study used critical discourse methodology, specifically the sociocognitive approach. Certainly, scholars could approach this topic using a different form of critical discourse analysis, such as Fairclough's analysis of genre, style, and grammar or corpus linguistics using large data sets and quantitative analysis. These CDA approaches could be applied to a data set of scholarly articles on CC internationalization[37]. For example, in her research, CC internationalization scholar, Rosalind Raby, often connects the purpose of CC internationalization to the global economy (e.g., Frost & Raby, 2009; Malveaux & Raby, 2019; Raby, 2007; Raby, 2009; Raby, Rhodes, Biscarra, 2013). How does neoliberal discourse emerge and change over time in CC internationalization research? What are the neoliberal logics in researchers' definition and rationalization of internationalization?

Lastly, this research used institutional logic theory through the lens of a critical theory paradigm (Sipe & Constable, 1996). Using institutional logics illuminated the ways in which neoliberalism occurs in CC internationalization, including the neoliberalization of democratic aims. Different theoretical applications would provide a different lens for understanding the tensions and resistance in CC internationalization, such as the "glonacal agency heuristic" (Marginson & Rhoades, 2002) or decolonial theory (e.g., Stein, & de Oliveira Andreotti, 2017). Finally, my beliefs shaping this study are that "reality is subjective and constituted on the basis of issues of power," and that discourse has political and rhetorical purposes (Sipe & Constable,

---

[37] I did not use scholarly articles as data, which as discussed, is a limitation of this study.

1996, p. 155) which advance social wrongs (Fairclough, 2009). Certainly, scholars could approach this study with a different research paradigm.

Recommendations for Practice

CC internationalization is rife with global economic discourse yet there is little empirical evidence that shows the actual economic impact for students or even alignment with student and faculty belief. What is evident—neoliberal logic shapes internationalization as a competitive tool for institutions, industry, and government. It works to commodify students and curriculum. It privatizes practice and creates a system of hierarchal control. Indeed, it is easy to say (and do) "we have to tow the company line;" "we have to work within this (neoliberal) system." Individuals practicing internationalization (whether institutional leaders, mid-level administrators, or faculty) should engage in individual and communal reflection to assess and challenge neoliberal logic in their beliefs, values, and actions. Reflection techniques are an effective practice for students (Fang & Ren, 2018) and faculty (Civitillo, Juang, Badra, & Schachner, 2019) to challenge dominant logics. Reflection techniques may be a worthy practice for practitioners as well (Hole & McEntree, 1999; Rogers, 2001). Practitioners might think through questions such as, how does my/our discourse challenge or support traditional power structures, such as market-oriented policy? How does my/our discourse humanize or commodify students? How does my/our discourse create opportunity for bottom-up participation and representation or top-down administrative control? Such reflection questions could be posed when discussing institutional strategic alignment, international student enrollment, administrative structure development, and curricular integration. To aid in this reflective technique, this study offers a framework for assessing democratic and neoliberal logic[38].

---

[38] Appendix D and H may serve as useful tools.

Conclusion

Using the sociocognitive approach to critical discourse analysis and institutional plans as my primary source of data, I set out to develop a critical understanding of how democracy and neoliberalism shape CC internationalization, who participates in the discourse, and who is othered and excluded. As a CC scholar, teacher, and advocate of internationalization and a believer in the CC egalitarian mission, I was hopeful this analysis could reveal CC internationalization shaped by democratic logics. I also set out to understand neoliberalism in CC internationalization and how we can resist this logic. This study challenges college educators to critically assess their internationalization discourse for democratic logics of opportunity, community, empowerment and emancipation and neoliberal logics of production, commodification, and competition. I hope this study serves as a reminder that neoliberalism is a man-made economic and political paradigm, and that we have the power to challenge and resist neoliberal pressures in education.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Neoliberal Logic—Conceptual Mapping

Table A1

Neoliberal Logic—Phase 1 Conceptual Mapping of Neoliberal Properties

Neoliberal Properties	Neoliberal Structure	Neoliberal value	Neoliberal Action	Neoliberal Outcome
Alienation		x	x	x
Reward wealth	x	x	x	
Redistribution of wealth		x	x	x
Downsize public sector		x	x	x
Lack of transparency		x		x
Lack of democratic accountability		x		x
People are unequal by nature		x		
Free-market governance		x	x	x
Production	x	x	x	
Commodification	x	x	x	x
Economic power		x		x
Lack of democratic participation		x		x
Material well-being		x		
Managerial		x	x	
Privatization	x	x	x	x
Individualism		x		x
Efficiency		x		
Credentialing		x	x	
Defunding public resources		x	x	
Consumerism		x	x	
Profit		x		x
Consolidation		x	x	x
Competition	x	x	x	x
Human relations/condition		x		

Note. This table shows properties of neoliberal logic organized in to four categories: structure, values, actions, and outcomes.

Table A2

Neoliberal Logic—Phase 2 Conceptual Mapping

Neoliberal Actions, Values and Outcomes	Commodification	Privatization	Production	Competition	Material Well-Being
Alienation		x		x	
Reward wealth	x	x	x	x	x
Redistribution of wealth		x		x	x
Downsize public sector		x		x	
Lack of transparency		x		x	x
Lack of democratic accountability		x		x	x
People are unequal by nature				x	x
Free-market governance		x		x	x
Lack of democratic participation		x			
Material well-being	x		x		x
Managerial		x	x		
Individualism		x		x	x
Efficiency			x		
Credentialing	x		x	x	x
Quantifiable accountability	x				
Defunding public resources		x		x	x
Consumerism	x		x		x
Profit	x	x	x	x	x
Consolidation		x		x	x
Freedom of choice	x			x	

Note. This table shows phase 2 of the conceptual mapping of neoliberal logic which was used to develop the study's codebook.

Appendix B: Democratic Logic—Conceptual Mapping

Table B1

Democratic Logic—Phase 1 Conceptual Mapping of Democratic Properties

Democratic Logic Properties	Democratic Structure	Democratic Value	Democratic Action	Democratic Outcome
Opportunity	x	x		x
Access		x		x
Reduce barriers		x	x	x
Community	x	x		x
Transparency		x		x
A way of living			x	
Association of actions and ideas between people				x
Empowerment	x	x	x	x
Critical Empathy		x	x	x
Service		x	x	
Orientation toward making change		x		
Nurtured or endulled				x
Challenge nature of power		x	x	
Realization of full potential				x
Emancipation	x			
Shared Governance		x	x	x
Human encounter (humanity first)		x	x	x
Deliberate		x	x	
Exercise voice			x	x
Exert control over decisions			x	x

Note. This table shows properties of democratic logic organized into four categories: structure,

values, actions, and outcomes.

Table B2

Democratic Logic—Phase 2 Conceptual Mapping

Democratic Actions, Values and Outcomes	Opportunity	Empowerment	Community	Emancipation
Access	x			
Reduce barriers	x			
Transparency	x			
A way of living			x	
Association of actions and ideas between people			x	
Critical Empathy			x	
Service			x	
Orientation toward making change		x		
Nurtured or endulled		x		
Challenge nature of power				x
Realization of full potential				x
Shared Governance		x		
Human encounter (humanity first)				x
Deliberate		x		
Exercise voice		x		
Exert control over decisions		x		
Access	x			
Reduce barriers	x			
Transparency	x			
A way of living			x	

Note. This table shows phase 2 of the conceptual mapping of democratic logic which was used to develop the study's codebook.

Appendix C: Study Population

Table C1

Study Population based on Sampling Frame Parameters

CC	AACC Case Study Report	ACE INT' Lab. Project	AIEA Innovation Award	IIE Open Doors CC Study Abroad	IIE' Open Doors INT. SS Enrollment	IIE Heiskell INT. Award	NAFSA Simon INT. Award	U.S. DOE IFLE
Alamo College-San Antonio	1							
Alan Hancock College	1							
American River College	1							
Anne Arundel CC				1				
Ashland KCTCS	1							
Austin CC	1			1	1			
Barstow College	1							
Bellevue College	1				1		1	
Bergen CC					1			
Berkeley City College (PCCD)	1				1			
Big Sandy KCTCS	1							
Bluegrass KCTCS	1							
Brookdale CC				1				
Broward College	1				1			
Bunker Hill CC					1			
Burlington County College					1			
Butte College								
Cabrillo College	1			1				
Camden County College					1			
Central Arizona College (Coolidge)	1							

Table C1 (cont'd)

Central CC (Grand Island)	1					
Central New Mexico CC	1		1			
Central Piedmont CC (Charlotte)	1					
Cerritos College	1					
Chabot College		1				
Chaffey College		1		1	1	
Chandler-Gilbert (MCCC)		1				
Chippewa Valley Technical College (Eau Claire)		1				1
Citrus College		1		1	1	
City College of San Francisco		1		1	1	
Clackamas CC (Oregon City)		1				
Clovis CC (SCCD)		1		1		
Coastline CC (CCCD)		1		1		
College of Alameda (PCCD)		1			1	
College of DuPage				1	1	
College of Lake County		1				1
College of Marin		1				
College of San Mateo District				1	1	
College of Southern Nevada					1	
College of the Canyons		1		1		
College of the Desert		1				
College of the Siskiyous				1		
Collin County CC District					1	
Columbia College (YCCD)		1		1		
CC of Baltimore County				1		1
CC of Philadelphia						1
Consumnes River College (LRCCD)		1		1		
Contra Costa CC District		1		1		
Cosumnes River College		1				
CUNY Borough of Manhattan CC					1	1
CUNY Kingsborough CC					1	
CUNY LaGuardia CC					1	
CUNY Queensborough CC					1	
Cypress College		1				
Dallas College: Brookhaven College		1		1		

Table C1 (cont'd)

Dallas College: Cedar Valley	**1**			
Dallas College: Eastfield	1			
Dallas College: El Centro	1			
Dallas College: Mountain View	1			
Dallas College: Richland College	1		1	1
Davidson County CC (Lexington)	1			
Dawson CC (Glendive)	1			
De Anza College	1		1	
Delaware County CC (International Studies and Foreigh Language Award (FY2018)	1			1
Delaware Technical CC (Dover)	1			
Diablo Valley College	1	1	1	
Dutchess CC		1		
East Los Angeles College	1	1	1	
Eastern Florida State College (Palm Bay)	1			
Eastern Iowa CCs (Davenport)	1			
Edmonds CC			1	
El Camino CC District	1	1	1	
El Paso CC			1	
Elgin CC (Elgin)	1			
Elizabeth Town KCTCS	1			
Estrella Mountain College (MCCC)	1			
Evergreen	1			
Florida Southwestern State College (Fort Myers)	1			
Florida State College at Jacksonville (Jacksonville)	1			
Folsom Lake College	1			
Foothill College	1		1	
Fox Valley Technical College (Appleton)	1			
Fresno City College (SCCCD)	1	1		
Fullerton College (part of North Orange County CC District)	1	1		
Gateway (MCCC)	1			
Gateway KCTCS	1			
Gateway Technical College (Kenosha)	1			
Gavilian College	1			

Table C1 (cont'd)

Genesee CC					**1**		
Georgia Perimeter College of Georgia State University				1			
Georgia Piedmont Technical College				1			
Glendale (MCCC)	1						
Glendale CC	1		1	1			
Golden West College (CCCD)	1		1				
Green River College	1			1		1	
Grossmont College				1			
Guilford Technical CC (Jamestown)	1						
Harford CC (Bel Air)	1						
Harper College	1		1		1		
Harrisburg Area CC	1		1				
Hartnell College	1						
Hawaii CC	1	1					
Hazard KCTCS	1						
Henderson KCTCS	1						
Highline College	1			1			
Hillsborough CC (Tampa) (Fulbright-Hays Group Projects Abroad DOE 2018)	1						1
Hocking College			1				
Honolulu CC	1						
Hopkinsivelle KCTCS	1						
Houston CC				1	1		
Howard CC	1		1		1		
Indian River CC			1				
Irvine Valley College				1			
James Sprunt CC (Kenansville)	1						
Jefferson KCTCS	1						
Johnson County CC				1			
Kapiolani CC	1			1			
Kauai CC	1						
Kirkwood CC	1			1		1	
Lake Tahoe CC	1		1				
Lane CC (Eugene)	1						
Laney College (PCCD)	1			1			
Las Positas College>	1						
Leeward CC	1	1					

Table C1 (cont'd)

Lone Star College System	**1**		**1**	**1**	**1**
Long Beach City College	1		1		
Los Angeles City College	1		1	1	
Los Angeles Harbor College	1				
Los Angeles Pierce College	1		1		
Los Angeles Southwest College	1				
Los Angeles Valley College	1				
Los Medanos (CCCD)	1				
Madison Area Technical College	1		1		1
Madisonville KCTCS	1				
Maysville KCTCS	1				
Merritt College (PCCD)	1			1	
Mesa CC	1		1	1	
Miami Dade College			1	1	1
MiraCosta College (Oceanside)	1				
Mission College	1		1	1	
Modesto Junior College (YCCD)	1		1		
Monroe CC		1			
Monterey Peninsula College	1				
Montgomery College	1			1	
Moraine Valley CC (Palos Hills)	1				
Moreno (RCCD)	1				
Mount Wachusett CC (Internatioanl Studies and Foreign Language Award FY 2018)					1
Mt San Antonio College	1			1	
Mt San Jacinto CC District	1		1		
Mt. San Antonio College				1	
Napa Valley College	1		1		
Nassau CC			1	1	
Norco (RCCD)	1				
Normandale CC (International studies and Foreign Language Award FY2018)					
North Hampton CC	1		1	1	
North Lake College	1			1	
North Seattle College	1			1	
Northeast CC (Norfolk)	1				
Northeast Wisconsin Technical College (Green Bay)	1				

