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Abstract

The rise in diversity and the increasing internationalization of United States higher education institutions are well established. In order to deal with these phenomena, areas of practice for multicultural education and internationalization have arisen. In the past few decades there have been calls for practitioners within these two separate areas to work together toward common goals.

The purpose of this study was to explore the engagement of multicultural student affairs professionals in the internationalization of the selected higher education institutions in which they work. This study used a basic qualitative methodology, consisting of interviews and observation, to investigate how a selected group of multicultural educators in the state of Connecticut defined and described internationalization, what internationalization activities they did and did not engage in, and their motivations and barriers to engagement.

The investigation found that not all of these professionals were familiar with the term “internationalization,” but all were able to define it. Their definitions had to do with student mobility, globalization, a broader perspective, and one more comprehensive definition, though many focused on international students coming to the United States. The participants were all engaged in internationalization to some extent. This engagement occurred at all institutional levels, the most common being the individual student level through student and student organization advising, as well as programming for students.

The participants’ motivations to engage were philosophical, personal, and practical. They were motivated by their beliefs and values, their backgrounds as immigrants or study abroad students, and the practical needs of their students. The origins
of their engagement were most often student based, though the professionals also
initiated the activities themselves or were invited by colleagues or administration.

The participants’ efforts or desires to engage more in internationalization
activities were hindered by a lack of time and personnel, their own or others’ perception
that this was not part of their job, as well as perceived cultural and financial barriers.
Most participants did desire to engage more in internationalization activities, but were
unable to due to these factors.

Future research on this topic is warranted, as is further research on multicultural
student affairs in general. The effects of recent, race-related events on U.S. campuses
should be taken into consideration and studied further as well. As increasing diversity and
globalization continue in U.S. higher education, further research into collaborations
between practitioners of multicultural and international education will also be needed.

Upper administration in higher education institutions should support both
multicultural education and internationalization efforts. This would include promoting the
internationalization of multicultural education and multicultural transformation of
international education. Training should be provided for practitioners in both of these
areas and other personnel across the institution. The administrative structures responsible
for managing the processes of internationalization and multicultural transformation
should be brought closer together administratively and physically, but remain separate so
that their individual missions are not diluted.
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Chapter One: Introduction

In 2006, the American Council on Education (ACE) convened a roundtable for administrators and theorists to discuss a divide between internationalization and multicultural education in higher education (Olson, Evans, & Shoenberg, 2007). ACE staff members had encountered this divide when working on their Global Learning for All project, which had focused on the internationalization of higher education institutions. In the At Home in the World report on the findings of the 2006 roundtable, the authors recognize the vital importance of both multicultural education and internationalization (Olson et al., 2007). They give some explanation as to why the divide they were there to discuss had occurred, but call very urgently for practitioners and theorists in both multicultural education and internationalization to work together (Olson et al., 2007).

The authors cite the changing demographics of higher education and the forces of globalization as forces necessitating collaboration between those working in both areas (Olson et al., 2007). This echoes earlier other calls for collaboration, which have been appearing since the 1980s (Cole, 1984; Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999; Cortés, 1983; Hovland, 2006; Noronha, 1992; Olson & Peacock, 2012). Despite these calls for collaboration and the projects such as ACE’s that are being undertaken across the United States (Olson & Peacock, 2012), little research has been published on those “working in the overlap” (Olson et al., 2007, p. 1) of multicultural education and internationalization. In order for the work that has begun to advance, it is necessary to understand the barriers and the opportunities involved in this work. This study will explore the engagement in one of the areas, internationalization, of practitioners who are grounded in the other area, multicultural education.
Statement of the Problem

Significance. The rise of internationalization and the rise of multicultural education at U.S. institutions of higher education are well documented (Banks, 2004b; de Wit & Merkx, 2012). The economic and social changes that brought about the rise of the two areas of practice continue, and higher education institutions continue to change in response. The two processes – internationalization and multicultural transformation – each of which is ideally woven throughout an entire institution of higher education rather than contained within a discrete department or unit (Banks, 2001; Ellingboe, 1998; Mestenhauser, 2002), must each be influenced by and engage with the other. The necessity of this engagement is beginning to be accepted within higher education (Hovland, 2006). Still, there is a perceived “gap” between the two areas of practice (Olson et al., 2007). This divide must be explored in order for both internationalization and multicultural transformation in higher education to be effective (Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999; Olson et al., 2007).

The internationalization of higher education is often seen as a response to the forces of globalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007). As demand for higher education increases worldwide, the mobility of what Knight calls “people, ideas, knowledge, programs, providers, services, and projects” (2010, p. 206) increases as well. This mobility necessitates changes in institutions. However, as Altbach and Knight remind us, “Globalization may be unalterable, but internationalization involves many choices” (2007, p. 291). The ways in which each institution internationalizes are different, depending on its needs and mission (Ellingboe, 1998; Hudzik, 2011).
Multicultural education in general and within the context of higher education is a response to different forces. The inequities and segregation of U.S. society in general have been reflected within institutions of higher education (Kupo, 2011). As part of the Civil Rights movement, schools and higher education institutions moved to correct these inequities, and multicultural education developed (Banks, 2004b; Kupo, 2011). Diversity of students, faculty and staff at higher education institutions became a concern (Kupo, 2011). Multicultural transformation is the process of adapting to these forces (Banks, 2001; Jackson & Holvino, 1988), as internationalization is the process of adapting to globalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

As the forces of globalization progress and higher education becomes more diverse, the need for internationalization and multicultural transformation of U.S. higher education institutions continues to grow (McClellan & Larimore, 2009; Olson et al., 2007). The need for collaboration between practitioners of international and multicultural education also grows (Charles, Longerbeam & Miller, 2013; Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999). While ACE recommends collaboration between the two areas (Olson et al., 2007), the American Association of Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) envisions a transformation of the liberal arts curriculum in which diversity and multiculturalism are woven together with global learning in order to prepare college students to live and work in a globalized world (Hovland, 2006). In this curriculum, multicultural and international are not loosely woven together, but totally integrated and not able to be separated from each other.

Collaboration or integration of these two areas of practice fits the context of comprehensive internationalization (Hudzik, 2011; Mestenhauser, 2002). Mestenhauser
calls internationalization “a program of change aiming to make international education a super-ordinate field of knowledge, inquiry, and application, which is interdisciplinary, multi-dimensional and multi-cultural, and to institutionalize this field throughout the structure and functions of the entire institution, including its governance and outreach.” (2002, p. 170) The collaboration or integration of the two fields is also necessary within the context of multicultural transformation of higher education (Boyer, 1995), which deals with changing institutions and indeed the entire system of U.S. higher education (Banks, 2001; Shuford, 2011). Indeed, under these frameworks, the internationalization of an institution cannot be complete until its multicultural student affairs units are internationalized, and the multicultural transformation of an institution cannot be complete until its international education units undergo multicultural transformation as well (Cole, 1984; Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999; Olson et al., 2007).

There are also some instances in which practitioners have collaborated with success, or incorporated concepts and theories from one area into the programs in the other (Alfaro, 2008; Baker, 1999; Fobes, 2005; Merryfield, 1996). However, many authors identify ideological and practical differences and disagreements (Cole, 1984; Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999; Cortés, 1983, 2002; Noronha, 1992; Olson et al., 2007), which have made it difficult for both academic and administrative practitioners to collaborate. Understanding more about these differences and the factors behind successful collaboration can help future researchers and practitioners to foster collaboration.

**Rationale.** The necessity for collaborations and connections between the practitioners of internationalization and multicultural education and the difficulties in
bringing them together have been subjects of essays, reports, and news articles in the last three decades (Baker, 1999; Cole, 1984; Cornwall & Stoddard, 1999; Cortés, 1983, 2002; Merryfield, 1996; Noronha, 1992; Olson et al., 2007). The purposes of collaboration are many: for example, authors have identified increasing the participation of different types of students in education abroad and helping international students deal with U.S. diversity (Peterson et al., 1999); student learning and development (Charles et al., 2013); and that working together toward common goals would make it more likely that the goals could be accomplished (Noronha, 1992). Still, there has been little research on how internationalization and multicultural education practitioners engage with each other. There are also areas closely related to this topic in which there are gaps in the literature.

Multicultural student affairs is part of the field of student affairs in U.S. higher education, but there has been limited research on multicultural student affairs (Shuford, 2011; Stewart & Bridges, 2011). Student affairs in U.S. higher education has only recently begun to internationalize; Ludeman (2008) identifies the 1980s as the time when this started to happen. Thus, there is little research on how the practitioners of student affairs, whether multicultural or in other areas such as housing, student activities, etc., have engaged in internationalization (Dalton & Sullivan, 2008; Di Maria, 2012). Given the lack of research in these areas, it follows that there is a gap in the area that is the focus of this study: the engagement of multicultural student affairs professionals in internationalization. However, as established above, the need for this engagement is critical. This study will contribute to the field of international education, and to the practices of multicultural student affairs and internationalization, by providing
understanding of the perceptions and engagement of professionals in one area of practice with the other.

**Statement of Study Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to explore the engagement of multicultural student affairs professionals in the internationalization of the selected higher education institutions in which they work.

**Research Questions**

1. How do multicultural student affairs professionals at selected higher education institutions define and describe internationalization?

2. In what ways are multicultural student affairs professionals at selected higher education institutions engaged in internationalization? In what ways are they not engaged?

3. How do multicultural student affairs professionals describe what motivates them to engage in the internationalization of the selected higher education institutions where they work? How do they describe the barriers to their engagement?

**Definition of Key Terms**

Several of the terms appearing in this study are contested and easily confused with one another (Knight, 2004; Olson et al., 2007). Therefore, a rationale for the choice of certain terms and definitions is helpful. Because the *At Home in the World* project from the American Council on Education (Olson et al., 2007) has provided much of the context for this research, I have chosen to use most often the terms “internationalization” and “multicultural education,” as the authors of the report on that project do, unless citing
sources that use different terms. That using these terms does not allow for grammatical parallel construction is less important than that these are the terms generally accepted by those who are working in the context where this study is located (Olson et al., 2007).

**Internationalization**

For this study, the definition is “the process of integrating an international or intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution” (Knight, 1994, p. 7). This definition deals with internationalization at the institutional rather than the national or the sector level (Knight, 2004).

“Internationalization” in this study also refers to the area of practice dealing with the process of the internationalization of higher education, and is then used parallel to “multicultural education.”

**International education**, another term used in higher education, is distinct from internationalization in that it refers to the *products*, or activities and programs, of an institution that have an international focus, while internationalization refers to the *process* by which an international focus is incorporated into the institution (Jones & De Wit, 2012). This term also refers to a field of study within higher education.

**Global education** refers to education that promotes a “global perspective” (Hanvey, 1982, p. 162). It may appear in this study when referring to works whose authors use it interchangeably with internationalization or international education; however, this term is mostly used in K-12 education (Olson et al., 2007), so it will not be the preferred term for the current research.

**Global learning** is a newer term within the field of international education and was defined by the Association of American Colleges & Universities as “a critical
analysis of and an engagement with complex, interdependent global systems and legacies (such as natural, physical, social, cultural, economic, and political) and their implications for people’s lives and the earth’s sustainability,” (2010).