Table C1 (cont'd)

Northern Essex CC (Haverhill)	**1**					
Northern Virginia CC		1			1	
Northwestern Michigan College (Traverse City)	1					
Oakland CC	1				1	
Ohlone College	1			1		
Onondaga CC, (Syracuse)	1					
Orange Coast College (CCCD)	1	1		1	1	
Owensboro KCTCS	1					
Paradise Valley (MCCC)	1					
Parkland College	1			1		
Pasadena City College				1	1	
Pellissippi State CC				1		
Phoenix College	1				1	
Pima CC	1		1		1	1
Pitt CC	1					1
Portland CC	1				1	
Prince George's CC					1	
Quincy College					1	
Reedley College (SCCCD)	1			1		
Rio Hondo College	1					
Rio Salado College	1				1	
Riverside CC	1			1		
Roane State CC (Harriman)	1					
Sacramento City College	1					
Saddleback College				1		
Saint Louis CC				1		
Salt Lake City CC						1
San Antonio College					1	
San Diego City College	1			1		
San Diego Mesa College	1			1		
San Diego Miramar College	1					
San Jacinto CC					1	
San Mateo County CC					1	
Sandhills CC (Pinehurst)	1					
Santa Ana College	1				1	
Santa Barbara City College	1			1	1	
Santa Monica College	1			1	1	
Santa Rosa Junior College	1			1		

Table C1 (cont'd)

Santiago Canyon College	**1**					
Scottsdale CC	1				1	
Seattle Central CC	1			1		
Seminole State College				1		
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Joint CC District	1					
Shoreline CC	1			1		1
Sierra College	1		1			
Sinclair CC (Dayton)	1					
Siskiyous College	1					
Snow College (Ephraim)	1					
Solano College	1					
Somerset KCTCS	1					
South Mountain (MCCC)	1					
South Puget Sound CC (Puget Sound)	1					
South Seattle College				1		
Southcentral Kentucky Community and Technical College	1		1			
Southeast Kentucky Community and Technical College	1		1			
Southwest Tennessee CC	1		1			
Southwestern College			1			
Southwestern CC	1					
Spokane Falls CC			1		1	
St Petersburg College			1			
Suffolk County CC			1			
SUNY Broome CC			1			
Tacoma CC				1		
Tacoma CC (Tacoma)	1					
Taft College		1				
Tallahassee CC (Tallahassee)	1					
Tarrant County College District	1		1	1		
Tompkins Cortland CC (Dryden)	1					
Tompkins-Cortland CC	1		1			
Tulsa CC			1			
University of Hawai'i Maui College	1					
Valencia College	1		1	1	1	
Wallace State CC (Hanceville)	1					
Waukesha County Technical College (Pewaukee)	1					

Table C1 (cont'd)

Wayne County CC District (Detroit)	**1**		
West Kentucky Community and Technical College	1		1
West Los Angeles College	1		
West Valley College	1		
Winward CC	1	1	

Note. This table shows the study population and the organizations that have recognized them for

their internationalization efforts.

Appendix D: Codebook

Table D1

Codebook for Deductive Analysis

Logic	Logic Structure	Code	Definition
Neoliberalism	**Commodification**	Reward wealth	Actions that depend on wealth and benefit the wealthy.
		Material well-being	Material well-being is satisfaction with one's income, employment benefits, wealth, and ability to consume; and it reflects social class status (Alford & Friedland, 1985; Sirgy, 2018)
		Credentialing	Establishing legitimacy by "acknowledging, recognizing, and validating the achievement of skills and competencies through explicit evidence" (Blackburn, et al., 2016).
		Accountability through quantification	Using numeric metrics to assess one's responsibility for outcomes.
		Defunding public resources	Reduce or shift funds away public resources
		Consumerism	The proliferation of buying and selling of goods and services (Crawford, 1998).
		Profit	Financial gain
		Consolidation	Combining independent entities to gain (e.g., efficiency or revenue).
		Freedom of choice	Opportunity and autonomy to make decisions/take action that typical benefits oneself.
	Production	Reward wealth	Actions that depend on wealth and benefit the wealthy.
		Consumerism	The proliferation of buying and selling of goods and services (Crawford, 1998).
		Profit	Financial gain
		Material well-being	Material well-being is satisfaction with one's income, employment benefits, wealth, and ability to consume; and it reflects social class status (Alford & Friedland, 1985; Sirgy, 2018)
		Individualism	Social ideology that emphasizes self-reliance and the "moral worth of the individual" (Wood, 1972)
		Efficiency	A ratio of input to output which results in resource gains (e.g., time, money)
		Credentialing	Establishing legitimacy by "acknowledging, recognizing, and validating the achievement of skills and competencies through explicit evidence" (Blackburn, et al., 2016).

161

Table D1 (cont'd)

		Managerial	Hierarchal, top-down decision making (Canhilal et al., 2016)
	Privatization	Alienation	Isolation from a group or community of which one should be a part (e.g., the electorate or even the self or humanity) (Flew, 1984).
		Redistribution of wealth	As a result of policy, money and assets transfer from one group to another.
		Lack of transparency	The practice or outcome of hiding or obscuring pertinent information.
		Lack of democratic accountability	Lack of accountability from those who are empowered to represent a group; lack of justification for the use of power.
		Free-market governance	Economic model of supply and demand where government acts as a facilitator of market-based policies (e.g., deregulating industry, removing public good protections, and defunding public goods to lower corporate taxes) (Giroux, 2005)
		Downsize public sector	Reduction of public employees and services typically through privatization and outsourcing.
		Lack of democratic participation	The practice or outcome of limiting deliberation and participation in social governance.
		Accountability through quantification	Using numeric metrics to assess one's responsibility for outcomes.
		Managerial	Hierarchal, top-down decision making (Canhilal et al., 2016)
		Reward wealth	Actions that depend on wealth and benefit the wealthy.
		Consolidation	Combining independent entities to gain (e.g., efficiency or revenue).
		Profit	Financial gain
		Defunding public resources	Reduce or shift funds away public resources
		Individualism	Social ideology that emphasizes self-reliance and the "moral worth of the individual" (Wood, 1972)
	Competition	Profit	Financial gain
		Consolidation	Combining independent entities to gain (e.g., efficiency or revenue).
		Defunding public resources	Reduce or shift funds away public resources
		Freedom of choice	Opportunity and autonomy to make decisions/take action that typical benefits oneself.
		Credentialing	Establishing legitimacy by "acknowledging, recognizing, and validating the achievement of skills and competencies through explicit evidence" (Blackburn, et al., 2016).
		Alienation	Isolation from a group or community of which one should be a part (e.g., the electorate or even the self or humanity) (Flew, 1984).

Table D1 (cont'd)

		Reward wealth	Actions that depend on wealth and benefit the wealthy.
		Redistribution of wealth	As a result of policy, money and assets transfer from one group to another.
		Lack of transparency	The practice or outcome of hiding or obscuring pertinent information.
		Lack of democratic accountability	Lack of accountability from those who are empowered to represent a group; lack of justification for the use of power.
		Free-market governance	Economic model of supply and demand where government acts as a facilitator of market-based policies (e.g., deregulating industry, removing public good protections, and defunding public goods to lower corporate taxes) (Giroux, 2005)
		Individualism	Social ideology that emphasizes self-reliance and the "moral worth of the individual" (Wood, 1972)
		People are unequal by nature	A social ideology that individuals are inherently unequal which often is used to explain social and economic inequalities.
		Downsize the public sector	Reduction of public employees and services typically through privatization and outsourcing.
Democracy	**Opportunity**	Access	The ability and opportunity to use something (e.g., a space or a system)
		Reduce barriers	To limit and reduce obstacles to opportunity.
		Transparency	The practice or outcome of providing unobscured pertinent information.
	Community	A way of living	Social behaviors and beliefs that shape day-to-day activities and interactions.
		Association of actions and ideas between people	Considering how one's actions and ideas related to another's actions and ideas (e.g., empathy)
		Critical Empathy	"Empathetic authority deployed in the genuine service of others' autonomy" and/or empathy deployed across peers that provides "affective foundations of political solidarity" (Lobb, 2017, 603).
		Service	Providing unpaid work and assistance in an effort to support others
	Empowerment	Exert control over decisions	Ability and opportunity to make decisions impacting one's life.
		Orientation toward making change	A mindset toward advocacy and empowerment
		Nurtured or endulled	To support the growth and success of someone or something
		Deliberate	Engaged dialogue
		Exercise voice	The ability and opportunity to give input (often on issues impacting oneself/community).
		Civic engagement	Individual or group activity that address public/community concerns (APA, 2009).

Table D1 (cont'd)

		Participation	Ability and opportunity to take part in something (usually of importance to one's life).
		Shared Governance	"A structure and process for partnership, equity, accountability, and ownership. It puts the responsibility, authority, and accountability for practice-related decisions into the hands of the individuals who will operationalize the decision" (Guanci, 2018, para. 2).
	Emancipation	Human encounter (humanity first)	The prioritization of human well-being; the prioritization of human qualities (e.g., compassion).
		Challenge nature of power	To critique, resist, and/reframe what power is, who has it, and why
		Realization of full potential	To come to know the one's individual power, ability, and capacity

Note. This table shows the democratic and neoliberal structures, codes, and definitions used for coding in this study.

Appendix E: Access Theme One—External Participants

Table E1

External Social Groups: Improving Access to Global Education Discourse

External Social Groups and Text Samples	
Organization / Source	**Excerpt**
American Association for CCs **International Programs and Services Statement**	In the 2017-18 academic year, only 7,427 CC students studied abroad. That is only one in every 1,589 CC students or less than half of one percent of all U.S. students who studied abroad. Many encounter various obstacles preventing study abroad, including Work responsibilities (more than 60% are employed full or part time). Insufficient funds (more than 50% are low-income and receiving financial aid). Family responsibilities (15% are single parents, 46% are age 22 or older).
American Council on Education **Internationalization Statement**	"Justice-oriented internationalization is critically self-reflective. It requires institutional and international leaders to actively consider who is part of planning and decision-making. It recognizes the vital importance of internationalization at home—that all students deserve and have access to a global education that prepares them for a contemporary, diverse workforce. It cultivates internationalization that is anti- colonial, anti-racist, and globally and locally inclusive."
CCs for International Development **Vision Statement**	That all community, technical and vocational institutions integrate international perspectives and experiences into their curricula and campus culture in order to develop globally competent students, faculty, and staff.
NAFSA Simon Award Criteria	What is being done to integrate internationalization into the curriculum and expand access to a diverse cross-section of students, and faculty?
Institute for International Education **Heiskell Award Description**	We are particularly interested in highlighting initiatives that remove institutional barriers and broaden the base of participation in international teaching and learning on campus.

Table E1 (cont'd)

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of International and Foreign Language Education	Expand access to international and foreign language learning, especially for traditionally underserved students
Program Purpose Statement	
CA-EMP-5 CC Districtwide International Education Committee **Vision and Goals Statement**	Vision: "increase international education opportunities for students throughout the district" Goals: • "Increase study abroad opportunities for all students" • "Increase awareness of international and global events and activities" • "Increase internationalization of the curriculum"
Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MSCU) **Strategic Framework**	Strategic Framework 1) Play an essential role in growing Minnesota economy and opening doors for educational opportunity. 2) Ensure access …
Transfer Curriculum Goals	A Transfer Curriculum Goal: Global Perspective To increase students' understanding of the growing interdependence of nations and peoples and develop their ability to apply a comparative perspective to cross-cultural social, economic and political experiences. …
Institute for International Education **Purpose**	Promote Access to Opportunity IIE provides opportunities to underserved populations, protects scholars and students in danger and encourages teaching and learning across cultures.

Note. This table shows external participants' "global education" discourse.

Appendix F: Access Theme One—Plan Participants

Table F1

Internationalization Plans: Improving Access to Global Education

Improving Access to Global Education Opportunities	
Study Abroad	**Excerpt**
IL-SP Plan	Because of its success, COD's Field and Experiential Learning/Study Abroad/Global Education program is so successful in creating new opportunities for students, the Institute of International Education recently ranked it second among CCs nationwide for international study opportunities.
NY-DEI Plan	We are the only CC in New York State to have any students receive the Benjamin A. Gilman Scholarship, designed to increase diversity in study abroad by increasing funding for non-traditional groups to unusual locales.
NY-DEI	Increase Underrepresented Minority student participation in high impact academic opportunities (internships, study abroad, capstone courses, Honors College, Phi Theta Kappa). Responsibility: CDO/ODESS/Global Initiatives
MD-EMP Plan	Identify and address barriers to participation in study abroad opportunities for diverse students.
WA-INT Plan	Campus internationalization is the ongoing process of collaborating across departments and programs to prepare all of our students to be global-ready and to thrive in our diverse, international communities in the Twin Cities and beyond. This includes incorporating international content in courses and co-curricular activities, providing pathways to study abroad/study away, developing intercultural competence, and fostering global partnerships.
AZ-DEI Plan	INITIATIVE 6: EXPAND GLOBAL PARTNERSHIPS AND INTERNATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES Strategy 1: Expand opportunities for students, faculty, and staff to study abroad through exchanges, short and long-term programs, and service learning. [Benchmark: Increase number of students and faculty participating in MC-sponsored international opportunity by 200% by 2021; Increase number of courses globalized through GHI to 60 by 2021.]
WA-INT*	Study Abroad Goal: Offer equitable opportunities, affordability, programs to support success and retention for all student populations Purpose: To advocate for, encourage, and support SA programs that internationalize the curriculum and maximize student experiential learning while focusing on diversity, accessibility, and affordability Outputs: 1. Study abroad processes and practices centralized and standardized 2. Info about SA included in HD 100 FYE 3. SA toolkit developed 4. Faculty trained on how to lead and propose SA programs

Table F1 (cont'd)

NY-DEI Plan	

Objective	Action	Unit(s) of measurement
Develop students' global awareness and sensitivity to cultural differences	Increase PCC Study Abroad Program and international learning opportunities locally and abroad	Number of PCC Study Abroad and international learning opportunities

WA-INT Plan	Goals: Prepare students to succeed in an interconnected and interdependent world
	Purpose: Collaborate with faculty and staff to ensure that [CC] students are exposed to international perspectives and build global competence
	Outputs:
	1. Completed inventory of courses that are internationalized.
	2. Faculty learning community on curriculum internationalization is established
	3. Toolkit on curriculum internationalization is developed

MN-INT Plan	Campus internationalization is the ongoing process of collaborating across departments and programs to prepare all of our students to be global-ready and to thrive in our diverse, international communities in the Twin Cities and beyond. This includes incorporating international content in courses and co-curricular activities, providing pathways to study abroad/study away, developing intercultural competence, and fostering global partnerships.

MD-EMP Plan	Goal: Expand Global Partnerships and International Opportunities
	Measurement: Globalization of the Curriculum

NY-DEI Plan	Goal: Prepare students, faculty, and staff for citizenship in a global society through increased international experience and interaction.
	Measurement: Increased Internationalization of curriculum

AZ-DEI Plan	

Objective	Action	Unit(s) of measurement
Design multicultural, global learning and social justice experiences for students	Increase connections between PCC and appropriate community partners	Numbers of community connections, student experiences, student participants
Design multicultural and global learning experiences for faculty and staff	Increase connections between PCC and appropriate community partners	Number of community connections; number of faculty and staff experiences

IL-SP Plan	NA

Note. This table shows plan participants' "global education" discourse which emphasizes

increasing access through study abroad and internationalizing the curriculum.

Table G1

Internal Discourse Participants' Global Education Discourse

Improving Access to Global Education Opportunities: Study Abroad	
Internal Organization	**Sample Discourse**
IL-SP **Unit: Field Experience/Study Abroad/Global Education**	Actions: • Study Away • Study Abroad Financial Aid • CC Initiative Program: "CCI participants are recruited from historically underrepresented and underserved communities."
NY-DEI **Global Initiatives Office**	"The global initiatives office aims to deliver exceptional global experiences for domestic students via our evolving study away offerings, for international students wanting to enroll in our more than 40 degree programs, and ESL classes, and for foreign institutions wanting to explore partnerships for academic programs, ESL, virtual exchanges, and more." (nothing about funding) "When we think of global education, we tend to think of mobility. However, as the world increasingly becomes equipped technologically for collaborative exchange in a virtual setting, educators are beginning to think of global education in a different way. Virtual exchange and collaborative programming offers an accessible, equitable, and sustainable alternative or supplement to global offerings." "CC sponsors short term programs in several different countries."
MN-INT **International Experience Center**	"The International Experience Center develops study abroad (international) and study away (domestic) courses."
MD-EMP **Global Humanities Institute**	"The college mission to bring greater awareness of global perspectives to the study body and community has led to the development of an international education program that provides opportunities through a variety of activities to foster a greater understanding and appreciation of other cultures. . . .. Two new programs have come to CC. The Global Exchange Through Social Media program and the Virtual International Internship program."

Table G1 (cont'd)

WA-INT **International Education and Global Initiatives Office**	**"These initiatives reflect the awareness that internationalization has to become more inclusive by focusing on both mobility and curriculum."**
CA-EMP-5 **Study Abroad Office**	"The benefits of study abroad- language immersion, multi-cultural experience, travel, and creating opportunities for career advancement- far outweigh the financial cost. Our programs are one of the most affordable options, and with good planning, you can certainly make it happen!" Actions: Financial Aid Resources
Improving Access to Global Education Opportunities: Internationalizing Curriculum	
WA-INT **International Education and Global Initiatives Office**	"These initiatives reflect the awareness that internationalization has to become more inclusive by focusing on both mobility and curriculum."
MN-INT **International Experience Center**	Normandale Diaspora Project: "The goal of the Normandale Diaspora Project is to center the voices of members of diaspora communities on our campus and provide resources for opening up conversations about diaspora (and related topics) in classes and spaces throughout [CC]."
MD-EMP **Global Humanities Institute**	"Global Classroms is one way the Global Humanities Institute is bringing the world to [CC] college students."
NY-DEI **Global Initiatives Office**	"The Global Initiatives office helps support Internatioanlization at Home initiatives and helps faculty and departments internationalize their curricula."
IL-SP **Unit: Field Experience/Study Abroad/Global Education**	Professional Development Toolkit: Ensuring that courses and program activities include global perspectives is central to the development of an internationalized curriculum. While only a small number of students can benefit from educational experiences abroad, internationalized curricula have the potential to affect all students.

Note. This table shows internal discourse participants' global education discourse on the topic of

improving access.

Table H1

Democratic Logic in Internationalization Discourse

Logic Categories	# of Instances	Logic Subcode	Beliefs/Values/Actions	# of Instances
Opportunity	118	Reducing Barriers	Offer/Expand resources (e.g., funding, advising, information)	54
		Access	Increase opportunities/Expand access	47
		Transparency	Publicly available plans Listing text participants	17
Empowerment	107	Participation	Increase Student / faculty engagement in global education	46
		Nurture	Develop students' skills and abilities, knowledge and attitudes to be global citizens	21
		Orientation toward making change	Learn to challenge injustices, solve problems in global context/community	22
		Governance	Faculty, staff, student representation/participation in strategic planning	10
		Civic Engagement	Global citizenship descriptions	8
Community	76	Association of Actions and Ideas between People	Develop Intercultural Competencies; embrace all nationalities and cultures; respect diversity; interdependence, interconnectedness	36
		Global Community	Global society, global, interdependence/ interconnectedness	27
		Local community	Serve local students, multicultural community, diaspora community	13
Emancipation	28	Human Encounter	Student-centered Faculty-centered	18
		Challenge Nature of Power	Critical pedagogy Critical global citizen	10

Note. Table H1 summarizes these findings by showing each democratic logic category, the number of instances per category, and the logic subcode for each category. Table 15 also includes related beliefs/values/actions codes and the number of occurrences.

Table H2

Neoliberal Logic in Internationalization Discourse

Logic Categories	# of Instances	Logic Subcode	Beliefs/Values/Actions	# of Instances
Production	144	Accountability through Quantification	Increase number of programs/funding sources/engagement	34
		Managerial	Centralized practices (e.g., inventories/databases)	24
		Free-market governance	Produce global workforce for industry/nation	19
		Credentialing	Completion, skills gap	17
		Reward wealth	Producing programming dependent on mobility	13
		Efficiency	Standardize processes	12
		Consolidation	State/regional consortiums for producing study abroad programs	9
		Consumerism	Value-added education, marketing global education	6
		Profit	Increase institutional revenues through international student recruitment/enrollment	5
		Individualism	Be the best/standout to produce more	5
Competition	90	Individualism	Standout to generate more; offer the best; leading economic state/nation; falling behind other countries' economies/education credentials	30
		Free-market governance	Value global economy; Lead in global economy; response decrease in state funding	23
		Success through quantification	Best programs/most success/leading field based on metrics	16
		Credentialing	Micro-credentials, skills lead to more competitive and employable workers; response to decrease in state funding	10
		Reward wealth	Membership	9
		Freedom of choice	Students/faculty choose institution/program for its world-class status	2
Commodification	71	Consumerism	Export knowledge; recruitment strategies; (economic) value-added education; supply and demand; Response decrease in state funding	32

Table H2 (cont'd)

		Freedom of choice	Recruitment strategies; global travel	11
		Reward wealth	Global travel; recruitment strategies; pay-to play membership	10
		Accountability through quantification	Enrollment metrics, new revenue streams	10
		Managerial	Executive leadership and administrative role	4
		Defunding public resources	Response decreases in state funding	4
Material Wealth	41	Nation/State Economy First	Economic growth and development National prosperity	16
Privatization	31	Managerial	Centralized administration	9
		Redistribution of wealth/power	Executive level management; Supporting business industry success	9
		Free-market governance	Meeting industry demands	5
		Reward Wealth	Recruiting agents	4
		Defunding public resources	Response decrease in state funding	4
		Individualism	Consolidated organization	2

Note. Table H2 summarizes these findings by showing each neoliberal logic category, the number of instances per category, and the logic subcode for each category. Table 16 also includes related beliefs/values/action codes and the number of occurrences.

Appendix I: Citizenship Theme One—External Participants

Table I1

External Participants' Global Citizenship Discourse

External Social Groups: Preparing Global Citizens	
Organization / Source	**Discourse Sample**
Higher Learning Commission Standards **Criterion 1: Mission**	The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations. 1.C. The institution provides opportunities for civic engagement in a diverse, multicultural society and globally connected world, as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves. • The institution encourages curricular or cocurricular activities that prepare students for informed citizenship and workplace success. • The institution's processes and activities demonstrate inclusive and equitable treatment of diverse populations. • The institution fosters a climate of respect among all students, faculty, staff and administrators from a range of diverse backgrounds, ideas and perspectives.
CCs for International Development (CCID) **Mission, Vison, Values, and Impact Statements**	CCID member institutions play a vital role in promoting international education and facilitating global citizenship. CCID believes: • An appreciation of international perspectives and values enhances all aspects of one\'s life. • Global Citizens embrace all nationalities and cultures. • Global understanding, cultural competence, and engagement promote student success, business productivity, and healthier communities. • Every institution of higher learning should create transformative international experiences through teaching, travel, and community engagement.
NAFSA **About Statement**	International education is the cornerstone for building a more understanding and peaceful world. With more than 10,000 members worldwide, NAFSA: Association of International Educators is the leading organization committed to international education and exchange, working to advance policies and practices that build global citizens with the knowledge and skills they need to succeed in today's interconnected world.
California CC System **Strategic Plan**	With the sixth largest economy in the world, California needs well-educated workers to propel our economy forward. Just as important, California needs engaged, well-informed citizens to participate in our thriving democracy and tackle the complex issues of our state.

Note. This table shows external participants' global citizenship discourse.

Table J1

Global Citizenship—Internationalization Plans

College Plan	Sample Excerpt
NY-DEI Plan	We serve our community by meeting educational needs, creating an environment for student success, and preparing our students and ourselves for citizenship in a global society.
	The department's staff and programming assist staff, faculty, and students to be good citizens of our global society, both domestically and abroad.
	Goal: Prepare students, faculty, and staff for citizenship in a global society through Increased International experience and interaction.
AZ-DEI Plan	We understand that the "community" in the CC of the 21st Century extends beyond local political boundaries, thus we aspire to build a community of responsible global citizens.
	Goal: Prepare students, faculty and staff to adapt and succeed in a diverse, global, multicultural and multi-ethnic society.
	Global citizen: PCC aspires "to build a community of responsible global citizens." A global citizen is someone who understands interconnectedness, respects and values diversity, has the ability to challenge injustice, and takes action in personally meaningful ways. Today's education for global citizenship empowers students to understand and exercise their human rights in ways that demonstrate solidarity with human beings everywhere and make a positive impact on the world (UNICEF).
CA-EMP-1	Global Citizenship Institutional Learning Outcome: Understanding the interconnection between current events, ethics, and personal and societal choices within our world.
	Institutional Guiding Question: How do we prepare our students to become globally aware citizens with knowledge and understanding of emerging global issues such as sustainable living, climate change, cultural competence, and social responsibility?
	Justice Administration Program Description: The program is dedicated to enriching society, embracing diversity, addressing global responsibility, and contributing to both the economic and social development of the surrounding community.