Globalization is often confused with internationalization (Knight, 2004), but refers instead to “the economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement” (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 290). It is, therefore, something over which universities have no control, but to which they must react. Internationalization is part of higher education institutions’ and systems’ reaction to globalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

Multicultural education

“Multicultural education is a reform movement designed to make major curricular and structural changes in the education of students in schools, colleges, and universities” (Banks, 2001, p. 44). Banks identifies the five dimensions of multicultural education as “1. Content integration, 2. The knowledge construction process, 3. Prejudice reduction, 4. An equity pedagogy, and 5. An empowering school culture and social structure” (2001, p. 5).

Multiculturalism is not the same as multicultural education, and is a term that sometimes has negative connotations (Olson et al., 2007). “Liberal multiculturalism” (May & Sleeter, 2010, p. 3) is associated with a movement that is too preoccupied with conflict reduction and cultural tolerance through awareness of cultural differences, with not enough emphasis on power relations and inequality (May & Sleeter, 2010).

Multicultural transformation is the process whereby higher education institutions adapt to the forces of increasing diversity and move to correct the inequities
that more diverse students and other stakeholders face on moving into the academy (Banks, 2001; Jackson & Holvino, 1988). It is somewhat parallel to the process of internationalization, whereby institutions adapt to the forces of globalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

**Context of the Study**

The context of the study is U.S. higher education, specifically within the state of Connecticut. The state of Connecticut is the context for the research due to the sampling method used in the study (see Chapter 3). Student affairs professionals who identify their main job as providing multicultural student services were the participants. These professionals provide services to an entire campus or to groups of students within an institution. The participants were selected based on institutional diversity within the state of Connecticut. Connecticut, though a small state geographically, contains a variety of institutional types. Participants from community colleges, research universities, comprehensive universities, liberal arts colleges, public and private institutions were included.

In participating in this study, multicultural student affairs professionals, who are in many cases working in the margins of their institutions (Kupo, 2011; Olson et al., 2007), expressed their views on the ways in which their institutions are responding to the forces of globalization. They described their engagement and defined what internationalization meant to them specifically in their daily work. This is the first empirical research to include the voices of these professionals in understanding the internationalization of U.S. higher education.
Conceptual Framework

This study is informed by concepts in comprehensive internationalization, multicultural education, and student affairs. Figure 1 is a visual representation of the intersection among all of these conceptual areas, in which this study is located. Since the conceptual area of student affairs centers on promoting student learning and success, student learning is at the center of this representation. This is in keeping with Jones and de Wit’s (2012) call to make student learning central to internationalization strategies, as well as recent movements in the field of student affairs, which place student learning at their core (ACPA, 1994; Braskamp, 2009). Student learning is also where much of the literature on collaboration between internationalization and multicultural education focuses (Davis, 2013; Olson et al., 2007). The two circles represent internationalization and multicultural education. In order for internationalization and multicultural education to be effective, they must not be marginalized or siloed in discrete offices or units, but they must be part of the whole institution (Banks, 2001; Boyer, 1995; Hudzik, 2011; Mestenhauser, 1998, 2002; Shuford, 2011). Each process – internationalization and multicultural transformation – encompasses much more than student learning. In keeping with Knight’s (1994) definition of internationalization, for example, internationalization should be present in the “teaching, research, and service functions” (p. 7) of an institution. According to Banks (2001), multicultural education has five dimensions: “1. Content integration, 2. The knowledge construction process, 3. Prejudice reduction, 4. An equity pedagogy, and 5. An empowering school culture and social structure” (p. 5). These dimensions have student learning at their core; however, they can encompass more than just student learning. For example, the knowledge construction process is involved in
research and theory as well. Internationalization and multicultural education overlap (Olson et al, 2007), and they may overlap in any of these functions.

Figure 1. Conceptual framework for the internationalization of multicultural student affairs

Student learning occurs in two different arenas in higher education: in the curriculum and in the co-curriculum (Magolda & Quaye, 2011). In this study, though there is discussion of study abroad, which is part of the curriculum, we are mostly concerned with the co-curriculum. This is because the participants are in student affairs and therefore not generally involved in the curricular offerings of the institutions where they work. The circles of internationalization and multicultural education overlap within student learning. This research study is situated where internationalization and multicultural education overlap within the co-curriculum. The co-curriculum is not a space for student services and activities in the absence of learning; instead, it has student learning as its main purpose (Magolda & Quaye, 2011). In fact, through partnerships with
academic affairs, the co-curriculum and curriculum are less separate than they once were (Kezar, 2009); however, for the purposes of this study, multicultural student affairs and internationalization of higher education meet mainly within the co-curricular area. In this space, represented by the dark purple space in the figure, work on the shared learning outcomes related to cultural identity and understanding, global interconnectedness, social justice, and social responsibility is taking place (Olson et al, 2007).

The current research is not focused on student learning, but on the professionals who facilitate it in the co-curriculum. The space where multicultural and international meet in student affairs can be further described using the concept of the “third space” (Whitchurch, 2013). Whitchurch refers to “third space” professionals in higher education in terms of academics who have non-academic or managerial functions, non-academic or managerial professionals who have academic functions, and those whose duties blend the two areas. Whitchurch draws on a tradition of scholars using the “third space” metaphor to describe the blending together of entities that once were more dichotomous: academic and non-academic staff, the classroom and outside the classroom, the institution and the community. Practitioners in each part of these pairs, and specifically the academic and non-academic professionals, may “see the other as dominant and themselves as marginalized,” (Whitchurch, 2013, p. 23). In seeking to work together in the spaces between the two halves of each pair, professionals “enshrine an ongoing tension that is essential to ‘critical engagement.’” (Whitchurch, 2013, p. 23). Bringing this back to multicultural and international education, and to the conceptual model above, the “third space” that becomes apparent is the one between internationalization and multicultural education.
Potential Study Limitations/Delimitations

Limitations. One limitation of this study is a social desirability bias (Spector, 2004). Because I as the researcher was known to the participants as an international education practitioner, they may have wished to appear to support internationalization more wholeheartedly in the interviews than they do in their practice. Indeed, I did not find as much tension or resistance to internationalization as I had expected; this could be partly due to this bias. Another possible limitation may be related to the identity of the researcher (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Staff members in multicultural student affairs tend to be members of diverse ethnic groups (Olson et al., 2007); in cases where they are employed at a “cultural center,” these professionals tend to be part of the group that is the center’s focus (Shuford, 2011). Because internationalization is a process that, according to the literature, may be perceived as “subsuming” the practice of multicultural education (Olson et al., 2007), it was possible that participants would find the subject of their participation in internationalization difficult to discuss openly with someone of a different ethnic, cultural, gender, or other type of identity who is also an international educator. Finding ways to establish a rapport was essential (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007).

Delimitations. The participants in this study were only student affairs professionals, not international education professionals or upper administration. Only those student affairs professionals working with multicultural education, for whom it is a main focus of their work, were included in the study. No faculty members, unless they also worked in multicultural student affairs administration, were included in the study. University executives at or above the Executive Director level, such as Provosts, Vice Presidents, and others, were not included. Two of the participants were Deans, but these
were among the only multicultural student affairs professionals at their institutions and had worked at lower levels earlier in their careers.

At the risk of perpetuating American exceptionalism (Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999), this study focuses on the U.S. context. The work of integrating international and multicultural perspectives in higher education is happening in other countries, such as the United Kingdom and Australia (Jones 2011; Caruana & Ploner, 2010). These contexts, however, are outside the scope of the current study.

**Summary**

This study provides some of the first academic research on a collaboration that is both timely and necessary as higher education continues to undergo internationalization and multicultural transformation. It will help in understanding the “third spaces” (Whitchurch, 2013) where internationalization and multicultural education practitioners and researchers come together, and what influences multicultural educators in colleges and universities in moving into or staying out of these spaces. This understanding, informed by research rather than by anecdotes and assumptions, is critical for both practitioners and researchers as calls for collaboration increase and initiatives for diversity in international education and internationalization of multicultural education continue at every level of higher education (see Chapter 2).

**Chapter Two: Review of the Literature**

The purpose of this study is to explore the engagement of multicultural student affairs professionals in the internationalization of the selected higher education institutions in which they work. The investigation concerns the intersections and tensions between the areas of internationalization and multicultural education in colleges and
universities, so the focus of the literature review will remain there. The first section will be a comparison of the areas of practice in terms of their origins and histories, key concepts and structures, goals and purposes. Following this will be a discussion of tensions and calls for collaboration between practitioners in the two areas, and finally a discussion on research with similarities or connections to this study.

**Comparison of Internationalization and Multicultural Education**

Many articles comparing the areas of internationalization and multicultural education in the United States begin with narratives of their histories (Cole, 1984; Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999; Olson et al., 2007). In describing the origins and shaping of each of the areas, important parallels and divergences start to emerge. Fundamental differences between the two areas, at least as they are embodied in U.S. higher education, lie in their origins and original purposes. Similarities between the two areas include recommended structures for the incorporation of their principles into higher education institutions, similar theoretical models, and goals and learning outcomes. These similarities and differences are all complicated by the problem that neither area of practice is at all unified in its key concepts and principles; each has critical perspectives and tensions within the area itself.

**Histories.** It is necessary to understand the histories of both multicultural education and the internationalization of higher education in order to understand the context of the current study, and the climate in which any collaboration between practitioners of the two areas must take place. The histories of the areas reveal differences in their origins, focuses, and the motivations that stakeholders have when choosing to participate in the activities of either area.
**History of multicultural education.** Banks (2004b) identifies the origins of multicultural education as far back as the nineteenth century. The intergroup education movement of the 1940s and 1950s, which emphasized how groups should be able to get along with one another and reduce tensions, was not the origin of multicultural education; instead, multicultural education arose out of ethnic studies movements, which were more focused on the struggles of certain ethnic groups in the United States (Banks, 2004b). These movements originated in the nineteenth century and continue to this day (Banks, 2004b). Banks identifies the ethnic studies movement as the first phase of multicultural education. The second phase was multiethnic education (Banks, 2004b; Cortés, 1983), focusing on systemic change rather than just curriculum reform. Phase Three was when non-ethnic groups such as women and people with disabilities began to be included (Banks, 2004b). Phase Four is where Banks placed the field in the early 2000s; it was characterized by the interplay of race, class and gender in education.

Other scholars (Cornwell & Stoddard 1999; Shuford, 2011) place the origins of multicultural education during the Civil Rights movement in the United States. The goals of multicultural education at that time were fair representation in institutions and in history, and it was manifested in academic departments such as Women’s Studies and African-American Studies (Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999). During the culture wars of the 1980s, there was a backlash against multiculturalism, trying to protect Eurocentrism (Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999).

Multicultural education came into higher education and student affairs as a result of the Civil Rights movement (Shuford, 2011). Student affairs in general had been evolving into a professional area of practice mainly in the twentieth century (Rhatigan,
It evolved over that century from the positions of deans of men, deans of women, and personnel workers into a more holistic approach to student development (Shuford, 2011). The societal changes of the 1960s affected student affairs in many ways, one of which had to do with civil rights. The oppression and segregation of different groups in U.S. society was reflected in higher education, and the purpose of multicultural student services is to redress these injustices (Kupo, 2011).