Table J1 (cont'd)

CA-EMP-5	The Social Justice Conference: The focus of the event is to highlight the importance of education in the creation of a just and equal society. The conference draws 250-300 participants and is open to all those interested in social justice in education with a special emphasis on faculty, staff, administrators, and students. Conference organizer and City College English Professor Paul Alexander explained, "At its core, social justice is the foundation of education. An education that ignores social realities and teaches a curriculum detached from an individual's ability to contribute to a more just and equitable world is a disservice to its participants. Instead of creating a healthy community with true civic engagement, it builds a society of uncritical workers devoid of true meaning and purpose."
	Black Studies Program Learning Outcome: Evaluate the role of active citizens who will be engaged in the global community.
	Self-Evaluation Report in Support of Reaffirmation of Accreditation: SDCC's general education courses instill the value of ethics, civility, cultural diversity, and the responsibilities of local, national, and global citizenship.
	One of the stated goals of the college is 'to prepare student to become "world-citizens" in the twenty-first century' and in doing so 'develop the whole person who is prepared to be an active citizen and participate in a global community'
MN-INT* Plan	Argument for Internationalization: CCs, which educate more individuals than any other type of higher education institution, can and should play a critical role in helping students become "global ready."
	Global-ready Normandale faculty, staff, and students demonstrate intercultural competence and a commitment to collaboratively solving local and global problems.
IL-SP	Environmental Scan: Student Activism Student activism in today's society includes a much broader range of causes, which includes, international solidarity, human rights, affirmative action, gender equality, diversity in higher education, programs of study and environmental concerns.

Note. This table shows plan participants' "global citizenship" discourse.

Table K1

Internal Discourse Participants' Global Citizenship Discourse

College Plan	Internal Social Structure-Discourse Sample
MN-INT* **International Experience Center**	Global Studies Certificate: The purpose of the Global Studies Certificate is to offer educational opportunities for a student to become a productive, global citizen and future leader in the community, state, nation, and world.
NY-DEI **Global Initiatives Office**	Study abroad makes students better leaders and more employable global citizens" "The Office of Global Initiatives creates, encourages, and maintains global learning opportunities that prepare and empower students to become engaged citizens of a diverse world." The office also helps support Internationalization at Home initiatives around the CC campus and helps faculty and departments internationalize their curricula.
WA-INT* **College Strategic Plan** **International Education and Global Initiatives Office (IEGI)**	Strategic Plan Commitment: "educating students to be global citizens" Strategic partnerships advance "student learning, as global citizens and as future members of a global workforce
CA-EMP-5 **Learning Communities** **Study Abroad Office**	Learning community students will achieve global perspective: Evolve into life-long scholars, conscious citizens and ethical leaders by integrating what they learn into their world view and other academic and social experiences. "[Study abroad programs] also serve to inspire and inform students, preparing them with the skills necessary to effectively engage with local and global communities and become culturally perceptive citizens.
CA-EMP-1 **Learning and Career Pathways in Social Sciences**	Global Citizenship Studies AA: Describe key developments in the ongoing processes of globalization, climate change, mono-culturalization, decreasing biodiversity and ongoing social injustices and inequities; analyze the concepts of global and local interdependence with reference to Unite Nations policies and documents, critically consider and connect political, economic, cultural, and ecological challenges as discussed in contemporary news and social media venues, and examine and practice strategies for solution.
MD-EMP **Global Humanities Institute**	We know that in order to address the needs of our societies and communities in the future, we will need a deep understanding of our global interconnectedness.

Note. This table shows plan participants' "global citizenship" discourse.

Appendix L: Institutional Effectiveness Theme Two—External Participants

Table L1

External Discourse Participants' Leveraging Internationalization Discourse

External Discourse Participants: Leveraging Internationalization	
Organization / Source	**Discourse Sample**
Higher Learning Commission **Accreditation Standard**	Criterion 5. Institutional Effectiveness, Resources and Planning The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. 5.C. The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning and improvement. Institutional planning anticipates evolving external factors, such as technology advancements, demographic shifts, globalization, the economy and state support.
American Council on Education **Definition and purpose of Comprehensive Internationalization**	Internationalization is a means for understanding and advancing human and technical connectivity; fostering local and global interdisciplinary research and teaching; supporting social, economic, and civic development; and propelling higher education forward as an equitable and agile public good. Agility & Transformation Lens …Institutions that are comprehensive, mission-driven, strategic, and adaptable demonstrate core stability and capacity to not only be resilient, but to grow—to transform—in adverse situations. They leverage current resources along with innovative, entrepreneurial thinking to explore creative solutions in time of crisis. The transformation lens is a strategic, coordinated, intentional process through which higher education institutions align and integrate policies, programs, initiatives, and individuals… Data-Informed Decision-Making Lens … Metrics and collective reflection provide a qualitative and quantitative way to take stock, analyze, and make sense of actual strengths and barriers to learner and organizational success—moving beyond perceptions and assumed narratives. … COMPREHENSIVE INTERNATIONALIZATION, as defined by ACE, is a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate policies, programs, and initiatives to position colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally connected institutions

Table L1 (cont'd)

American Association of CCs **Global Education Policy Brief**	Our world and workplace are rapidly changing, becoming more diverse and globalized. For CC leaders and other decision makers, the importance of global education is an urgent need that is deeply rooted in economics—student employability, our ability to live and work successfully in diverse environments, and the prosperity of local communities. As the largest and most diverse sector of U.S. higher education, CCs are essential and uniquely situated to ensure America's future economic prosperity. Civil Society … As new immigrants arrive from more diverse places around the world, the face of America is dramatically changing and CCs play an important role to ensure a civil society which facilitates the free of forces necessary for economic development. Increasingly, immigrants are encountered in every facet of American life. Whether as a customer, employer, or employee, the need for intercultural and global competence has become increasingly important in American society. Prosperous Local communities U.S. communities, especially in rural areas, are increasingly competing for foreign investment, and globally competent and competitive workers make such communities more attractive to foreign subsidiaries. CCs, 43% of which are in rural areas, play a crucial role in helping local communities attract foreign investment. Such foreign investment (i.e., insourcing) has profoundly positive effects on both the local and national economy… Valued Workers Our local and national prosperity are inexorably linked to the global economy. Today's employers look for and highly value globally competent workers. CCs can have a direct and immediate impact on ensuring American prosperity by preparing a future workforce that can live and work successfully in a global economy.
American Association of CCs **Empowering CCs To Build the Nation's Future—An Implementation Guide**	Chapter Four Refocus the CC mission and redefine institutional roles Develop the role of brokers of educational opportunities Example: The Global Corporate College is a nationwide network of colleges that provides consistent, high-quality training for national and multinational corporations.
Institute for International Education **Mission**	IIE's mission is to help people and organizations leverage the power of international education to thrive in today's interconnected world. IIE helps governments and corporations develop an educated workforce and prepare students and professionals to succeed in the global economy.

Table L1 (cont'd)

American Association of CCs Empowering CCs To Build the Nation's Future—An Implementation Guide	Creating the seamless transition between education and work requires another level of collaboration—in this case, among postsecondary education, employers, and their respective agencies and organizations— so that colleges are offering the programs and teaching the knowledge and skills that will effectively prepare students for a rapidly changing and globally competitive labor market. If CCs take bold action to improve college completion, they not only will better serve their students, but they also can help rebuild the U.S. workforce and improve its global competitiveness… **Recommendation: Close the American skills gap** **Close the American skills gap by sharply focusing career and technical education on preparing students with the knowledge and skills required for existing and future jobs in regional and global economies.**
Office of Postsecondary Education-International and Foreign Education Programs	The International and Foreign Language Education (IFLE) office administers Title VI (domestic) and Fulbright-Hays (overseas) grant and fellowship programs that strengthen foreign language instruction, area/international studies teaching and research, professional development for educators, and curriculum development at the K-12, graduate, and postsecondary levels. IFLE programs: … • Contribute to developing a globally competent workforce able to engage with a multilingual and multicultural clientele at home and abroad • Support teaching and research on critical world regions, languages, and issues
CCs for International Development (CCID) About Statement	Founded in 1976, CCID has been helping members further their internationalization initiatives and develop globally competent workers for the past 40 years. Today, more than ever, employers are looking for graduates with multi-cultural experiences and CCID is committed to helping our members meet that need.
State of California	**External factor: "California's call to increase by at least 20 percent the number of California CC students annually who acquire associate degrees, credentials, certificates, or specific skill sets that prepare them for an in-demand job."**
Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MSCU) Strategic Framework	Strategic Framework 1) Play an essential role in growing Minnesota economy and opening doors for educational opportunity. 2) Ensure access 3) Be a partner of choice to meeting workforce and community needs 4) Deliver highest value
Transfer Curriculum Goals	A Transfer Curriculum Goal: Global Perspective To increase students' understanding of the growing interdependence of nations and peoples and develop their ability to apply a comparative perspective to cross-cultural social, economic and political experiences.

Table L1 (cont'd)

California CC System **Strategic Plan**	MISSION With 2.1 million students attending 116 colleges, our mission is to provide students with the knowledge and background necessary to compete in today's economy. The colleges deliver training programs for both future and current workers to prepare them to be competitive with the workforces of other countries in the application of emerging technologies. With the sixth largest economy in the world, California needs well-educated workers to propel our economy forward. Just as important, California needs engaged, well-informed citizens to participate in our thriving democracy and tackle the complex issues of our state.
American Association of CCs **Global Education Policy Brief**	"The most common internationalization activity at CCs is international student recruitment and support services. More than 700 CCs are federally approved to enroll international students. • 86,351 international students were enrolled at U.S. CCs during the 2018-2019 academic year. They contributed $2.6 billion to the U.S. economy and supported 13,970 U.S. jobs. • Only 30 institutions located 9 U.S. states enroll more than half (43,200) of all international student at CCs. 12 of them are in California. • Most international students attend CCs to obtain the first 2 years of a postsecondary education, and plan to transfer to a 4-year college or university to obtain a bachelor's degree.
Education USA Mission Statement Excerpt	EducationUSA Serves the U.S. Higher Education Community [through] EducationUSA advisers [who] support the international student recruitment and internationalization efforts of all accredited U.S. higher education institutions by: (Education USA, Pos. 9)

Note. This table shows excerpts of external participants' leveraging internationalization

discourse.

Appendix M: Institutional Effectiveness Theme Two—Plan Participants

Table M1

Internationalization Plan Discourse Participants' Leveraging Internationalization Discourse

Plan	Responding to Decreased State Funding
IL-SP	1) Institutional Goal Section a) Goal 2: Value Added Education College of DuPage is committed to ensuring the courses and programs we provide deliver facts, experience, skills, and intellectual growth to students and the community. College of DuPage is committed to going beyond standard expectations and providing something more to the students and communities we serve. To accomplish this, we will: Grow credit enrollment by enhancing and being known for providing exceptional educational and cultural experience to students (e.g., study abroad programs, learning technologies, co-curricular activities).

MD-EMP	Goal: Offer [CC] Curriculum and Credentials Globally
	
	    a) INITIATIVE 6: EXPAND GLOBAL PARTNERSHIPS AND INTERNATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES
	      i) As we prepare students to live and work in an increasingly globalized environment, the Academic Affairs division must foster new opportunities for students, staff, faculty, and Academic Affairs units to work with international governments, businesses, and institutions of higher education in order to provide a twenty-first century education for our students and much-needed services and expertise to our colleagues abroad. In light of shrinking state funding, we must be willing and able to export our knowledge and leverage entrepreneurial efforts to fund programs for our own students.
	      (1) Strategy 2: Establish new global partnerships for entrepreneurial, educational, and/ or community outreach purposes. [Benchmark: Increase in the number of global partnerships/ contracts/ memoranda of understanding (MOUs) to 20 by 2021.]

WA-INT*	Goal: Pursue funding opportunities to mitigate decreased state support Purpose: To reduce dependency on state funding while engaging the [CC] community and external stakeholders in expanding and enhancing the quality and quantity of GI programs/events domestically and internationally

Table M1 (cont'd)

CA-EMP-1	Enrollment Productivity and Efficiency Measures: "As the basis for state funding, FTES (or Full-Time Equivalent Students) is an enrollment measurement that represents the income associated with instruction. If the college enrollments are dropping, the state will reduce funding. However, if enrollments are growing, the state will increase funding up to the cap. To maximize funding from the state, most colleges try to achieve a slight amount of unfunded growth each year. This unfunded growth both ensures that the college does not fall below its projected FTES and makes the college eligible for growth monies. Due to the direct link between FTES and funding from the state, FTES trends are important to examine and serve as a key indicator for college planning." Outreach and Recruitment: "The CC Outreach Department must continue to prepare for a growing diverse population, including many international students and adult learners, by increasing awareness through a variety of unique recruitment strategies and personalized support throughout their college experience." . . . "Funding: If sparking an educational interest is one of the most critical outreach objectives, then increasing the Full Time Equivalent Student (FTES) number is equally as important, in order to obtain the necessary funding. Presently, the Outreach Department is funded by two budgets: the Student Success & Support Program and the Student Equity Plan. Appropriations for both are contingent upon the State's ability to provide funding each year. Continued outreach success will require the administration to commit to paying for this department with general funds." English as a Second Language Department International students, who pay non-resident tuition, now make up between 25-30% of the CC ESL student enrollment. These students are enrolled in the college on average from two-and-a-half to three years before they complete associate degrees and/or transfer to UCs and CSUs and commonly take four semesters of ESL core classes as well as ESL electives in preparation for ENGL 100. They are required by Federal law to enroll in a minimum of twelve units per semester in a credit program." Future of International Student Programs: "The international student population will also be changing in the future. ISP has seen an increase in the number of students from the following regions: Southeast Asia, Middle East and Europe. . .. These demographic shifts will have financial benefits for the college because international students are required to pay non-resident fees and therefore generate and contribute revenue to both the district and the college, so there is a clear financial incentive in hosting and enrolling international students at CC."

CA-EMP-2	Institutional Goal: "Core Commitment for A Vision for Success"
	  a) "Enable Action and Thoughtful Innovation
	    i) More full-time students
	      (1) "As part of its strategy for growth, the College might wish to accelerate the idea of creating affordable student housing on campus.
	        (a) International students offer a similar possibility

Plan	**Internationalizing for Institutional Effectiveness: Responding to Government Mandates**
CA-EMP-5	The National Completion Agenda . . . has brought many changes to the CCs.

Table M1 (cont'd)

IL-SP	Trend: The skills gap is hurting national and local competitiveness and impeding economic growth. College of DuPage wants to work with business leaders to develop strategies to close the gap in both white collar and industrial or technical areas, and ensure our local workforce is prepared to perform. COD has a long history of partnering with employers to develop educational programs to meet changing workforce needs. National completion agenda
CA-EMP-3	The Completion Agenda: The need to increase student achievement of degrees and certificates in order to meet current and projected workforce needs. (Source: aacc.nche.edu). …. Forty-two percent of adults in the United States have completed an associate degree or higher, compared to 64 percent in South Korea and close to 60 percent in Japan and Canada. In a global comparison of the portion of the population that have attained postsecondary education, the United States ranks 12th. In addition to this requirement that each college develop plans to address equity issues, the State's urgency to contribute to the Completion Agenda and to reduce the Achievement Gap have driven a number of initiatives, policy changes, and funding allocations in California since 2012. . . The following are a few examples of the initiatives that the College is currently successfully implementing. … Study Abroad
CA-EMP-3	The Completion Agenda: The need to increase student achievement of degrees and certificates in order to meet current and projected workforce needs. (Source: aacc.nche.edu). …. Forty-two percent of adults in the United States have completed an associate degree or higher, compared to 64 percent in South Korea and close to 60 percent in Japan and Canada. In a global comparison of the portion of the population that have attained postsecondary education, the United States ranks 12th. In addition to this requirement that each college develop plans to address equity issues, the State's urgency to contribute to the Completion Agenda and to reduce the Achievement Gap have driven a number of initiatives, policy changes, and funding allocations in California since 2012. . . The following are a few examples of the initiatives that the College is currently successfully implementing. … Study Abroad

MD-EMP	Externally, even as funding streams are reduced, redirected, or cut off entirely, colleges are called upon to improve completion rates and align programs with workforce needs—all while adapting our strategies to serve an ever-changing student body.
	
	Initiative: Expand Global Partnerships and International
	Opportunities
	Strategy: Expand opportunities for students, faculty, and staff to study abroad through exchanges, short and long-term programs, and service learning.
	
	Aligns with Academic Priorities:
	1. Increase the graduation rate of first-time, full-time students.
	2. Increase the student transfer rate.
	
	Strategy: Establish new global partnerships for entrepreneurial, educational, and/or community outreach purposes
	Aligns with Academic Priorities:
	      1. Align programs with workforce needs and
	        industry demands

Table M1 (cont'd)

AZ-DEI	The 21st century's global economy will value transnational leadership skills, fluency in multiple languages, and respect for and understanding of other cultures.
	DEI Goal: Prepare students, faculty and staff to adapt and succeed in a diverse, global, multicultural, multi-ethnic society.
	Aligns with:
	Core Theme and Objective of DEI:
	• Expand and support the diversity of the College's student population
	• Expand and support the diversity of the College's workforce
	• Develop and increase the student population through global education
	2017-2021 Strategic Plan:
	• Strategic direction 1: Improve student success
	"Declining enrollment and College data on student progress and success indicate that the College can do more to help students earn a college degree or certificate.
	Analyze available information, including attendance data, student input from surveys and practices at peer institutions, to identify and implement strategies to increase course completion" (Excerpt from Strategic Plan)
	• Strategic direction 2: Enrich the community through engagement
	"The College will work with its K-12, university, and business/industry partners to develop a coherent educational strategy that ensures student success and that builds a skilled workforce that will promote the general prosperity of the County." (Excerpt from Strategic Plan)
	Initiative: PCC Plan for Internationalization (sample below)
	Objective: Develop students' global awareness and sensitivity to cultural differences
	Action: Increase PCC Study Abroad Program and international learning opportunities locally and abroad
	Objective: Increase overall PCC students' exposure to different world views
	Action: Increase international student engagement in cross-cultural learning activities
MN-INT*	Campus internationalization is the ongoing process of collaborating across departments and programs to prepare all of our students to be global-ready and to thrive in our diverse, international communities in the Twin Cities and beyond.
	Global-ready Normandale faculty, staff, and students demonstrate intercultural competence and a commitment to collaboratively solving local and global problems.
	Our goal is to provide opportunities for our students to develop the skills and perspectives they need to work with people from different cultural backgrounds to innovate and solve local and global problems.

Note. This table shows excerpts of plan participants' leveraging internationalization discourse.

Appendix N: Institutional Effectiveness Theme Two—Internal Participants

Table N1

Internal Discourse Participants' Leveraging Internationalization Discourse

Plan	Excerpts of Internal Discourse
WA-INT* **Global Initiatives Offices**	In the last 5 years, CC has maintained its place among the top 20 international-hosting CCs in the nation. CC has benefit from its diverse community and the support of the administration and the Board of Trustees. As a result, CC has decided to consolidate and extend its progress to pursue a new vision for comprehensive international education that integrates an international dimension into our teachings, activities, and administration with the aim of becoming a regional center for international education and global initiatives. Entrepreneurial: As with many colleges and universities across the United States and around the world, at CC we are reexamining our efforts towards international engagement and partnerships. …. A Strategic Partnership is generally pursued with an institution within a country with strategic importance for the internationalization of the CC. Strategic Partnerships will have campus wide significance, involving multiple CC departments and units. They represent an institutional commitment to long-term, broad-based, sustainable relationships. Goals of strategic partnerships: … Generating revenue through tuition and grants; General institutional capacity building Practice: International Student Recruitment Team
MN-INT* **Certificate Description** **College news brief on certificate**	The International Experience Certificate is a 14-credit certificate that can be completed on its own or paired with any other certificate or degree program to communicate to future employers that you are ready to work in a diverse, global environment. CC takes great pride in its ability to respond to the needs of the community and its industry partners. One of the concerns that CC has recently heard from industry is a need for employees who know more than one language and can demonstrate that they have a global perspective and awareness. CC has responded with a flexible international Experience Certificate. The certificate adds an important skill set to pair with a degree and can also be a great option on its own to help individuals to succeed professionally.
CA-EMP-4	The mission of Career Education Programs at CC is to engage, prepare, and educate learners, communities, and employees for careers in a global and competitive workforce.

Note. This table shows excerpts of internal participants' leveraging internationalization

discourse.

Appendix O: Theme One—Excluding and Othering Students

Table O1

Excluding International Students in Global Education

Plan	Excluding International Students in Global Education
AZ-DEI	The College acknowledges and embraces that its prime responsibility is to Southern Arizonans, especially its underrepresented, marginalized communities.
NY-DEI	Increase URM [underrepresented minority] student participation in high impact academic opportunities (internships, study abroad, capstone courses, Honors College, Phi Theta Kappa). Responsibility: CDO/ODESS/Global Initiatives
NY-DEI **Global Initiatives Office**	"The global initiatives office aims to deliver exceptional global experiences for domestic students via our evolving study away offerings"
IL-SP	College of DuPage engages in planning to assure that it is future-oriented in serving our students, community, and other stakeholders. Opportunities are external factors that the College can leverage to create value for our students and community or give the College a better competitive advantage. Our nation is in a college-readiness crisis. Too few of our students are prepared to enter the workforce or post-secondary education without additional training or remediation when they graduate from high school.
CA-EMP-5	[CC] is a multi-cultural institution committed to providing open access to all who can benefit from instruction and to meeting the diverse and ever-changing educational, cultural, and economic needs of the urban core and surrounding communities of [CC].

Note. This table shows excerpts of exclusionary discourse.

Table O2

Othering International Students in Global Education

Plan	Othering International Students in Global Education
AZ-DEI	Strategic Goal 6 (i.e., internationalization goal) Prepare students, faculty and staff to adapt and succeed in a diverse, global, multicultural, multi-ethnic society.
IL-SP	Institutional Goal 4: Equality and Inclusiveness • College of DuPage is committed to ensuring that all stakeholders are involved in setting institutional direction; that their perspectives are heard and valued, and their needs are understood and addressed. To accomplish this, we will: Strategic Objective: Develop and implement programs and services to enhance institutional diversity and global engagement, including recruitment and support for international students.
NY-DEI	Institutional DEI Goal 5: Prepare students, faculty, and staff for citizenship in a global society through increased international experience and interaction • Strategy: Develop and implement a recruitment plan to increase and diversify international student enrollment. • Assessment: target enrollment of traditional international students $\geq 6\%$
WA-INT*	Global Initiatives works on instilling a global perspective in our students by exposing them to other countries, cultures and languages.

Note. This table shows excerpts of exclusionary discourse.

Appendix P: Theme Two—Excluding and Othering Students

Table P1

Excluding and Othering Students in Institutional Effectiveness Discourse

Plan	Othering Students in Institutional Effectiveness Discourse
CA-EMP-1	Enrollment Productivity and Efficiency Measures: "Due to the direct link between FTES and funding from the state, FTES trends are important to examine and serve as a key indicator for college planning." Outreach and Recruitment: "The CC Outreach Department must continue to prepare for a growing diverse population, including many international students and adult learners, by increasing awareness through a variety of unique recruitment strategies and personalized support throughout their college experience." . . . "Funding: If sparking an educational interest is one of the most critical outreach objectives, then increasing the Full Time Equivalent Student (FTES) number is equally as important, in order to obtain the necessary funding." English as a Second Language Department International students, who pay non-resident tuition, …. are required by Federal law to enroll in a minimum of twelve units per semester in a credit program." These demographic shifts will have financial benefits for the college because international students are required to pay non-resident fees and therefore generate and contribute revenue to both the district and the college, so there is a clear financial incentive in hosting and enrolling international students at CC."
American Association of CCs **Empowering CCs to Build the Nation's Future—An Implementation Guide**	If CCs take bold action to improve college completion, they not only will better serve their students, but they also can help rebuild the U.S. workforce and improve its global competitiveness.

Table P1 (cont'd)

American Association of CCs **Global Education Policy Brief**	Our world and workplace are rapidly changing, becoming more diverse and globalized. For CC leaders and other decision makers, the importance of global education is an urgent need that is deeply rooted in economics—student employability, our ability to live and work successfully in diverse environments, and the prosperity of local communities. As the largest and most diverse sector of U.S. higher education, CCs are essential and uniquely situated to ensure America's future economic prosperity. Civil Society … As new immigrants arrive from more diverse places around the world, the face of America is dramatically changing and CCs play an important role to ensure a civil society which facilitates the free of forces necessary for economic development. Increasingly, immigrants are encountered in every facet of American life. Whether as a customer, employer, or employee, the need for intercultural and global competence has become increasingly important in American society. Prosperous Local communities U.S. communities, especially in rural areas, are increasingly competing for foreign investment, and globally competent and competitive workers make such communities more attractive to foreign subsidiaries. CCs, 43% of which are in rural areas, play a crucial role in helping local communities attract foreign investment. Such foreign investment (i.e., insourcing) has profoundly positive effects on both the local and national economy… Valued Workers Our local and national prosperity are inexorably linked to the global economy. Today's employers look for and highly value globally competent workers. CCs can have a direct and immediate impact on ensuring American prosperity by preparing a future workforce that can live and work successfully in a global economy.
CCs for International Development (CCID) **About Statement**	Founded in 1976, CCID has been helping members further their internationalization initiatives and develop globally competent workers for the past 40 years. Today, more than ever, employers are looking for graduates with multi-cultural experiences and CCID is committed to helping our members meet that need.

Note. This table shows excerpts of discourse producers othering of students in institutional

effectiveness discourse.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Aguilar-Smith, S., & Gonzales, L. D. (2021). A study of community college faculty work expectations: Generous educators and their managed generosity. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *45*(3), 184-204.

Alford, R. R., & Friedland, R. (1985). *Powers of theory: Capitalism, the state, and democracy*. Cambridge University Press.

Altbach, P. G. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management, 10*(1), 3-25.

Altbach, P.G. (2009). Globalization and forces for changes in higher education. *International Higher Education, 50*, 2-4.