Multicultural student affairs offices developed at predominantly White institutions (PWIs) to serve different students who were coming in after these institutions began to desegregate, in the early 1960s (Shuford, 2011). Each of these offices was established to provide services to help students of one specific group adjust to college life, but the offices evolved to provide services for all different groups and offer multicultural and diversity programming for all students on campus (Shuford, 2011). The name of this office, usually housed within the student affairs division in colleges and universities, also evolved, from minority affairs to multicultural affairs, diversity affairs, intercultural services and others (Shuford, 2011). “Cultural centers,” bearing the name of a group – for example, the Center for Black Studies – are not the same as multicultural student services offices (Shuford, 2011; Young, 1991). Cultural centers also provide student support, but they have academic and programming functions that the multicultural student services offices do not have (Young, 1991).

Campus climate is another issue in multicultural student services and campus diversity. Cheatham (1991) promoted cultural pluralism and diversity on college campuses. Milem, Clayton-Pedersen, Hurtado, and Allen (1998) identified four
dimensions of campus climate: these are historical legacy, structural diversity, and psychological and behavioral climate.

Another aspect of multicultural education in institutions of higher education is the notion that all student affairs personnel should be multiculturally competent. Pope and Mueller (2000) developed an instrument to measure multicultural competency for student affairs professionals. The impetus for this was their conviction that student affairs professionals needed to be multiculturally competent in order to deal with diversity on campuses (Pope, Reynolds, & Mueller, 2004). This was remarkable in that it was not specifically focused on multicultural student affairs professionals (Pope et al., 2004). Currently, the two major professional associations for U.S. student affairs professionals, ACPA and NASPA, promote an “Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion,” or EDI, competency area, which “includes the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to create learning environments that are enriched with diverse views and people. It is also designed to create an institutional ethos that accepts and celebrates differences among people, helping to free them of any misconceptions and prejudices,” (ACPA & NASPA, 2010). The two associations provide lists of competencies expected for the basic, intermediate, and advanced levels of this competency area.

History of internationalization. In contrast to that of multicultural education, the history of internationalization of higher education in the United States goes back to the first U.S. colleges and universities (de Wit & Merkx, 2012). At first, U.S. universities were modeled on English and German universities, and U.S American students went to Europe to finish their studies (de Wit & Merkx, 2012). Until the end of the nineteenth century, however, what is currently defined as internationalization cannot be said to have
been taking place. The period from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century in U.S.
higher education is more accurately characterized as national than as international,
though international student and scholar mobility and research collaboration were a part
of this period as well (de Wit & Merkx, 2012).

At the end of the nineteenth century, there began to appear more systematic
programs to provide an international dimension to higher education (de Wit & Merkx,
2012), which would bring this period into line with Knight’s (1994) definition of
internationalization. Cornwell and Stoddard (1999) place the beginning of modern
internationalization after the second World War, though international organizations such
as the Institute of International Education and education abroad programs for women had
begun to be founded before and after the first World War (de Wit & Merkx, 2012).
Cornwell and Stoddard (1999) identify the goal of internationalization as promoting
peace among nations and strategic interests of U.S. During the Cold War, there were also
the motivations of learning about potential allies and enemies; Cornwell and Stoddard
(1999) link this to area studies programs. De Wit and Merkx (2012) also identify national
security as a motivation for international programs.

Jones and de Wit (2012) assert that internationalization became more holistic in
scope in 1990s. Rather than talking about discrete international education activities such
as student mobility and curricular dimensions, internationalization of the core functions
of institutions began to be discussed (Jones & de Wit, 2012). Thus, the modern
conception of internationalization includes a more comprehensive dimension.

Ludeman (2008) dates the beginning of the internationalization of U.S. student
affairs from the 1980s, when representatives from Ireland, Germany, Hong Kong, and
other countries began attending meetings of NASPA and ACPA, two professional associations for student affairs. Fulbright International Education Administrators grants have been awarded to U.S. student affairs professionals since about that time as well, with the aim of mutual understanding between these administrators and their counterparts abroad (Ludeman, 2008). In the 1990s, NASPA began its International Education Knowledge Community and exchange programs with organizations in other countries (Ludeman, 2008). Perhaps because many international activities, such as international student and scholar services and education abroad offices, are housed within academic affairs rather than student affairs, research on internationalization of student affairs on campus is minimal (Di Maria, 2012).

**Fundamental differences.** It is apparent in reading the short histories above that there are some fundamental differences in the origins and focuses of multicultural education and the internationalization of higher education. Bennett and Bennett (1994) call the origin of internationalization a “top down” approach, where administrators and those in power at institutions started to engage in internationalization activities such as education abroad programs and international partnerships and linkages. Funding was necessary for these programs, which also gave them a privileged position (Bennett and Bennett, 1994). Meanwhile, multicultural education came from the “bottom up”: those who were marginalized and disregarded in higher education began to demand equal treatment in institutions. These were students or individual faculty members, so they did not have the power that the administration had (Bennett and Bennett, 1994). The ACE At Home in the World report (Olson et al., 2007) also identified differences in structures and motivations. Though both areas are often marginalized on campuses, the structures of
who is responsible for multicultural education and internationalization vary widely even within each area of practice. Also, there are the academic aspects of each area and the student services aspects, which are often separate as well (Olson et al., 2007). The motivations for participation by faculty and by students vary as well. Olson et al. (2007) assert that multicultural education has traditionally been taken up as a way to redress inequities in society or in education, while internationalization has been something faculty and students engaged in for personal enrichment.

Cornwell and Stoddard (1999) identify American isolationism and exceptionalism as reasons that practitioners in the two areas have not worked together more. They identify the focus of multicultural education as citizenship and leadership – local rather than global. Multicultural studies represents people from diverse groups being brought into the academy, whereas area studies and internationalization represent White Americans studying “the other” (Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999).

**Similarities.** The differences between multicultural education and internationalization may run deep, but there are also many common elements that the two areas share. These include conceptual elements such as their ideal implementation at an institution, stage models for the development of intercultural and multicultural competence, and common goals and outcomes. In addition to these common elements, each area must respond or continue to respond to the forces of globalization in higher education, and each has its critics who describe limitations in the current status quo. The parallels between the two areas provide structures in which collaboration can occur.

**Comprehensive/systems approach.** One striking similarity between multicultural education and internationalization is the structure that their adherents idealize within
higher education. Each process ideally transforms every aspect of an institution and academia in general. In international education, this is currently referred to as “comprehensive internationalization” (Hudzik, 2011). Mestenhauser (1998, 2002, 2011) called this concept a “systems approach.” His complaint with internationalization as it had happened up to that point was that it was too fragmented to be effective. Internationalization had been implemented piecemeal in area studies, foreign languages, and other departments, and in international offices, but not in the institution as a whole. Thus there was no strategic direction for internationalization (Mestenhauser, 1998).

Boyer (1995) called for a “total multicultural transformation of the academy” (p. 23). This was similar to comprehensive internationalization in that it would make multicultural content and initiatives part of the entire system of U.S. higher education, rather than marginalize multicultural education into a few programs designed just for certain students. Banks (2001) also advocated for the multicultural transformation of the “total school environment” (p. 51). Like Mestenhauser, Banks cites Senge (1990) and calls for “systems thinking.” Shuford (2011), in writing about multicultural student services, describes the work toward this goal: “In some respects, MSS staff were working themselves out of a job. If the campus climate was more embracing of diversity, where all students felt welcomed and included on campus, there would be no need for direct services for underrepresented groups on campus” (p. 36). She goes on to say, however, that this state of affairs is far from reality (Shuford, 2011).

Models and typologies. Practitioners and researchers in the areas of internationalization and multicultural education employ a number of models and typologies in order to explain intercultural and multicultural development in individuals,
types of curricular integration of multicultural concepts, and the internationalization or multicultural transformation of an institution or organization. Some of these models are quite similar. The parallels between the models may seem superficial, such as two theoretical models with six stages, but they enable a researcher to understand how the areas of practice can fit together, and may help practitioners in each to be able to understand the other.

In the field of international education, Bennett’s (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, or DMIS, is frequently used in intercultural training. An instrument based on this model, the Intercultural Development Inventory, or IDI, is also commonly used in intercultural training and as a pre- and post-test for study abroad and intercultural programs (Hammer, 2012). Bennett and Bennett (1994) also recommend that the DMIS be used in multicultural or diversity training in institutions. The DMIS consists of six stages, moving from ethnocentric stages (the first three) to ethnorelative stages (the last three). Denial is the first stage, followed by Defense, Minimization, Acceptance, Adaptation, and, finally, Integration (Bennett, 1993). Each of the stages describes how an individual deals with cultural difference: for example, in the Minimization stage, the individual tends to minimize cultural difference, favoring instead characteristics and behaviors that this individual thinks are universal.

In terms of multicultural development of an individual, Banks (2001) developed the Typology of Ethnic Identity. This model is similar to Bennett’s model, in that it contains six stages, which are developmental in nature and exist along a continuum over which an individual develops through time and learning (Banks, 2001). Banks includes curricular implications of the six stages, just as Bennett (1993) includes training design
suggestions for each of his six stages. Both Bennett and Banks advocate for
developmentally-appropriate curriculum in order to promote development along their
respective continua. While the constructs of intercultural sensitivity and ethnic identity
development are not the same, the stages in the two models also show some similarities.
For example, Banks’s (2001) Stage 4: Biculturalism is similar to Bennett’s (1993)
Acceptance stage, which is also at the fourth position on the continuum. People in these
stages are culturally self-aware. In Banks’s (2001) Stage 4, however, these people are
already starting to be able to navigate two cultures; in Bennett’s (1993) model, this comes
at Adaptation rather than Acceptance. Bennett and Bennett (1994) cite Banks’s model as
a way for international educators to understand where certain students are in terms of
their identity development, and advocate for this approach to training, perhaps since it is
similar to the latter Bennett’s DMIS (1993).

There are also developmental models in each area for how institutions transform
into multicultural or internationalized organizations. One of these is Jackson and
Holvino’s (1988) framework, which pertains to any organization, not just a higher
education institution. Jackson and Holvino (1988), drawing from Jackson’s previous
work in an unpublished paper with Hardiman, outline six developmental stages for the
multicultural development of an organization. The first is the exclusionary organization,
followed by the club, then the compliance organization (in which diversity is only
pursued insofar as it will not disrupt the organization’s status quo), and then stage four is
the affirmative action organization (Jackson and Holvino, 1988). The first two stages are
level one, and the second two are level two. In level three, stage five is the redefining
organization, and finally, stage six is the multicultural organization (Jackson and
Holvino, 1988). This is similar to the developmental models for individuals described above.

Pope and Reynolds developed a template for multicultural organization development for student affairs practitioners, which could be used to develop a strategic plan around this area (Pope et al., 2004). The categories for development are definition of multicultural, mission statement, leadership and advocacy, policy, diverse staff, training for multicultural competency, scholarly activities, department/division programs and services, physical environment and assessment (Pope et al., 2004). This does not pertain just to the multicultural student affairs area, but to all areas of student affairs.

For internationalization of an institution, there are also several models. Knight (1994) developed the internationalization cycle. There are six stages in this cycle: awareness, commitment, planning, operationalize, review, and reinforcement. These are represented not in a hierarchy but in a circle; institutions move through these phases, but not necessarily sequentially. The circle itself represents a culture in the institution that is supportive of internationalization. Ellingboe (1998) used Bennett’s (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity to determine where different colleges at the University of Minnesota stood in terms of their intercultural development. Ellingboe was using a model intended for an individual instead on units within an institution; in this context, Bennett’s model is actually not dissimilar to Jackson and Holvino’s (1988).

Other models of internationalization are less process-oriented and more like maps or portraits. Paige (2005) developed a model with 10 categories of key performance indicators that colleges and universities could use to assess their internationalization. These categories were areas in which progress could be measured. They included
leadership, strategic plans, infrastructure, and activities such as student mobility and faculty involvement. Paige included several specific indicators under each category. Horn, Hendel, and Fry (2007), also listed a number of performance indicators, based on a model in Mestenhauser’s (2002) work. They included only five categories, which were student characteristics, scholar characteristics, research orientation, curricular content, and organizational support. Horn et al. applied these indicators to several research institutions in the United States and came up with an index that they used to rank these universities.

These models and typologies show some similarities; they are developmental and show an individual or an institution as moving from less multicultural to more, or less international to more, though the movement through these stages differs in the different models (for example in Jackson and Holvino’s (1988) model and in Knight’s (1994) model). In looking at the models, one can see that it would not be difficult to adapt a model from one area for use in the other. For example, Bennett’s (1993) model has been used in multicultural as well as international education contexts (Bennett & Bennett, 2004).

**Common learning outcomes.** Braskamp (2009), writing about the gap between internationalization and multicultural education in higher education institutions, recommends beginning with student learning outcomes when trying to bridge the gap. This is echoed in other calls for collaboration (Bennett & Bennett, 1994; Olson et al., 2007) Common goals and learning outcomes are identified in many of these articles. Cortés, as early as 1983, identified common goals between what he called at that time
“global education” and “multiethnic education”; these were improving understanding, 
communications, and group relations; stereotype reduction, and understanding diversity.

Cole (1984), Cornwell and Stoddard (1999), Olson et al. (2007), and Matriano and Toh (2013) all developed detailed lists of common student learning outcomes. Banks (2001) holds that multicultural and global education are intended to promote cross-cultural competency and the ability to see issues and topics from a variety of viewpoints. It is because of these common learning outcomes that student learning should be at the center of any attempt to integrate the two areas to any degree; if practitioners from one area engage with the other, it must be with these outcomes or similar ones in mind.

Response to globalization. Though internationalization as a process is identified as a response to globalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Jones & de Wit, 2012; Knight, 1994), both areas of practice must continue to respond to this economic and social force. Banks (2004a) documents ways in which education systems in different countries have implemented policies on multicultural education as mobility has increased the ethnic diversity of these countries. The calls for collaboration between practitioners of internationalization and multicultural education also represent a recognition that multicultural education must respond to globalization (Davis, 2013; Olson et al., 2007; Olson & Peacock, 2012). Internationalization, too, must change as globalization continues to transform higher education. Knight (2012) discusses changes in internationalization throughout the last 30 years, including the terminology used, the increasing diversity and number of stakeholders in the process, and the changing motivations for internationalization at the institutional and national levels. She warns that
internationalization will continue to be a disorganized, reactionary movement unless clear rationales are put forward by institutions and at the policy level.

**Critical perspectives.** There are critical perspectives on the work in each of these areas. Some authors believe that either internationalization or multicultural education has run its course, or that it is not operating in a way that serves important goals. In fact, critical authors in each area have speculated on the “end” of the area or some important aspect of it (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011; Willinsky, 2012). These critical perspectives are important as higher education moves toward collaboration between the two areas. The critics raise important concerns about the purposes and directions – the futures of each area as well as the future that they may share.

Some of these critical perspectives are parallel. Grünzweig and Rinehart (2002) critique international education at the beginning of the 21st century. They warn against international education promoting globalism, which they see as a homogenizing influence in which cultures become more and more the same instead of celebrating difference. Similarly, May and Sleeter (2010) critique liberal multiculturalism as a hegemonic system in which tolerance becomes more important than justice and human rights.

Brandenburg and de Wit (2011) criticize international education for being too focused on the means rather than on the end of internationalization. They exhort international educators and researchers to look at the outcomes of international education activities rather than on the activities themselves. This echoes Braskamp’s (2009) call to focus on student learning outcomes in internationalization. It also hearkens back to Mestenhauser’s (1998, 2002) critique of a fragmented, disconnected area of practice. Failing to recognize that activities are not producing the desired outcomes, and that there
is still considerable confusion as to what the desired outcomes are, will result in stagnation of the process (Brandenburg and de Wit, 2012; Mestenhauser, 2002).

Critiques of multicultural education go back further in time and are more numerous. Banks (2001) identifies 10 different paradigms for multicultural education, each of which is somewhat at odds with one or more of the others. Ladson-Billings (2004) also details different paradigms, such as conservative multiculturalism, liberal multiculturalism, and critical multiculturalism. She suggests critical race theory as a way forward for multicultural education. By working within this paradigm, researchers can challenge the other forms of multiculturalism that Ladson-Billings warns may be reproducing social inequities.

**Tensions and Calls for Collaboration between Multicultural Education and Internationalization**

There have long been tensions between multicultural education and internationalization. These tensions have been manifest not just in higher education but in U.S. education in general, at all levels. In the 1980s, calls for collaboration between the two areas began to emerge. Acknowledgement of the tensions between the two areas was followed by recommendations on how to merge principles, personnel, and programs, towards some common goals. These recommendations rarely call for a merger or integration of the areas, but collaboration and dialogue among practitioners. There are also theories, which, according to their proponents, encompass multicultural and international or global educational ideals, thus providing spaces where the two areas can come together.
It is important to note that very few of the calls for collaboration or descriptions of tensions between the two areas contain any research findings or documentation on the tensions or the collaborations. Perceptions and opinions that multicultural and international educators held about one another and about their areas of practice are listed and described anecdotally, but, for the most part, not substantiated. This does not imply that the perceptions and opinions do not exist; they have been observed, but not studied.

**Tensions Identified**

Cortés (1983) may have been one of the first to recognize common goals and possible synergies between global education and multiethnic education (note that these are terms that Cortés used in the 1980s, not terms that are in wide use today). Cortés was talking about U.S. education in general, not higher education specifically. He recognized that collaboration might be difficult, as at that time neither of the two areas, or educational reform movements as he called them, was assured of its future in U.S. education. Turf and territory were contested, and teachers or other practitioners in each area feared that the other would dilute or draw attention away from their own (Cortés, 1983). Cortés uses the example of teachers teaching about Japanese Americans by teaching about Japanese people instead; these groups of people are not the same, but it may be easier for U.S. Americans to talk about a group that is far removed from its own experience than to confront the unpleasant fact of Japanese internment camps in their own recent history. The unpleasant facts, however, are important to discuss and should not be avoided in this way.

Noronha (1992) asserts that multicultural education is political and focuses on conflict, but, in contrast, international/intercultural education is focused on enrichment
and adjustment. Multicultural education and international education professionals do not often work together, and even the students they serve, whom Noronha identifies as “multicultural students” and “international students” do not interact or identify with each other (Noronha, 1992). Noronha further claims that international students have more money, are older, and tend to be involved in graduate studies, while multicultural students are from lower socioeconomic statuses and do not complete degrees in as high proportions. Though Noronha cites other authors to substantiate her claims about the focuses of multicultural and international education, there are no such citations or research substantiating the claims about “international” and “multicultural” students. Similarly, Baker (1999), writing about K-12 education, and Bennett and Bennett (1994) discuss many disputes between the two “sides,” but do not provide evidence or research to show what these disputes are.

**Toward collaboration.** Cole (1984) identified linkages and common goals for multicultural and global education. Cole states that in order to bring the two areas together, one must go through the process of integrating the other. This author recommends multiculturalizing global education rather than globalizing multicultural education as a way forward for the two areas, because the focus in this case would be more on the individual, which is where change must begin (Cole, 1984). Bennett and Bennett (2004), on the other hand, see focusing too much on the individual as ethnocentric; individualism is a value of certain cultural groups, but not others. They recommend intercultural communication as a common ground where international educators and multicultural educators in higher education could meet (Bennett and Bennett, 1994). Cornwell and Stoddard (1999) also identify common goals and make
recommendations on how to advance them. These recommendations included focusing on language study, experiential learning both on and off campus, study abroad, and service learning (Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999). Banks (2001) recommends that global and multicultural education should be linked, because of their common learning outcomes related to cultural competence and seeing things from different perspectives, but warns that they should not become one area of practice.

Bennett and Bennett (1994) suggest bringing international educators into the dialogue about diversity on campuses. They point to the expertise that international educators have about cultural difference and how to navigate culture shock and intercultural conflict as useful in “domestic diversity” situations and training (Bennett and Bennett, 1994). Washington (2011), on the other hand, suggests that multicultural student services be brought into international education: “MSS offices are in the best position to partner with faculty, community, and service-learning offices, as well as internships and study abroad programs, to create intentional opportunities for students not only to be in a different space and exposed to difference, but also to actively engage others within and across difference. These partnerships create a climate in which the MSS office can be an integral part of the learning for all students and not just those who the office has been thought to traditionally serve” (p. 251).

Lowman (2013), in a book called *Internationalizing Multiculturalism*, makes the assertion that immigration and globalization mean that professionals in all fields must be not only multiculturally competent but internationally so. Old concepts of domestic multiculturalism no longer work, if one must deal with new immigrants to one’s own country or with populations in other countries (Lowman, 2013). Matriano and Toh
(2013), in a chapter in this same book, stress the importance of multicultural education and internationalization coming together, but add an emphasis on critical multicultural education rather than liberal multicultural education. The common goals should be more along the lines of peace, justice, and social responsibility than personal development (Matriano & Toh, 2013)

Gailda Pitre Davis, Associate Director of the Inclusive Excellence Group at the American Council on Education, worked on the At Home in the World initiative, though she was not one of the authors of the report (Olson et al., 2007). In a publication for NAFSA: Association of International Educators, she summarizes some of the findings from the project and brings in literature on organizational change to give direction on how to proceed to international educators who are interested in collaborating (Davis, 2013). Olson et al. (2007), in the At Home in the World report, reiterate Banks’s (2001) recommendation that the two areas work together, but stay separate, and that one not take over the other.

**Theories integrating the two areas.** Certain authors and practitioners have proposed theoretical frameworks in which multicultural education and internationalization can exist together, so that the professionals in these areas can collaborate toward common goals. Global citizenship, Bennett’s (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, and Deardorff’s (2006) process model of intercultural competence are existing constructs that incorporate both multicultural education and internationalization. “Intercross-culturalism” (Intercultural Communication Institute, 2013) is a new framework proposed for the two areas to work together, and
“glocalization” of higher education (Jean Francois, 2015; Sobania, 2015) is bringing the international and the domestic together to bridge this gap.