American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). (2016). *Data points: Boom in certificates.* Washington, D.C. https://www.aacc.nche.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/DP_Jan7.pdf

American Association of Community Colleges (n.d.). *About us.* Retrieved October 15, 2020, from https://www.aacc.nche.edu/about-us/

American Association of Community Colleges (AACC). (2014). *Empowering community colleges to build the nation's future: An implementation guide.* http://www.aacc21stcenturycenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/EmpoweringCommunityColleges_final.pdf

American Association of Community Colleges (2020). *Case Studies in global education.* https://www.aacc.nche.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Case-Studies-update-2020_B.pdf

American Association of Community Colleges (2020a). *Fast facts 2020.* https://www.aacc.nche.edu/research-trends/fast-facts/

American Association of Community Colleges (2020b). *The Importance of global education.* https://www.aacc.nche.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Importance-of-Global_Education_2020.pdf

American Association of Community Colleges (n.d.a). *Research*. Retrieved October 15, 2020, from https://www.aacc.nche.edu/research-trends/

American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). (2020). *Voting rights act: Major dates in history.* https://www.aclu.org/voting-rights-act-major-dates-history

American Council on Education (ACE). (2012). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses*. http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/2012-Mapping-Internationalization-on-U-S--Campuses.aspx.

American Council on Education (ACE). (n.d.). *Research insights*. Retrieved October 15, 2020, from https://www.acenet.edu/Research-Insights/Pages/default.aspx

American Council on Education (ACE) (2020). *Comprehensive internationalization.* https://www.acenet.edu/Research-Insights/Pages/Internationalization/Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx

American Council on Education (ACE). (n.d.a). *About the American Council on Education*. Retrieved October 15, 2020, from https://www.acenet.edu/About/Pages/default.aspx

American Council on Education (ACE) (2020a). *Internationalization laboratory.* https://www.acenet.edu/Programs-Services/Pages/Professional-Learning/ACE-Internationalization-Laboratory.aspx

American Council on Education (ACE) (2020b). *Internationalization laboratory project*. https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Internationalization-Lab-Flyer.pdf

American Council on International Intercultural Education (ACIIE) (1996, November). Educating for the global community: A framework for CCs. In *Conference Report*. Muscatine, IA: Stanley Foundation.

American Psychological Association (APA). (2009). *Civic engagement.* https://www.apa.org/education/undergrad/civic-engagement

Appadurai, A. (1988). The social life of things. *Commodities in cultural perspective*, 6494.

Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA). (n.d.) *About us.* Retrieved October 15,2020 from https://www.aieaworld.org/about-us

Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA). (n.d.a). *Innovation award.* https://www.aieaworld.org/innovation-award

Ayers, D. F. (2015). Credentialing structures, pedagogies, practices, and curriculum goals: Trajectories of change in community college mission statements. *CC Review*, *43*(2), 191-214.

Ayers, D. F. (2013). From governance to competitiveness: A diachronic analysis of the community college discourse of local. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *10*(1), 99-116.

Ayers, D. F. (2005). Neoliberal ideology in community college mission statements: A critical discourse analysis. *The review of higher education*, *28*(4), 527-549.

Ayers, D. F., & Palmadessa, A. L. (2015). The community college and a rising global imaginary: An analysis of practical reasoning, 1950-2013. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *86*(6), 864-892.

Baber, L. D., Zamani-Gallaher, E. M., Stevenson, T. N., & Porter, J. (2019). From access to equity: Community colleges and the social justice imperative. In *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (pp. 203-240). Springer.

Baker, W. O. (2017). Democracy, class, and white settler colonialism. *Public*, *28*(55), 144-153.

Ballerini, V. (2017). Global higher education trends and national policies: access, privatization, and internationalization in Argentina. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education, 1*(1), 42-68.

Beelen, J., & Jones, E. (2015a). Looking back at 15 years of internationalisation at home. In *EAIE Forum member magazine* (No. Winter 2015, pp. 6-8).

Beelen, J., & Jones, E. (2015b). Redefining internationalization at home. In *The European higher education area*, 59-72. Springer.

Blackburn, R., Porto, S., & Thompson, J. (2016). Competency-based education and the relationship to digital badges. *Digital badges in education: Trends, issues, and cases*, 30-38.

Blaufarb, R. (1995). The French revolution: the birth of European popular democracy? *Comparative studies in society and history*, *37*(3), 608-618.

Bodine Al-Sharif, M. A., García, H. A., & McNaughtan, J. (2021). Making meaning of the mid-level administrator roles in international student service centers. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *92*(1), 116-139.

Bradshaw, G. W. (2013). Internationalization and faculty-led service learning. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2013*(161), 39-53.

Branham, D. S. (2018). *Designing for global learning in the community college: A multiple case study*. Michigan State University. [Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University University]. MSU Campus Repository. https://d.lib.msu.edu/etd

Brennan, M., & Dellow, D. A. (2013). International students as a resource for achieving comprehensive internationalization. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2013*(161), 27-37.

Brenner, A. (2016). Transformative learning through education abroad: A case study of a community college program. In *International Education at Community Colleges* (pp. 293-309). Palgrave Macmillan.

Brint, S. G., & Karabel, J. (1989). *The diverted dream: Community colleges and the promise of educational opportunity in America, 1900-1985*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Budd, D., Serban, A., Van Hook, D. G., & Raby, R. L. (2016). Addressing myths about international students. In *International Education at Community Colleges* (pp. 215-222). Palgrave Macmillan.

Butler, D. C. (2016). *Comprehensive internationalization: Examining the what, why, and how at community colleges* (Order No. 10111570). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1794166988). http://ezproxy.msu.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/docview/1794166988?accountid=12598

Byrd, J. A. (2011). *The transit of empire: Indigenous critiques of colonialism*. University of Minnesota Press.

Bylsma, P. E. (2015). The teleological effect of neoliberalism on American higher education. *College Student Affairs Leadership*, *2*(2), 3.

California Colleges for International Education (CCIE). (2020). *College Member Links*. http://www.ccieworld.org/

California Community Colleges (n.d.). *Contract Education.* Retrieved October 15, 2020, form https://www.cccco.edu/About-Us/Chancellors-Office/Divisions/Workforce-and-Economic-Development/Contract-Education

Campbell, D. S. (1930). *A critical study of the stated purposes of the junior college*. George Peabody College for Teachers.

Canhilal, S. K., Lepori, B., & Seeber, M. (2016). Decision-making power and institutional logic in higher education institutions: A comparative analysis of European universities. In *Towards a comparative institutionalism: Forms, dynamics and logics across the organizational fields of health care and higher education*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Cantwell, B. (2019). Are international students cash cows? Examining the relationship between new international undergraduate enrollments and institutional revenue at public colleges and universities in the US. *Journal of international students*, *5*(4), 512-525.

Cantwell, B., & Maldonado-Maldonado, A. (2009). Four stories: Confronting contemporary ideas about globalisation and internationalisation in higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *7*(3), 289-306.

Carnegie. (2019). *Voting rights: A short history.* https://www.carnegie.org/topics/topic-articles/voting-rights/voting-rights-timeline/

Castro-Salazar, R., Merriam-Castro, K., & Lopez, Y. A. P. (2016). Building a World-Class College: Creating a Global Community at Pima CC. In *International Education at Community Colleges* (pp. 175-188). Palgrave Macmillan.

Childers, J., & Hentzi, G. (1995). *The Columbia dictionary of modern literary and cultural criticism*. Columbia University Press.

Childress, L. K. (2009). Internationalization plans for higher education institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *13*(3), 289-309.

Chouliaraki, L., & N. Fairclough (1999) *Discourse in late modernity: rethinking Critical discourse analysis.* Edinburgh University Press.

Chowdhury, R., & Le Ha, P. (2014). Desiring TESOL and international education: Market abuse and exploitation. *Multilingual Matters, 37*.

Cierniak, K., & Ruddy, A. M. (2016). Partnering for New Possibilities: The Development of a Global Learning Certificate. In *International Education at CCs* (pp. 247-262). Palgrave Macmillan.

Civitillo, S., Juang, L. P., Badra, M., & Schachner, M. K. (2019). The interplay between culturally responsive teaching, cultural diversity beliefs, and self-reflection: A multiple case study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *77*, 341-351.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (2003). *The American community college.* John Wiley & Sons.

Community College Consortium for Immigrant Education (CCCIE). (2015). *Fast Facts.* https://www.cccie.org/resources/fast-facts/

Community Colleges for International Development (CCID). (n.d.). *About us.* Retrieved October 15, 2020, from https://www.ccidinc.org/about-us/.

Community Colleges for International Development (CCID). (2020). *Membership Map.* https://www.ccidinc.org/member-map/

Community Colleges for International Development (CCID). (2018). *The Vision and History.* https://wordpressstorageaccount.blob.core.windows.net/wp-media/wp-content/uploads/sites/802/2018/10/76-to-94-Vision.pdf

Community College Resource Center (CRCC) (2020). *Community college FAQs: How does the population of community college students breakdown by income?* Retrieved March 30, 2020, from https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/Community-College-FAQs.html

Connell, R. (2013). Why do market 'reforms' persistently increase inequality?. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*, *34*(2), 279-285.

Copeland, J. M., McCrink, C. L., & Starratt, G. K. (2017). Development of the CC internationalization index. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *21*(4), 349-374.

Córdova, A. M. (2019). *Latinx Spanish-speaking Students' Experiences with Language and Race on Campus* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas). UT Campus Repository. Repositories.lib.utexas.edu

Cox, R. D., & Sallee, M. W. (2018). Neoliberalism across borders: A comparative case study of CCs' capacity to serve student-parents. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *89*(1), 54-80.

Crawford, G. A. (1998, Winter). Encyclopedia of the Consumer Movement. *Reference & User Services Quarterly, 38*(2), 196.

Dahl, R. (1971). A. 1989. Democracy and its Critics. *New Haven*.

Day, K. (2016). *Religious resistance to neoliberalism: Womanist and black feminist perspectives*. Springer.

Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *10*(3), 241-266.

Dellow, D. A. (2007). The role of globalization in technical and occupational programs. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2007*(138), 39-45.

Desierto, A., & De Maio, C. (2021). Neoliberalism and "Resistance" Analyzing the Philosophical Foundations of Student Support Services at Universities. *Student Support Services*, 1-19.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Education and democracy*. Macmillan.

De Wit, H. (1999). Changing rationales for the internationalization of higher education. *International Higher Education, 15*, 2-4. https://www.bc.edu/content/dam/files/research_sites/cihe/pdf/IHEpdfs/ihe15.pdf

De Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

De Wit, H., & Jones, E. (2018). Inclusive internationalization: Improving access and equity. *International Higher Education*, *94*, 16-18.

DiMagio, P., & Powell, W. (1991). Iron Cage Revisited. *Institutional Isomorphism*.

Dooris, M. J., Kelley, J. M., & Trainer, J. F. (2004). Strategic planning in higher education. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2004*(123), 5-11.

Dougherty, K. J. (1994). *The contradictory college: The conflicting origins, impacts, and futures of the community college*. Suny Press.

Dowd, A. C. (2003). From access to outcome equity: Revitalizing the democratic mission of the community college. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *586*(1), 92-119.

Ertman, M., & Williams, J. C. (Eds.). (2005). *Rethinking commodification: Cases and readings in law and culture* (Vol. 52). NYU Press.

Edwards, J., & Tonkin, H. R. (1990). Internationalizing the CC: Strategies for the Classroom. *New Directions for CCs*, *70*, 17-26.

Economist Intelligence Unit (2020). *Democracy index 2019. A year of democratic setbacks and popular protest*. https://www.eiu.com/topic/democracy-index

Economist Intelligence Unit (2011). *Democracy Index 2011*. https://www.eiu.com/public/topical_report.aspx?campaignid=DemocracyIndex2011

Elsner, P. A., Tsunoda, J. S., & Korbel, L. A. (1994). Building the global community: The next step. *Points of Departure for the American Council on International Intercultural Education/Stanley Foundation Leadership Retreat*.

Epstein, E. H. (1992). Comparative Education and International Education. *Comparative Education Review*, *36*(4), 409-16.

Everett, J. B. (2015). Public community colleges: Creating access and opportunities for first-generation college students. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, *81*(3).

Fairclough, N. (2009). A dialectical-relational approach to critical discourse analysis in social research. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, *2*, 162-187.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1995). The critical study of language. *Critical Discourse Analysis*.

Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2011). Practical reasoning in political discourse: The UK government's response to the economic crisis in the 2008 Pre-Budget Report. *Discourse & Society*, *22*(3), 243-268.

Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis, in van Dijk, TA (ed.) Discourse as Social Interaction. *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, *2*, 258-284.

Fang, F., & Ren, W. (2018). Developing students' awareness of Global Englishes. *ELT Journal*, *72*(4), 384-394.

Farrugia, C., & Sanger, J. (2017). *Gaining an employment edge: The impact of study abroad on 21st century skills & career prospects in the United States*. Washington, DC: IIE Center for Academic Mobility Research and Impact.

Fersch, S. (1980). International opportunities: Toward an informed electorate. *Community and Junior College Journal, 50*(8), 32-34. http://ezproxy.msu.edu.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/docview/63619172?accountid=12598

Fersch, S., & Green, W. (1984). *The CC and international education: A report of progress.* Broward Community College

Flew, A. (1984). *A Dictionary of Philosophy: Revised Second Edition*. Macmillan.

Flores, W. V., & Rogers, K. S. (2019). *Democracy, civic engagement, and citizenship in higher education: Reclaiming our civic purpose*. Lexington Books.

Flowerdew, J., & Richardson, J. E. (Eds.). (2017). *The Routledge handbook of critical discourse studies*. Taylor & Francis.

Franco, R. W. (2002). The civic role of CCs: Preparing students for the work of democracy. *The Journal of Public Affairs*, *6*(1), 119-136.