Global citizenship is a concept that has recently been gaining ground in internationalization, especially in education abroad (Lewin, 2009; Schattle, 2009). Citizenship is an important construct in multicultural education as well, and recently this has taken on a global dimension (Banks, 2004a). Schattle (2009) traces the origins of the concept of global citizenship from the realms of political philosophy and international relations, where it stemmed from cosmopolitanism. In its modern conception, global citizenship contains elements of self-awareness, outward awareness, and global responsibility. Global citizenship is a potential meeting ground for multicultural and international education (Hovland, 2006).

Olson & Peacock (2012) suggest other meeting grounds. They suggest Bennett’s (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity and Deardorff’s (2006) process model of intercultural competence as possible “bridging constructs” between internationalization and multicultural education. They also point to grounded globalism, which “explicates how global domains are grounded in local contexts” (p. 313). One of the authors, James Peacock, worked with the concept of grounded globalism in implementing local/global programs at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

These suggestions for using existing theories and constructs may not be deemed adequate for all practitioners, however. At the Intercultural Communication Institute’s Winter Institute for Intercultural Communication in March 2014, Dr. Barbee Myers Oakes and Dr. J. Kline Harrison, both of Wake Forest University, presented on a new paradigm they called “intercross-culturalism” (Intercultural Communication Institute,
This was promoted as a way for international and diversity offices to work together with a “common language,” suggesting possibly that to use terms or theories from one area and not the other would be exclusionary or place one area in a more privileged position.

There have been two recent works on incorporating glocalization into global or international education (Jean Francois, 2015; Sobania, 2015a). Glocalization is described by Jean Francois as “the hybridization of globality and localness through the integration of multistakeholderness into a framework of segmented inclusiveness,” (2015, p. 64). Jean Francois goes on to lay out a theoretical framework for incorporating glocalization into international education. He argues that this is a better approach than internationalization because it is executed through partnerships between global and local interests. This lessens inequities and homogenization, both of which are associated with globalization and therefore internationalization (Jean Francois, 2015).

The contributors to the volume edited by Sobania (2015a) take a more practical approach to the glocalization of higher education, focusing specifically on study away. Study away programs are similar to study abroad, where students go to other countries to study, but study away programs take place in students’ home country. Sobania (2015b) asserts that these programs help students learn about domestic diversity as well as global issues. Each chapter in this volume describes a different study away program. In one of the chapters, Book, McMerty, and Webb (2015) describe the Elon in Los Angeles and Elon in NYC programs from Elon University in North Carolina. These programs have the explicit goals of global awareness and preparing students to work with diverse people. The learning outcomes of the programs showed gains in intercultural learning (Book,
McMerty, & Webb, 2015). Thus, glocalization can be seen as another theoretical framework bridging the gap between multicultural education and internationalization, and study away is its practical application.

**Research Works Informing This Study**

While much of the literature cited above is theoretical or anecdotal in nature, and research on internationalization of student affairs and collaborations between multicultural student affairs and internationalization is just beginning (Olson et al., 2007), there are bodies of research literature that, when considered together, provide a context for and inform the current study. There are several theoretical and research works that deal with the internationalization of certain fields of study or disciplines, and then some with perceptions or engagement in internationalization among certain groups, for example faculty. There is some literature on the internationalization of U.S. student affairs as well as multicultural education in student affairs. One area of the literature on education abroad deals with multicultural groups and is often referred to as literature on underrepresentation in education abroad, and there is also some research on the internationalization of multicultural education. These last two categories may be seen as multiculturalizing international education and internationalizing multicultural education, respectively (Cole, 1984).

**Internationalization of fields/disciplines.** Because multicultural student affairs is part of a field of study within U.S. higher education, studies on the internationalization of other fields and disciplines are helpful in informing this study. These studies contain frameworks for looking at the internationalization of certain fields or disciplines, as well as indicators that can be used to assess the level or degree of internationalization of the
field or discipline. The studies included here each deal with internationalization of several disciplines or academic units.

Groennings and Wiley (1990) did the first work on internationalization of academic disciplines. As part of a Title VI-funded project, they invited the professional associations for academic disciplines to participate and contribute to the understanding of internationalization. Eight of the professional associations responded, and the resulting book is a collection of essays from each of the disciplines, describing the internationalization of undergraduate education in the discipline. The fields that are represented are geography, political science, philosophy, sociology, psychology, history, and journalism. The rationale behind this project was that faculty in the disciplines are where change can be seen in universities. The essays reveal a variety of approaches and processes of internationalization, but the authors generalize themes of expanding frameworks for knowledge, using global data in research, involving more faculty in internationalization, and bringing global perspectives to the curriculum.

Ellingboe (1998), building on Groennings and Wiley’s (1990) work, analyzed the internationalization of five different colleges at the University of Minnesota. She looked at six different components of internationalization, and used indicators within these components to place each college along an adapted form of Bennett’s (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. She found considerable variation in the ways each college internationalized. She also identified barriers and resistance factors to internationalization, as well as encouragement factors. Though this is a case study, Ellingboe’s identification of these encouragement and resistance factors is important to any researcher looking at engagement in internationalization.
Paige and Mestenhauser (1999), not in a research study but in a book review, lay out seven dimensions in the internationalization of a field. These are: the integrative dimension, the intercultural dimension, the interdisciplinary dimension, the comparative dimension, the transfer of knowledge-technology dimension, the contextual dimension, and the global dimension (pp. 504-505). Paige and Mestenhauser call the combination of these dimensions an “international mind-set” (p. 505). This framework incorporates thinking and research from other scholars, and is helpful in understanding the internationalization of a field; it could be applied to multicultural student affairs, for example.

Engagement in/perceptions of internationalization and multicultural education. Because this research study is about engagement in internationalization, it is helpful to understand other studies that have focused on engagement, participation, or perceptions of internationalization and multicultural education by certain groups. These studies contain information on motivations and barriers to participating in internationalization and multicultural education activities and programs for certain groups, as well as ideas about how these groups perceive internationalization and multicultural education on their campuses. Included here are studies on faculty and teacher engagement in internationalization, as well as works about student affairs and internationalization and/or multicultural education. Some of these studies are only about internationalization, others are only about multicultural education, and in some, the two are inextricably bound together.

Faculty. There have been several case studies of faculty engagement in internationalization. In these case studies, the authors researched faculty members’
understanding of internationalization, motivations for faculty to participate, perceived importance or value of internationalization at the institution, and barriers the faculty members perceived to their engagement. Some findings of these studies include lack of understanding on the part of the faculty members (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Friesen, 2013); the need for more structure from the administration on internationalization strategies (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Friesen, 2013); the lack of funding and personnel available for international education activities (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Friesen, 2013) and the different motivations held by faculty and administration when it comes to rationales for engagement in internationalization (Friesen, 2013). There are also different factors contributing to faculty members’ engagement or non-engagement in internationalization; Beatty (2013) found that men and women faculty members in his case study of two schools at the University of Minnesota had different levels of engagement in internationalization, as did tenured and non-tenured faculty members. In some of these studies, the faculty members perceived that internationalization was a priority at their institutions, though they might have wanted more structure and/or support (Beatty, 2013; Dewey and Duff, 2009; Friesen, 2013). The research described in this paragraph is mostly case-study research, with the exception of Friesen’s (2013) phenomenological study. The case study method does not allow for generalizability, usually (Creswell, 2009), but the fact that the findings are similar across all of these studies is interesting and will inform the current research.

**Student affairs.** The research on internationalization, multicultural education, and student affairs is not as focused on engagement as the literature on internationalization and faculty. Included here are studies on student experiences of internationalization, a
portrait of multicultural student services, student affairs graduate programs and internationalization, and student affairs professionals’ perceptions of international student services. This is not an exhaustive list of studies on multicultural education and student affairs; there are a few more studies on multicultural competence in student affairs professionals, for example (Pope et al., 2004). There are also more studies on international student adjustment, which reference student affairs (Di Maria, 2012). The studies listed have been selected because they relate to the current research.

Mazon (2010) conducted a qualitative study on the student experience of internationalization at a U.S. and a Dutch university. The findings have implications for student affairs practice. They indicate that there are silos for international student services, multicultural affairs, and international education. Campus culture "has a bearing on how student affairs professionals approach their role as facilitators of internationalization," (p. 206). According to the study, students choose components of international education but do not integrate them; they are consumers of activities and experiences. Mazon recommends that institutions be more intentional about their internationalization strategies in order for students to engage fully. Students need to understand internationalization in context of their education and future career plans. Mazon implicates the gap between student affairs and international student and scholar services, as well as the gap between multicultural education and international education, in preventing these learning outcomes from being achieved.

Stewart and Bridges (2011) sought a portrait of multicultural student services. They sent e-mail surveys to those ACPA members who identified as multicultural student services professionals. They found that the purposes for creation of a multicultural
student services office were student interest and activism; to address retention issues; to serve a changing student population; and institutional reorganization. They provide statistics on where these respondents said their multicultural student services office was housed, what the reporting line was within the institution, what position in the institution the person in charge held was, and other descriptive information. They also examined attitudes on campus toward multicultural student services. They found that most felt lukewarm support from faculty and upper administration, but somewhat more support from students. This study had a methodological issue, in that the population was rather small, with only 464 professionals on the mailing list, and the response rate was extremely low. The authors give possible reasons for this, which informed Chapter 3 of the present study.

Pope and Mueller (2000) developed a scale of multicultural competence for student affairs personnel. Drawing on work in the counseling psychology field, which they place ten years ahead of their own, they developed a model of seven competencies for student affairs practitioners. One of these competencies was multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills, but the authors also are careful to point out that this competency should infuse and inform the other six competencies as well (Pope et al., 2004). A few researchers have used Pope and Mueller’s scale to draw connections between multicultural competence and other characteristics of the student affairs professional (Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller, 2004). These studies have had interesting results, but Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller identify them as initial research and call for more work to be done in this area.
Schulz, Lee, Cantwell, McClellan, and Woodard (2007) found a wide range of
degrees of internationalization in student affairs graduate programs. Of 63 institutions
that responded to the researchers’ survey, 17 had student affairs graduate programs that
were not internationalized at all, 8 had programs that were highly internationalized, and
the rest had some degree of internationalization. The researchers looked at different
components of internationalization, and found that student-driven ones such as
independent research on international topics and education abroad opportunities were
more prevalent than faculty-driven ones such as curricular internationalization and
faculty members overseeing international initiatives. Obstacles to internationalization in
these programs included lack of funding and resources, faculty not feeling qualified to
provide international programs, travel issues, and ethnocentrism on the part of the faculty
members.

Schulz et al.’s (2007) analysis found that education abroad programs were a
common form of internationalization in student affairs graduate programs. Haber and
Getz (2011) discuss a study abroad program in which the students traveled to Doha,
Qatar to gain cultural understanding and help colleagues there to provide student affairs
services. Study abroad can also be part of student affairs practice. For example, Christie
and Ragans (1999) describe study abroad programs led by student affairs staff, and
exchanges of student affairs staff to different countries. They helped build a residence
hall in Costa Rica with Costa Rican colleagues. Because a multicultural student affairs
professional participated in the program described by Christie and Ragans, it is also an
example of multicultural student affairs participation in international education, though
the article is not a research study.
Though there has been literature on the adjustment of international students to college life in the United States and elsewhere, the research on international students and student affairs professionals is relatively rare (Di Maria, 2012). Di Maria, however, studied factors related to the views of student affairs professionals regarding international student services. He used a Scale of Current Views and a Scale of Ideal Views, and found positive correlations between certain factors, such as number of foreign language courses taken, and high scores on these scales, but also a lack of correlation for other factors, such as previous travel outside the United States. He also found that student affairs administrators would like to know more about internationalization at their institutions, but did not feel that they had sufficient training to deal with the unique problems of international students. The student affairs professionals also saw the main responsibility of providing support to international students in the international student office. Though this study only included student affairs professionals at institutions in Ohio with more than 1,000 international students, and its findings are therefore not generalizable to all institution types or the entire United States, the methodology and the survey instrument were influential in the current research.

One other study, an unpublished Master’s thesis from the University of Minnesota, dealt with the internationalization of student affairs administrators (Samano, 2012). This study shares some commonalities with the current study: Samano investigated the perceptions of internationalization among student affairs administrators, and found that many of her participants had positive perceptions, but that there was confusion or ambiguity about the concept itself (2012). However, Samano also discussed with these administrators the importance of their incorporating an international dimension...
into their work, and competencies required for students to be global-ready. Her participants were all from one institution, the University of Minnesota, and were engaged in a concerted effort to “help students be ‘global-ready,’” (Samano, 2012, p. 34). Samano also found that her participants discussed diversity and multicultural issues along with internationalization, almost seeing them as parallel or interwoven (2012).

Underrepresentation in education abroad. From studies on the internationalization of disciplines and of student affairs, we move on to studies on multicultural transformation in international education, beginning with underrepresentation in education abroad. This is an area of the literature that has seen a lot of attention in recent years (Comp, 2006). Researchers and international educators, perceiving an inequity in the provision of international education to students who are “underrepresented” in study abroad participation, seek to understand the reasons for low rates of participation among certain groups. The following studies do not represent an exhaustive listing of this area, because it is only tangentially related to the current research in that it is an area where principles and theory from multicultural education may be incorporated into internationalization, thus forming a part of the “overlap” where this study is situated. This area, however, relates to the multicultural transformation of internationalization rather than the internationalization of multicultural education.

Some of the studies on underrepresentation in education abroad relate to one specific group and reasons for the low rates of participation, while others relate to diversity of participation in general. For example, the Council on International Educational Exchange (1991) and Talburt and Stewart (1999) deal with the participation and experiences of African American students in education abroad. In the Council on
International Educational Exchange (1991) document, different authors who were presenters and participants at a conference discuss barriers to participation in study abroad by African American students, including the famous “Four Fs”: faculty and staff, finances, family and community, and fears (Cole, 1991). Talburt and Stewart (1999) discuss a study abroad program they led in which they observed the experiences of one African American student, and ineffective and shallow discussions of race and gender. This article ends with recommendations for curriculum that specifically deal with these issues (Talburt and Stewart, 1999).

Picard, Bernardino, and Ehigiator (2009) present case studies of Georgia State University and the University of Pittsburgh, in which they detail initiatives which might be of help in reaching out to underrepresented student groups and thereby increase their participation. These initiatives included a Study Abroad Squad, peer mentoring, and other programs aimed at reaching diverse students. At the University of Pittsburgh, the study abroad office specifically reached out to other offices on campus, as well as student organizations. They worked with African American fraternities and sororities, and the student affairs office. Diversifying the staff and student workers was seen as essential at both of the institutions (Picard et al., 2009). This is not supported as an effective method, beyond testimony from an administrator at Pittsburgh). The case study method is somewhat limited in that it only showed what worked at these institutions and did not establish a causal relationship between what was done and what happened. Indeed, no evidence was presented that there actually was an increase in students of color or other underrepresented students studying abroad. This chapter helps to outline ways in which international education practitioners might enlist the help of multicultural educators in
order to address what they perceive as an unfair situation, but it does not provide evidence that these methods are effective.

Salisbury, Paulsen, and Pascarella (2010) compared factors related to the intent to study abroad of students of color and White students, using a student choice theory. They found differences in intent to study abroad between different groups of students: for example, openness to diversity was a bigger factor for White students (Salisbury et al., 2010). In a somewhat different vein, Kasravi (2009) compared students of color who planned to study abroad to those who did not. He found that perceived outcomes of study abroad and personal characteristics of students positively influenced them to study abroad, and their barriers were financial and academic. Van Der Meid (2003) performed a study on groups of Asian American students who studied abroad and did not study abroad, finding motivations and barriers for these students. Comp (2006) reviewed the literature and identified several more studies on underrepresentation in education abroad. He found common themes in barriers for underrepresented students over the 131 articles he had identified (Comp, 2006)

It is of note that in the above studies of the participation of underrepresented student groups in study abroad programs, multicultural education frameworks do not guide the research. Picard et al. (2009) do recommend working with multicultural educators, but it is toward the goal of increasing participation in education abroad, which is not necessarily a goal that would be shared by the multicultural educators themselves. Talburt and Stewart (1999) recommend multicultural pedagogy be brought into the programming, but this is after they approach the research ethnographically. Two studies, however, do come from multicultural paradigms. These are Sweeney’s (2013) research
on inclusive excellence in education abroad and Willis’s (2015) study on Black women’s study abroad experiences. Sweeney used an “inclusive excellence scorecard” to analyze the literature on education abroad and underrepresentation. The scorecard that she developed, she offers, can also be used by institutions when assessing their own education abroad programs and offerings. This study is a departure from the other studies’ focus on participation numbers and experiences (Sweeney, 2013). Willis (2015) uses the concept of intersectionality to discuss Black women’s experiences of microagression during their study abroad programs. All participants experienced microaggressions, and Willis relates this to the intersections of multiple aspects of their identities.

In another interesting study on underrepresentation, Norfles (2003) had some findings related to perceptions of student affairs personnel about study abroad programs. Norfles surveyed TRIO program directors at colleges and universities. These are personnel serving low-income and first-generation students. They are not multicultural student affairs professionals in the main function of their positions, but they do serve somewhat overlapping groups of students. One of the research questions in this study was whether the TRIO directors perceived study abroad opportunities for TRIO students to be important. Norfles found that 90% of the TRIO directors perceived study abroad as “somewhat necessary” or “essential” for their students, with only 10% deeming it “unnecessary.” (p. 20). The TRIO directors also identified important barriers to study abroad among their students, and provided revealing responses to open-ended questions on the survey used in the research. This is somewhat different research from the other studies on underrepresentation mentioned above, in that it focuses on the student affairs
professionals themselves, rather than on students or institutions. It is important to note that this study is a commissioned paper rather than a peer-reviewed article.

**Internationalization of multicultural education.** As international education has been influenced by multicultural education and implemented some of its principles and practices, so multicultural education has started to become internationalized. James A. Banks is invited around the world to speak about multicultural education, and edited a book about how multicultural education looks in different countries (2004a). To Banks (2006), it is just as important that a global dimension be brought into multicultural education in the United States. This is what the examples that follow show.

Several of these examples are from the field of teacher education, a part of higher education but also a field specifically designed to teach K-12 teachers. Wells (2008) advocates for connections between global education and multicultural education. He teaches a required multicultural course in a teacher education program, and uses this course to illustrate ways in which he has used examples from international contexts rather than only U.S. American ones to illustrate key concepts in multicultural education. He uses the example of teaching about concepts such as gender and sexuality, white privilege, and others with examples from Samoa rather than examples from the U.S. first, and then connecting the examples to experience in the U.S. The benefit of this is that these issues can be easier to understand when viewed from a perspective removed from the students' experiences and preconceived notions of groups in their own country. Other multicultural educators (Banks, 2001; Cortés, 1983) caution against such pedagogy, concerned that teaching about people in faraway places will make it easy to avoid confronting uncomfortable issues at home. Teaching about, for example, Japanese people
in Japan is not the same as teaching about Japanese Americans; they do not share the same history or issues (Cortés, 1983). Wells (2008) sees some challenges to this approach as well, including that it might actually perpetuate stereotypes and not allow students to acquire deep cultural knowledge.

Wells’s (2008) article is not a research study, but a description of his own practice in the classroom. Merryfield (1996), on the other hand, did a quantitative study of teacher educators and teacher education programs that were linking multicultural and global education. She found that teacher educators were making these links to teach students about the “universals in being human” (p. 1), human diversity, and interconnectedness. They made the links by using cross-cultural experiences, multiple perspectives, and local-global connections, modeling their commitment to equity and diversity, teaching about theoretical frameworks, and using reflection and inquiry (Merryfield, 1996).

Lucas (2010) also did a qualitative study, this one about perceptions of multicultural and global education. Through interviews and classroom observations, he found that middle school teachers had a hard time defining multicultural and global education, they attached varying degrees of importance to each, were uncomfortable with multicultural education (and consequently substituted global education when they could) and they had difficulty distinguishing between multicultural and global education. Though Lucas’s (2010) study is in a context outside higher education, it mirrors some of the issues found in studies of faculty and internationalization in higher education, such as confusion over definitions and direction (Beatty, 2013). The study shows perceptions of multicultural and global education from those outside both areas, and the author contends
that it has implications for teacher education, which brings it into higher education (Lucas, 2010).

Fobes (2005) describes a critical pedagogical model for teaching a study abroad course in Peru on the sociology of gender. This is interesting because critical pedagogy is often used in achieving multicultural learning objectives, and it focuses on power and privilege. A lack of focus on power and privilege is one of the criticisms of internationalization that is attributed to multicultural educators (Noronha, 1992). The author illustrates with examples from her students' reflective assignments how critical pedagogical principles were applied during the program. One important principle Fobes espouses is that meaning is not transmitted from the teacher to the learner, but rather co-constructed by the teacher and the learner.

In the study abroad program described by Smith and Moreno-Lopez (2012), the intended outcomes were achievement in Spanish language, multicultural education, and intercultural understanding. The researchers taught a three-week Interdisciplinary Intensive Course Abroad in Costa Rica with a seven-week on-campus component at Goucher College prior to the travel portion, and a seven-week on-campus component after the travel portion as well. There were service learning components both in Costa Rica and at the home campus. The researchers assessed the students' progress in all of the course objectives using mixed methods. They used pre- and post-tests, and they also analyzed the field notes and other written work done by the students. Through their analysis, the researchers found that the students improved in language, multicultural education concepts, and cultural awareness. Alfaro (2008) did a grounded theory study on student teaching experiences in California and Mexico. The emergent themes in Alfaro’s
study were also related to multicultural education: They included students’ discussion of cultural difference and “multicultural inclusive pedagogy” (p. 24). Alfaro, in contrast to Smith and Moreno-Lopez who used multicultural education as a framework, used Bennett’s (1993) model for intercultural sensitivity. That using this framework was successful in teaching multicultural concepts in an international education setting gives credence to Olson and Peacock’s (2012) suggestion to use interculturalism as a meeting ground for the two areas of practice.