Friedland, R. (2013). God, love, and other good reasons for practice: Thinking through institutional logics. In *Institutional Logics in Action, Part A* (pp. 25-50). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Frost, R., & Raby, R. L. (2009). Creating global citizens: The democratization of community college open access. *The Handbook of Practice and Research in Study Abroad: Higher Education and the Quest for Global Citizenship*.

Garcia, H., McNaughtan, J., Li, X., Leong, M. C., & Herridge, A. S. (2021). Empowered to Serve?: Higher Education International Center Directors and Their Roles on Campus Internationalization. *Journal of International Students*, *11*(3), 666-686.

George, S. (1999). A Short History of Neoliberalism. paper presented at the *Conference on Economic Sovereignty in a Globalising World, Global Policy Forum*. March24–26.

Gerring, J. (2006). *Case study research: Principles and practices*. Cambridge University Press.

Gill, P., Stewart, K., Treasure, E., & Chadwick, B. (2008). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: interviews and focus groups. *British dental journal*, *204*(6), 291-295.

Ginder, S.A., Kelly-Reid, J.E., and Mann, F.B. (2018). *Enrollment and Employees in Postsecondary Institutions, Fall 2017; and Financial Statistics and Academic Libraries, Fiscal Year 2017: First Look (Provisional Data)* (NCES 2019- 021rev). U.S. Department of Education. National Center for Education Statistics. http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch.

Giroux, H. A. (2014). *Neoliberalism's war on higher education*. Haymarket Books.

Giroux, H. A. (2005). The terror of neoliberalism: Rethinking the significance of cultural politics. *College literature*, 1-19.

Glesne, C. (2016). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction*. Pearson.

Gonzales, L. D., & Ayers, D. F. (2018). The Convergence of Institutional Logics on the CC Sector and the Normalization of Emotional Labor: A New Theoretical Approach for Considering the CC Faculty Labor Expectations. *The Review of Higher Education*, *41*(3), 455-478.

Gordon, N. (2010). Democracy and colonialism. *Theory & Event*, *13*(2).

Gordon, G., & Fischer, M. (2015). Strategic Planning in Public Higher Education: Management Tool or Publicity Platform? *Educational Planning*, *22*(3), 5-17.

Gould, E. (2020). Black-White Wage Gaps are Worse Today than in 2000. *Economic Policy Institute*. https://www.epi.org/blog/black-white-wage-gaps-are-worse-today-than-in-2000/

Grant, S. R. (1979). Internationalizing the College Curriculum. *New Directions for CCs*, *26*, 19-29.

Green, Q. (2017). *Feeling to see: Black graduate student women (re)membering black womanhood through study abroad*. [Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University University]. MSU Campus Repository. https://d.lib.msu.edu/etd

Green, M. F., Luu, D. T., & Burris, B. (2008). *Mapping internationalization on US campuses: 2008 edition*. American Council on Education.

Greenwood, R., Díaz, A. M., Li, S. X., & Lorente, J. C. (2010). The multiplicity of institutional logics and the heterogeneity of organizational responses. *Organization science*, *21*(2), 521-539.

Guillén, M. F. (2001). *The limits of convergence: Globalization and organizational change in Argentina, South Korea, and Spain*. Princeton University Press.

Hammer, T. (1990). Democracy and the Nation State: Aliens. *Denizens, and Citizens in a World International Migrant, Aldershot*.

Harbour, C. P., & Wolgemuth, J. R. (2015). The reconstruction of community college vocational education: A vision for renewing American democracy. *Community College Review*, *43*(4), 315-328.

Harder, N. J. (2010). Internationalization efforts in United States community colleges: A comparative analysis of urban, suburban, and rural institutions. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *35*(1-2), 152-164.

Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Helms, R. M., Brajkovic, L., & Struthers, B. (2017). Mapping internationalization on US campuses: 2017 edition. *Washington, DC: American Council on Education*.

Hendrick, R. Z., Hightower, W. H., & Gregory, D. E. (2006). State funding limitations and Community College open door policy: Conflicting priorities?. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *30*(8), 627-640.

Higher Learning Commission (HLC). (2020). Policy title: Criteria for accreditation. Retrieved October 15, 2020, from https://www.hlcommission.org/Policies/criteria-and-core-components.html

Hinton, K. E. (2012). *A practical guide to strategic planning in higher education* (Vol. 7). USA: Society for College and University Planning.

Hole, S., & McEntree, G. H. (1999). Reflection is at the heart of practice. *Educational leadership*, *56*(8), 34-37.

Hudzik, J., K. (2011). *Comprehensive internationalization: From concept to action*. (report). http://www.nafsa.org/Find_Resources/Internationalizing_Higher_Education/Comprehensive_Internationalization/

Hudzik, J. K., & Stohl, M. (2012). *Comprehensive and strategic internationalization of US higher education* (pp. 61-80). Sage.

Hughes, R. P., Kimball, E. W., & Koricich, A. (2019). The dual commodification of college-going: individual and institutional influences on access and choice. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 415-477). Springer.

Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research (n.d.). The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, 2018 edition, Bloomington, IN: Author.

Institute of International Education (IIE). (2012). International Education as an Institutional Priority. *Institute of International education*. https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Publications/International-Education-as-an-Institutional-Priority

Institute of International Education (IIE). (2019a). International Students CCs, Total Students, 1999/00-2018/2019. *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Http://www.iie.org/opendoorsdata.org

Institute of International Education (IIE). (2019b). Student Characteristics of Associate's Colleges, 2003/04-2018/2019. *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Http://www.iie.org/opendoorsdata.org

Institute of International Education (IIE). (2019c). U.S. Study Abroad Associate's Institutions. *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange.* Http://www.iie.org/opendoorsdata.org

Institute of International Education (IIE). (n.d.) *Our Vision*. Retrieved October 15, 2020, https://www.iie.org/en/Why-IIE/Our-Vision.

Institute of International Education (IIE). (n.d.a). *Selection Criteria*. Retrieved October 15, 2020, from https://www.iie.org/Research-and-Insights/Best-Practices-Resource/Selection-Criteria

Jaafar, W. N. W., & Maki, T. (2017). Roles of community colleges for community development in Malaysia: Entrepreneurship education program. *Handbook of Comparative Studies on community colleges and global counterparts*, 1-17.

Jacobs, J., & Worth, J. (2019). The evolving mission of workforce development in the community college. *13 Ideas That Are Transforming the Community College World*, 167.

Jankowski, N., & Provezis, S. (2014). Neoliberal ideologies, governmentality and the academy: An examination of accountability through assessment and transparency. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *46*(5), 475-487.

Johnstone, C., & Edwards, P. (2019). Accommodations, Accessibility, and Culture: Increasing Access to Study Abroad for Students with Disabilities. *Journal of Studies in International Education,* 1028315319842344.

Kim, C., & Tamborini, C. R. (2019). Are they still worth it? The long-run earnings benefits of an associate degree, vocational diploma or certificate, and some college. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, *5*(3), 64-85.

King, M. C., & Fersch, S. C. (1982). General education through international intercultural dimensions. *New Directions for CCs,* (40), 49-57. http://dx.doi.org.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/10.1002/cc.36819824008

King, M. C., & Fersch, S. H. (1992). Integrating the international/intercultural dimension. In S. Fersch & R. H. Furlow (Eds.), *The Community College and International Education: A Report of Progress.* College of DuPage.

King, M. C., & Fersch, S. H. (1989). International education: Its future is now. *Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 59*(3), 28-29. Http://ezproxy.msu.edu.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/docview/63126641?accountid=12598

Kliebard, H. M., & Franklin, B. M. (2003). The ascendance of practical and vocational mathematics, 1893-1945: Academic mathematics under siege. *A History of School Mathematics*, *1*, 399-440.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *8*(1), 5-31.

Knight, J., & de Wit, H. (2018). Internationalization of higher education: past and future. *International Higher Education*, (95), 2-4.

Knight, J., & De Wit, H. (1995). Strategies for internationalisation of higher education: Historical and conceptual perspectives. *Strategies for internationalisation of higher education: A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States of America*, *5*, 32.

Kuh, G. D. (2008). Excerpt from high-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. *Association of American Colleges and Universities*, *14*(3), 28-29.

Labaree, D. F. (2018). Public schools for private gain: The declining American commitment to serving the public good. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *100*(3), 8-13.

Landreth, N., Campbell, M., De León, J. (n.d.). Native American voting rights coalition. *Native American Rights Fund. https://www.narf.org/cases/voting-rights/*

Lee, C. T. (2014). Decolonizing global citizenship. In *Routledge handbook of global citizenship studies* (pp. 97-107). Routledge.

Levin, J. (2007). *Nontraditional students and CCs: The conflict of justice and neoliberalism*. Springer.

Levin, J., Kater, S., & Wagoner, R. L. (2006). *Community college faculty: At work in the new economy*. Springer.

Levin, J. S., Martin, M. C., López Damián, A. I., & Hoggatt, M. J. (2018). Preservation of community college logic: Organizational responses to state policies and funding practices in three states. *CC Review*, *46*(2), 197-220.

Levin, J. S., López-Damián, A. I., Martin, M. C., & Hoggatt, M. J. (2017). The US community college after globalization. In *Internationalization in vocational education and training* (pp. 19-40). Springer.

Li, A. Y., & Kennedy, A. I. (2018). Performance funding policy effects on community outcomes: Are short-term certificates on the rise?. Community College Review, 46(1), 3-39.

Lissovoy, N. (2015). *Education and emancipation in the neoliberal era: Being, teaching, and power*. Springer.

Lourenço, M. (2018). Global, international and intercultural education: three contemporary approaches to teaching and learning. *On the Horizon*.

Luke, A. (2002). Beyond science and ideology critique: Developments in critical discourse analysis . *Annual review of applied linguistics*, *22*(1), 96-110.

Luo, J., & Jamieson-Drake, D. (2015). *Predictors of study abroad intent, participation, and college outcomes.* Research in Higher Education, 56, 29-56.

Lynch, K. (2017). New managerialism in education: the organisational form of neoliberalism. In *Abraham-Hamanoiel, A., Freedman, D., Khiabany, G., Nash, K.(eds.). Liberalism in Neoliberal Times: Dimensions, Contradictions, Limits*. Goldsmiths.

Lynch, K., & Grummell, B. (2018). New managerialism as an organisational form of neoliberalism. In *Sowa, F., Staples, R., Zapfel, S.(eds.). The Transformation of Work in*

Welfare State Organizations: New Public Management and the Institutional Diffusion of Ideas. Routledge.

Malveaux, G. F., & Raby, R. L. (Eds.). (2019). *Study abroad opportunities for community college students and strategies for global learning*. IGI Global.

Mann, E. (2017). Connecting CCs with employers: A toolkit for building successful partnerships. *Washington, DC: Brookings.*

Mautner, G. (2016). Checks and balances: How corpus linguistics can contribute to CDA. *Methods of critical discourse studies*, *3*, 155-180.

Marginson, S. (2011). Higher education and public good. *Higher education quarterly*, *65*(4), 411-433.

Marginson, S., & Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher education*, *43*(3), 281-309.

Maringe, F. (2010). The meanings of globalization and internationalization in HE: Findings from a world survey. *Globalization and internationalization in higher education: Theoretical, strategic and management perspectives*, 17-34.

Mars, M. M. (2012). Community college economic and workforce development education in the neoliberal and academic capitalist contexts. In *Understanding Community Colleges* (pp. 237-250). Routledge.

McDowell, F. M. (1919). *The junior college* (No. 35). US Government Printing Office.

McRaven, N., & Somers, P. (2017). Internationalizing a community college: A view from the top. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 41(7), 436-446. doi:10.1080/10668926.2016.1195306

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American journal of sociology*, *83*(2), 340-363.

Migration Policy Institute (MPI). (n.d.). *About Migration Policy Institute.* Retrieved October 15, 2020, from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/about/about-migration-policy-institute

Migration Policy Institute. (n.d.a). *U.S. immigration population by state and county.* Retrieved October 15, 2020 from https://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/data-hub/charts/us-immigrant-population-state-and-county

Miller, S. (2016). Ensuring Social Success: A Case Study of International Students' Social Experiences at Austin CC. In *International Education at Community Colleges* (pp. 223-236). Palgrave Macmillan.

Milner, V. (2018). Confront inequity/Assessment for equity. *Educational Leadership, 75*(5), 88-89.

Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MSCU, n.d.). *About Us.* Retrieved October 15, 2020, from https://www.minnstate.edu/system/index.html

Mitchell, D. E., & Nielsen, S. Y. (2012). Internationalization and globalization in higher education. *Globalization–Education and management agendas*, 3-22.

Moran, M., & Parry, G. (2015). *Democracy and democratization*. Routledge.

Morrell, M. E. (2010). *Empathy and democracy: Feeling, thinking, and deliberation*. Penn State Press.

Mullet, D. R. (2018). A general critical discourse analysis framework for educational research. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, *29*(2), 116-142.