**Summary**

This review of the literature revealed gaps and important directions for future research. The many urgent calls for collaboration between practitioners of multicultural education and international education necessitate a greater understanding of the ways in which the practitioners of each area engage with the other. This understanding, however, is incomplete without further study. Through the histories, comparisons, perceived tensions, and synergies of the two areas, a research agenda emerges for understanding how the processes work together and barriers to collaboration. This agenda is partially informed by research from each of the two areas, including studies on internationalizing fields and disciplines, internationalized and multicultural student affairs and student affairs graduate programs, underrepresentation in education abroad, and the internationalization of multicultural education, including education abroad programs with multicultural learning objectives. However, it is clear that more research is necessary to inform policy and practice for this critical issue.
Chapter Three: Methodology

Introduction

In this study, I sought to understand how multicultural student affairs professionals at selected colleges and universities in the state of Connecticut engage in the internationalization of their institutions. This chapter will outline the methodology I used to investigate the research questions involved, as well as the population and sampling, data collection procedures, data analysis, and limitations of the research.

Statement of Study Purpose

The purpose of this study is to explore the engagement of multicultural student affairs professionals in the internationalization of the selected higher education institutions in which they work.

This is an important topic because multicultural student affairs professionals and professionals involved primarily in the internationalization of higher education are increasingly being asked to work together (see Chapters 1 and 2). While there have been projects encouraging professionals from each field to work together, (Olson, Evans, & Shoenberg, 2007), very little academic research exists regarding the interactions between the professionals and their engagement in the collaborative work. Indeed, not much research exists on multicultural student affairs professionals in general, or on how the larger population of student affairs professionals engages in internationalization (see Chapters 1 and 2).

Research Questions
1. How do multicultural student affairs professionals at selected higher education institutions define and describe internationalization?

Learning what multicultural student affairs professionals think and feel about internationalization is critical in understanding how they engage in it. This question addresses the cognitive and affective dimensions of engagement (Osterman, 2006). Asking the professionals about their knowledge of and feelings about internationalization allowed me to investigate how they make meaning of how internationalization happens at their institutions and their role in it. It was important to take an inductive approach to this question, and not make assumptions as to what the participants would say (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007).

2. In what ways are multicultural student affairs professionals at selected higher education institutions engaged in internationalization? In what ways are they not engaged?

This question deals with the behavioral aspect of engagement (Osterman, 2006). What are these multicultural student affairs professionals doing in the course of their work that is part of the internationalization of their institutions? What do they see others on campus doing that they themselves could be engaged in, but are not? Would they like to be more involved but do not see it as part of their work? Are some professionals engaging and others not?

3. How do multicultural student affairs professionals describe what motivates them to engage in the internationalization of the selected higher education institutions where they work? How do they describe the barriers to their engagement?
Some of the literature on collaborations between multicultural professionals and practitioners whose main work is in the internationalization of higher education includes anecdotal evidence or hypotheses on motivations to work together and barriers to such collaboration (Merryfield, 1996; Noronha, 1992; Olson et al., 2007). Through this question, I will investigate what multicultural student affairs practitioners identify as their motivations and their barriers to engagement. This will provide much-needed empirical evidence of the meaning that these professionals create around their work in internationalization.

Answering these questions will contribute to the field of higher education research by providing the beginnings of an understanding of how multicultural student affairs professionals engage in internationalization efforts. Future researchers and practitioners will be able to build upon this understanding in many different ways: by designing research that will increase knowledge of multicultural student affairs practice, and by finding new spaces and motivations for collaboration. Current efforts, such as those of the American Council on Education (Olson et al., 2007), and those underway at colleges and universities across the United States, have not had the benefit of this type of research to inform their work, but future efforts will.

**Methodology and Rationale**

**Research paradigm.** This research is based on a constructivist, interpretive paradigm. In constructivism, reality or meaning is constructed by every individual (Merriam, 2009). Therefore, in order to understand the meaning that individuals make of certain phenomena, such as internationalization, one must go to the individuals
themselves. There is no objective truth or reality that can be applied; the participants create their own truth or reality.

In order to investigate the participants’ reality, I used a qualitative, inductive methodology. The multicultural student affairs professionals studied are stakeholders whose voices on internationalization have not yet been heard. It was therefore necessary to ask them to describe their own meanings for the international activities happening on their campuses, and reveal factors and perceptions related to their engagement in these activities that are not known in the literature, rather than asking them to choose among factors and perceptions given to them on a quantitative survey. Creswell (2009) states this as follows: “In the entire qualitative research process, the researcher keeps a focus on learning the meaning that the participants hold about the problem or issue, not the meaning that the researchers bring to the research or writers express in the literature,” (p. 175).

**Research design.** I have used a basic, inductive qualitative design (Merriam, 2009), to investigate the research questions above. In this type of qualitative research design, the researcher seeks to understand how individuals understand and engage with a phenomenon. In this particular study, the individuals are the multicultural student affairs professionals and the phenomenon is internationalization; the understanding comes purely from the individuals themselves (Merriam, 2009). This methodology is the most appropriate for a number of reasons, including the lack of prior research, the constructivist/interpretive orientation of the study (described above), and the population to be studied. A quantitative or deductive study would not be appropriate to investigate these types of questions with these participants.
The literature review in Chapter 2 showed a lack of prior empirical research on the topic and population to be studied. The anecdotal accounts of multicultural educators’ perceptions and engagement in internationalization activities (Noronha, 1992; Olsen et al., 2007) do not provide the foundation for a quantitative study on factors related to engagement. There is prior academic research on the engagement of other groups in internationalization (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Friesen, 2013; Di Maria, 2013), which informs this study to some extent, but the population of multicultural student affairs professionals is different from the populations previously researched in many ways (Stewart & Bridges, 2011). Therefore, there are almost certainly different perceptions and factors associated with these professionals’ engagement. However, these perceptions and factors are not found in the literature, and must be arrived at through the inductive process of qualitative research.

Stewart and Bridges (2011), when seeking to develop a portrait of multicultural student affairs professionals, had problems in using a predominantly quantitative research design. They did not find a large population of these professionals to survey, and when they sent the surveys, they received an almost unacceptably low response rate. They asserted that the reasons for this were cultural in nature: since many multicultural student services professionals are members of the groups they serve, a survey methodology may not have been the most effective choice (Stewart & Bridges, 2011). The population for the current study, described below, will be multicultural student affairs professionals dealing with diverse student populations, so they will not readily identify as a group. A survey might be answered disproportionately by certain groups of professionals and less
by others, so a random sample in a predominantly quantitative study would be very difficult to achieve.

**Research Methods and Rationale**

The research methods for this study include interviews, observation, and document analysis. Following is a description of how the methods will be used to investigate each research question; in addition, a summary of the methods and data collection is provided in Table 1.

Q1 is “How do multicultural student affairs professionals at selected higher education institutions define and describe internationalization?” In order to investigate this question, I used qualitative, open-ended, semi-structured interview questions (see Appendix B). Specifically, the interview questions “What is your understanding of internationalization? How would you define it?” and “What does internationalization mean at this institution?” were designed to elicit responses that revealed the meaning that the participant has created around internationalization. After it became clear through the interviews that some participants were not familiar with the word “internationalization,” I added the follow-up question “Is that a word you have heard or used before?” This was intended to let the participants know that they were not expected to have a ready answer to the definition question, thus putting them more at ease (Kvale, 2007).

The investigation of Q2 – “In what ways are multicultural student affairs professionals at selected higher education institutions engaged in internationalization? In what ways are they not engaged?” – was more complex. The open-ended interview questions associated with this research question were “Is there an international dimension to your work? What is it?” and “I’m going to read you this list of activities associated
with internationalization. Please tell me if you know whether any of these activities are happening here at _________, and, if so, the extent to which you have been involved.” I also obtained data on engagement by observing the context where the participants worked, and analyzing printed matter and websites associated with the participants’ work.

I used the interviews also to investigate the third research question (Q3) – “How do multicultural student affairs professionals describe what motivates them to engage in the internationalization of the selected higher education institutions where they work? How do they describe the barriers to their engagement?”. The questions in the interview that were designed to investigate this research question were “When you participated in _____, how did that come about? How did you decide to do this?”; “You mentioned that ______ does go on here at your institution, but you are not involved. Can you tell me why?”; “What factors have motivated you or inspired you to engage in internationalization?”; and “What factors have been barriers to your engagement in internationalization?” After I had conducted some interviews and found that the participants had difficulty with the “barriers” question, I added the follow-up, “Have there been activities you wanted to participate in but didn’t?” This helped them to identify barriers through remembering actual situations in their work.

Table 1

Overview of research methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Method(s)</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Collection Method(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Interview participants in their locations, establishing trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rationale. In this study, I used interviews to collect qualitative data. These participants have their profession somewhat in common, but may not identify as a group. Of qualitative methods, Bogdan and Biklen (2007) recommend interviews for a diverse group of participants such as this. Interviews allow the themes and commonalities among the participants to emerge more clearly than other qualitative research methods (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). The rapport that I was able to establish with the participants in individual interviews is important (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Kvale, 2009), as is the ability to establish communicative validity (Kvale, 2007) through the interview process.

Additional data were collected by means of observation and document analysis. Using multiple data sources is common in qualitative research (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Creswell, 2009) and helps in the analysis and identification of themes. I conducted the interviews in the participants’ locations, making observations about the setting, environment, and campus where the participants do their work each day (see Appendix C). The documents I analyzed were printed materials available from the participants’ offices, as well as web pages associated with the participants’ work. The observation and document analysis gave context to the data from the interviews.
Population and Sample

**Population.** The population for this research was multicultural student affairs professionals. Professionals with primary responsibility for advising or serving certain groups of students, including those serving African American, Asian American, Latino or other racial/ethnic groups of students, women, men, students with disabilities, LGBTQ students, or general multicultural centers, were included in the population. Those with primary duties advising international or study abroad students were excluded; the primary identification of each subject had to be as a multicultural educator. Executives with positions above the level of Director were generally not part of the population; nor were graduate assistants or clerical/civil service workers. Exceptions to this criterion could be made if there were no other multicultural student affairs professionals on staff at a given institution.

**Sampling method.** The sampling method for this study was purposeful and contained elements of network and convenience sampling (Merriam, 2009). Participants from several different institutional types were purposefully included (Hu & Kuh, 2002; Hirt, 2006). Because this is a qualitative study, and the professionals to be studied do not necessarily identify as a cohesive group, generalizability was not important, so a random sample was not practical or necessary (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). I began by identifying all professionals within the population who worked in the state of Connecticut – thus the element of convenience sampling (Merriam, 2009). I then used a combination of personal connections, through colleagues at my home university and contacts at other institutions, and “cold calling” to recruit participants. This had elements of network sampling in that I did use these connections; however, I was not able to make further connections through
those I interviewed (Merriam, 2009). Personal connections with the participants were helpful in obtaining access and establishing a rapport and relationship of trust (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Many of the participants had cultural identities different from my own (see Chapter 1), which can be challenging when conducting qualitative interviews (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). The more I was able to establish some connection with the participants, the more open they would be, and the better the data quality (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Kvale, 2007). The one thing I had in common with all of the participants was that we were all higher education administrators in the state of Connecticut; this connection and others I identified with the participants helped the conversation to flow and the data to be robust.