NAFSA: Association of International Educators (NAFSA). (n.d.). *About*. Retrieved October 15, 2020, from https://www.nafsa.org/about

NAFSA: Association of International Educators (NAFSA). (n.d.a). *Internationalization*. Retrieved October 15, 2020, from https://www.nafsa.org/about/about-international-education/internationalization

NAFSA: Association of International Educators (NAFSA). (n.d.b). *Mission, Vision, Values*. Retrieved October 15, 2020, from https://www.nafsa.org/about/about-nafsa/mission-vision-values

NAFSA: Association of International Educators (NAFSA). (n.d.c). *Senator Paul Simon award campus internationalization.* Retrieved October 15, 2020, from https://www.nafsa.org/about/about-nafsa/senator-paul-simon-award-campus-internationalization

NAFSA: Association of International Educators (NAFSA). (n.d.d). *Simon award-how to apply.* Retrieved October 15, 2020, from https://www.nafsa.org/about/about-nafsa/simon-award-how-apply

Newkirk, V. (2018). Voter suppression is warping democracy. *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2018/07/poll-prri-voter-suppression/565355/

O'Banion, T. (1971). Humanizing Education in the CC. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *42*(8), 657-668.

Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE). (2020). International and Foreign Language Education. *U.S. Department of Education*. https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/iegps/index.html

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). (2020). *Poverty Rate*. https://data.oecd.org/inequality/poverty-rate.htm

Osei-Kofi, N., Shahjahan, R. A., & Patton, L. D. (2010). Centering social justice in the study of higher education: The challenges and possibilities for institutional change. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *43*(3), 326-340.

Pal, P. R., McNaughtan, J., & García, H. A. (2020). Defining mid-level career motivation and primary work responsibilities in international higher education. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *2020*(189), 103-116.

Park, S. (2019). Wealthier Individuals Receive Higher Returns to Wealth. *Washington Center for Equitable Growth*. https://equitablegrowth.org/wealthier-individuals-receive-higher-returns-to-wealth/

Petrovic, J. E., & Kuntz, A. M. (2018). Invasion, alienation, and imperialist nostalgia: Overcoming the necrophilous nature of neoliberal schools. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *50*(10), 957-969.

Pew Research Center. (2016). *The State of American Jobs: How the shifting economic landscape is reshaping work and society and affecting the way people think about the skills and training they need to get ahead*. The Pew Research Center. https://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2016/10/06/the-state-of-american-jobs/

Phillips, N., Sewell, G., & Jaynes, S. (2008). Applying critical discourse analysis in strategic management research. *Organizational research methods*, *11*(4), 770-789.

Phillipson, R. (2016). Native speakers in linguistic imperialism. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, *14*(3), 80-96.

Pike, G. (2015). Re-imagining global education in the neoliberal age: Challenges and opportunities. In *Contesting and constructing international perspectives in global education* (pp. 9-25). Brill Sense.

Quezada, R. L., & Cordeiro, P. A. (2016). Internationalization in teacher education in the US: Innovative programs and practices to meet the global challenges of tomorrow's schools. In *Quality and Change in Teacher Education* (pp. 195-212). Springer.

Raby, R. L. (2008). *Expanding education abroad at US community colleges*. Institute of International Education.

Raby, R. L. (2009). Globalization and community college model development. In *Community college models* (pp. 21-38). Springer, Dordrecht.

Raby, R. L. (1996). International, intercultural, and multicultural dimensions of community colleges in the United States. *Dimensions of the Community College: International, intercultural, and multicultural perspectives*, 9-35.

Raby, R. L. (2007). Internationalizing the curriculum: On-and off-campus strategies. *New directions for Community Colleges*, *2007*(138), 57-66.

Raby, E. B. R. L., & Valeau, E. J. (2016). *International education at community colleges*: *Themes practices and case studies.* Palgrave Macmilan: New York, NY

Raby, R. L. (2020). Celebrating the last 10 years of community college internationalization. *Journal of International Students*, *10*(4).

Ramlackhan, K. (2020). Restricting social justice practices in public education: The neoliberal stronghold. *Handbook on promoting social justice in education*, 193-212.

Reay, T., & Jones, C. (2016). Qualitatively capturing institutional logics. *Strategic Organization*, *14*(4), 441-454.

Reay, T., & Hinings, C. R. (2009). Managing the rivalry of competing institutional logics. *Organization studies*, *30*(6), 629-652.

Reeb-Reascos, K., & Serniuk, J. (2018). ESSA, Low-Wage Migrants, and the Persistent Neoliberal Education Structure: A Critical Review. *Texas Education Review*.

Remler, D. K., & Van Ryzin, G. G. (2015). *Research methods in practice: Strategies for description and causation*. Sage Publications.

Rhoades, G. M., Raby, R. L., & Biscarra, A. (2013). Student outcomes from participating in California community college education abroad programs. *Education and Society*, *31*(3), 23-40.

Rhoades, G. M., Thomas, J. M., Raby, R. L., Codding, A. G., & Lynch, A. (2016). CC Study Abroad and Implications for Student Success: Comparing California and New Jersey CCs. In *International Education at CCs* (pp. 281-292). Palgrave Macmillan.

Rhoades, R. A., & Valadez, J. R. (1996). *Democracy, multiculturalism, and the community*

Robertson, J. J. (2015). Student interest in international education at the community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *39*(5), 473-484.

Rodriguez, P. (2016). Global Certificates: Bringing Intentionality and Ownership to Comprehensive Internationalization. In *International Education at Community Colleges* (pp. 223-236). Palgrave Macmillan.

Rogers, R. R. (2001). Reflection in higher education: A concept analysis. *Innovative higher education*, *26*(1), 37-57.

Romero, M., & Purdy, L. (2004). The community college leadership development institute. *Community College Journal*, *74*(4), 32-34.

Rossman, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2016). *An introduction to qualitative research: Learning in the field*. Sage Publications.

Rowley, D. J., Lujan, H. D., & Dolence, M. G. (1997). Strategic Change in Colleges and Universities.

Saunders, D. (2007). The impact of neoliberalism on college students. *Journal of College and Character*, *8*(5).

Sethares, G. (2020). *The Impacts of Neoliberalism on US Community Colleges: Reclaiming Faculty Voice in Academic Governance*. Routledge.

Shah, Q. A. S. I. R. (2016). The Democratic Paradigm: A Vanishing Act? *Glocalism, Journal of Culture, Politics and Innovation*, *2016*(2).

Shin, H., & Park, J. S. Y. (2016). Researching language and neoliberalism. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *37*(5), 443-452.

Shaffer, T. J., Longo, N. V., Manosevitch, I., & Thomas, M. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Deliberative pedagogy: Teaching and learning for democratic engagement*. MSU Press.

Shaffer, T. J., & Longo, N. V. (Eds.). (2019). *Creating Space for Democracy: A Primer on Dialogue and Deliberation in Higher Education*. Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Siaya, L. M., & Hayward, F. M. (2003). *Mapping internationalization on US campuses: Final report, 2003*. American Council on Education.

Sierra College. (2016). *Educational Master Plan.* https://www.sierracollege.edu/_files/resources/governance-planning/docs/Educational-Master-Plan-2016-2026.pdf

Sipe, L., & Constable, S. (1996). A chart of four contemporary research paradigms: Metaphors for the modes of inquiry. *Taboo: The journal of culture and education*, *1*(Spring), 153-163.

Sirgy, M. J. (2018). The psychology of material well-being. *Applied Research in Quality of Life, 13*(2), 273-301.

Slaughter, S., Slaughter, S. A., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. JHU Press.

Smaller, H., & O'Sullivan, M. (2018). International Service Learning: Decolonizing Possibilities? *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education*, *6*(1).

Snedden, D. (1929). The socially efficient community. *The Journal of Educational Sociology, 2*(8), 464-470.

Stanley, M. L., Dougherty, A. M., Yang, B. W., Henne, P., & De Brigard, F. (2018). Reasons probably won't change your mind: The role of reasons in revising moral decisions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 147*(7), 962–987.

Steger, M. B. (2017). *Globalization: A very short introduction* (Vol. 86). Oxford University Press.

Steger, M. B. (2008). *The rise of the global imaginary: Political ideologies from the French revolution to the global war on terror*. Oxford University Press.

Stein, S., & de Andreotti, V. O. (2016). Cash, competition, or charity: International students and the global imaginary. *Higher Education*, *72*(2), 225-239.

Stein, S., & de Oliveira Andreotti, V. (2017). Higher education and the modern/colonial global imaginary. *Cultural Studies↔ Critical Methodologies*, *17*(3), 173-181.

Suárez-Orozco, C., Osei-Twumasi, O., & Banks, J. A. (Eds.). (2019). *Immigrant-origin students in community college: Navigating risk and reward in higher education*. Teachers College Press.

Tang, H. H. H., & Tsui, C. P. G. (2018). Democratizing higher education through internationalization: the case of HKU SPACE. *Asian Education and Development Studies*.

Tett, L., & Hamilton, M. (Eds.). (2021). *Resisting neoliberalism in education: Local, national and transnational perspectives*. Policy Press.

Thomas, M. (2016). *International Education: A Manual to Improve Student Global Competence through CC Education Abroad Programs* (Doctoral dissertation, Ferris State University).

Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional logics. *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*, *840*, 99-128.

Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2012). *The institutional logics perspective: A new approach to culture, structure, and process*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Treat, T., & Hagedorn, L. S. (2013). Resituating the community college in a global context. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2013*(161), 5-9.

Trumbull, E., & Lash, A. (2013). *Understanding formative assessment: Insights from learning theory and measurement theory*. WestEd.org

Tuliao, M. D., Hatch, D. K., & Torraco, R. J. (2017). Refugee students in community colleges: How colleges can respond to an emerging demographic challenge. *Journal of Applied Research in the Community College*, *24*(1), 15-26.

TyndorfJr, D. M., & Glass, C. R. (2017). Community colleges, human capital, and economic growth in developing countries. *Global Development of the Community College Model: New Directions for Community College, 177*(105).

Unangst, L. M., & Barone, N. I. (2019). Operationalizing "internationalization" in the community college sector: Textual analysis of institutional internationalization Plans. *Journal for the Study of Postsecondary and Tertiary Education, 4,* 177-196.

U.S. Department of Education (USDE) (2012). Succeeding globally through international education and engagement.

Vaara, E., Sorsa, V., & Pälli, P. (2010). On the force potential of strategy texts: a critical discourse analysis of a strategic plan and its power effects in a city organization. *Organization*, *17*(6), 685-702.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). Critical discourse studies: A sociocognitive approach. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, *2*(1), 62-86.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2016). Sociocognitive discourse studies. *In J. Richardson & J. Flowerdew (eds.) Handbook of discourse analysis.* New York: Routledge.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). From text grammar to critical discourse analysis. A brief academic autobiography.

Van Dijk, T. (1998). Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of political ideologies*, *11*(2), 115-140.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1996). Discourse, power and access: In Texts and Practices. Readings in Critical discourse analysis. *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical discourse analysis, Routledge.* 84-104.

Van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). Strategies of discourse comprehension.

Von Hayek, F. A. (2014). *The road to serfdom: Text and documents: The definitive edition*. Routledge.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2009). Discourse as the recontextualization of social practice: A guide. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, *2*, 144-161.

Vaughan, G. B. (2006). *The community college story*. American Association of Community Colleges.

VERBI Software. (2019). MAXQDA 2020 [computer software]. Berlin, Germany: VERBI Software. Available from maxqda.com.

Viggiano, T., López Damián, A. I., Morales Vázquez, E., & Levin, J. S. (2018). The others: Equitable access, international students, and the community college. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *22*(1), 71-85.

Willis, T. Y. (2016). Microaggressions and intersectionality in the experiences of Black women studying abroad through community colleges: Implications for practice. In *International Education at Community Colleges* (pp. 127-141). Palgrave Macmillan.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, *2*, 1-33.

Wood, E. M. (1972). *Mind and politics: An approach to the meaning of liberal and socialist individualism*. University of California Press.

Woodin, S. (2016). Calls for accountability: Measuring internationalization at CCs. In *International Education at CCs* (pp. 143-162). Palgrave Macmillan.

World Bank. (2020). *US GDP Growth.* https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD

Wright-Mair, R., & Museus, S. D. (2021). Playing the game just enough: How racially minoritized faculty who advance equity conceptualize success in the neoliberal academy. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*.

Yao, C. W., & Viggiano, T. (2019). Interest Convergence and the Commodification of International Students and Scholars in the United States. *JCSCORE*, *5*(1), 81-109.

Yakaboski, T., & Perozzi, B. (2018). *Internationalizing US student affairs practice: An intercultural and inclusive framework*. Routledge.

Zamani-Gallaher, E. M., Leon, R. A., & Lang, J. (2016). Study abroad as self-authorship: Globalization and reconceptualizing college and career readiness. In *International Education at Community Colleges* (pp. 111-125). Palgrave Macmillan.

Zapp, M., & Ramirez, F. O. (2019). Beyond internationalisation and isomorphism–the construction of a global higher education regime. *Comparative Education*, *55*(4), 473-493.

Zepke, N. (2015). Student engagement and neoliberalism: mapping an elective affinity. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *34*(6), 696-709.

Zhang, Yi. (2016). Appreciative Advising with International students in American community colleges. In *International Education at Community Colleges* (pp. 223-236). Palgrave Macmillan.

Zimmerman, M. A. (2000). Empowerment theory. In *Handbook of community psychology* (pp. 43-63). Springer.