I made sure to recruit participants from a number of different institution types. Institution type has been shown to be a factor influencing dependent variables in other studies in higher education (Hu & Kuh, 2002; Hirt, 2006); therefore, interviewing participants from different institution types produced a variety of responses. Employees of Wesleyan University, where I am also employed, were excluded from the sample. I continued pursuing more interviews until I had participants from all of the different institution types represented in Connecticut, and began to hear the same responses to questions in the interviews, thus reaching data saturation (Kvale, 2007; Merriam, 2009). Employees of Wesleyan University, where I am also employed, were excluded from the sample.

**Description of the participants.** In the end, there were 19 participants in the study, from 10 separate institutions. They were from different institution types, as intended in the sampling method. They worked in different types of offices or centers,
with the most participants working at general multicultural centers. The most common job title for the participants was Director, which was also in keeping with the intentions of the sampling method.

There were an equal number of public and private institutions, and nearly an equal number of participants from each (see Table 2). The institutional types varied: participants worked at community colleges, baccalaureate colleges, Master’s institutions, and research institutions. More Master’s universities were represented than other institution types, and more participants came from these institutions (see Table 3). This had to do with both the number of each institution type in the state of Connecticut and the numbers of multicultural student affairs professionals employed at each one. The community colleges represented in this study had only one multicultural student affairs professional each, while the Master’s universities sometimes had multiple staff members. The research universities, of which there are many fewer in the state, nevertheless had the most potential participants each.

Table 2

*Control of Institutions Where Participants Worked*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Types of Institutions Where Participants Worked*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution type</th>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants worked in a variety of office types (see Table 4). The most common was the general multicultural/diversity office, intended to serve a variety of groups. The next most common were women’s centers, and then Asian American centers. There was one participant each from an African American center, a disability office, and an LGBT center. There were one program office and two upper administration offices where the participants worked and identified themselves as multicultural student affairs professionals.
Consistent with the intentions of the sampling method, most of the participants were at the Director level or below (see Table 5). In only two cases were the participants at higher levels in the institution. In each of these exceptional cases, the participant had been employed at her institution for a number of years and had risen through the ranks, and was still the only or one of the only staff members on campus who could be considered a multicultural student affairs professional.
Table 5

*Job Titles of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Vice President</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sampling method therefore yielded the variety of institution types and offices desired. The participants were at the desired levels in their institutions as well. This ensured that the data collected were appropriate for the study, and resulted in high-quality discussions with the participants.

**Data Collection Strategies**

The data collection for this study was accomplished through interviews, observation, and document analysis. Following are collection strategies for each method, along with the research questions to which each method relates. For a shorter summary of this information, please refer back to Table 1.

The interviews, which were intended to investigate all three research questions, were conducted in person, and when possible on site at each participant’s location. This allowed for observation, as well as help to establish the rapport that was critical in obtaining quality data from participants. I used a semi-structured interview guide (see
Appendix B) in order to make sure to cover all of the main topics, but also allowed for follow-ups or diversions of topic when a participant raises an interesting thread of discussion (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Throughout each interview, I attempted to maintain a two-way dialogue with the participants, nodding and affirming when they were answering my questions. When possible I would remark on things that the participant and I had in common, or things I admired about their work. The interviews were recorded on a laptop computer using free audio recording software, and saved locally on the same laptop in order to ensure confidentiality.

The observation of each participant’s surroundings, office, and institution were performed using both photographs and field notes. The observation method was intended to relate to Q2, “In what ways are multicultural student affairs professionals at selected higher education institutions engaged in internationalization? In what ways are they not engaged?” An observation that, for example, a multicultural student affairs professional had posters or decorations related to study abroad or other international themes in her office, would be germane to the engagement question, and should be recorded. Observation took place before, during, and after the interviews, and during data analysis I included the photographs in the coding process (see below).

The document analysis was also intended to address Q2. Prior to or after each interview, I downloaded copies of each participant’s office’s main and linked web pages for analysis. I did the same with each institution’s mission statement and campus map. During the interviews, I asked for printed material available on any initiatives discussed, and I collected printed material freely available in the participants’ offices. I collected all of these documents in the software used for analysis, which I will discuss below.
Data Analysis

**Qualitative analysis.** In order to analyze the qualitative data, including interviews, photographs, field notes, and documents, I used basic qualitative methods, as well as a coding method from grounded theory. Analysis began immediately, from the first interview, and in some cases changed certain details of the investigation. For example, when I realized that a common theme would be participants’ lack of familiarity with the word “internationalization,” I changed the way I asked for their definitions in order to make the participants feel more at ease and be able to give me more detailed responses.

During and after the data collection, I developed a coding system to analyze the data (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). My intention was that the codes and themes would not be predetermined but come from the data themselves (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). In practice, with the semi-structured interview, it was not possible for the emerging themes to be completely organic like this, because the themes were somewhat guided by the interview questions themselves. In addition, the research questions provide three broad categories with which to start categorizing the data. Interpretation and analysis will continue into the final stages of writing on the findings (Bogdan & Biklen, 2008).

**MAXQDA software.** To aid with the qualitative data analysis, I chose the MAXQDA software package. This software allowed me to code, organize, and store different types of data, including audio recordings, photographs, and text. I organized the data by institution within MAXQDA’s document browser. I listened to the recording of each interview soon after conducting it in order to develop and assign codes to the data. I
then developed and assigned codes to the other documents and photographs, working by institution rather than by document type.

As discussed above, these codes were somewhat organized according to the research questions – for example, when I asked a participant whether there were an international dimension to their work, that was a code I assigned to their response. However, the codes and themes became much more complex, and I departed from the structure in order to avoid trying to fit them into categories where they might not belong. After these initial coding sessions, I went back to each code and listened to the segments again, rearranging and re-classifying them as necessary and within the context of the full set of data.

I then returned to the structure provided by the research questions to outline the findings of the study. I used the software to organize the codes into this structure. The frequency with which each code occurred was important in this organization, and the software allowed me to sort through this information. Once I had the outline, I went back and transcribed the coded segments that were necessary in describing the findings in detail.

**Limitations**

Because of the small population/sample size and the qualitative nature of this study, generalizability to larger populations or to populations in other regions of the United States is impossible. However, the purpose of research of this kind is not to generalize in this way (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Limitations that may be of more concern deal with my own identity relative to those of the participants. My identity as an international educator, a member of the field that the participants may or may not see as a
threat to their own (Cortés, 1983), may have created a bias on the part of the participants. Other aspects of my identity and the participants’ identities – culture, gender, our rank in our positions – meant that each participant and I were not always balanced in the power and privilege we had or perceived we had. This may have lessened their willingness to be candid with me (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Furthermore, participants may have been subject to a social desirability bias, in which they expressed a more favorable opinion of internationalization in the interviews than they actually held (Spector, 2004).

Summary

This qualitative research study will contribute to higher education research by providing an understanding of multicultural student affairs professionals’ engagement in internationalization. This research is timely and necessary, due to the current gap in the literature and an increasing urgency for multicultural and international educators to work together. By exploring how multicultural student affairs professionals define and describe internationalization, how they engage, and what they consider to be motivations and barriers, the researcher will provide a foundation for future research and greater understanding for practitioners working in the intersection of multicultural and international education.

Chapter Four: Findings

The overall findings from the coding and analysis were somewhat unexpected. Based on some of the literature (Cole, 1984; Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999; Cortés, 1983, 2002; Noronha, 1992; Olson et al., 2007), I had expected to find a great deal of tension between these professionals and their counterparts working in international education. I thought these professionals would be knowledgeable about internationalization but see it
as a threat. Instead, I found that all of the professionals I interviewed were engaging in internationalization to a certain extent, and most desired to engage more. However, many were not aware of internationalization as a trend, not having heard the word nor thought about a definition before participating in the study. The definitions they produced when asked fell into different categories, but generally focused on student mobility. Their engagement was mostly at the individual student advising level, though some did have more involvement institutionally and professionally. The motivations or inspirations that they mentioned had to do with personal background and/or philosophy, and the barrier most often cited to greater involvement was time/personnel. There was tension, but it had to do with these barriers and the professionals’ ability to do their jobs with the resources and time given to them by their institutions.

**Definitions and Descriptions**

Research Question 1 was: How do multicultural student affairs professionals at selected higher education institutions define and describe internationalization?

Despite a general lack of familiarity with the word “internationalization,” each participant was able to articulate his or her understanding of what it meant. The definitions that these participants constructed out of their own experiences fell into several different categories. Most, as might be expected (Knight, 2004; Olson et al., 2007), had to do with mobility of students, either outgoing (study abroad students) or incoming (international students). There were other definitions as well, having to do with globalization and broadening student perspectives. Only one participant seemed to have an understanding of comprehensive internationalization (Hudzik, 2011), which she articulated during a discussion of how her institution was not engaging in this particular
strategy. Participants also discussed institutional definitions of internationalization, which fell into similar categories as the general definitions, and they talked about international dimensions to their own specific work.

**Lack of a definition.** Most of the participants lacked a ready definition for the word “internationalization;” in fact, many of them did not remember ever having heard the term before. Several struggled to pronounce the eight-syllable word for the first time. This finding was surprising. Of course, I am more familiar with the word than one might expect other higher education administrators in the US to be, given my education, experience, and the focus of this research. However, as has been established in the literature review, internationalization is a major trend in higher education, of which these professionals could be expected to be aware. Despite the participants’ lack of knowledge about the term “internationalization,” they were not ignorant of internationalization activities. All were able to come up with a definition when asked or prompted. One participant even mentioned that she was using the meaning she understands for words ending in “-ization” to construct a definition for the interview.

**Mobility definitions.** Most of the participants talked about student mobility first and foremost in formulating their definitions. International students were mentioned most often, sometimes in combination with domestic students studying abroad, or mobility in general: “Yes, it’s more like going across borders, right? Like people are traveling around the world, becoming like a citizen of the world. (Interview 15).” The participants’ understandings of international students varied. Some participants pointed out the financial benefits of having international students on campus:

Well, my understanding [of the word “internationalization”] is I realize that our populations of international students are increasing dramatically. Some of that I attribute
to the fact that they are full paying students, and they do help to offset that bottom line. – Interview 14

Others expressed that there was a need to support international students when they come to campus. One participant pointed to a lack of support for international students on her own campus:

I know the university is in a push to get as many international students as they can… Um… It’s frustrating for those of us who work with students because it’s great to say we want them, it’s great to open your doors and accept them… but when they get here, if you don’t have the services to take care of them, those poor k… it’s terrible! – Interview 2

Two participants expressed the belief that international students come to the United States because U.S. education is desirable for students from other countries. One participant described an article she had recently read in the New York Times

… talking about you know how in China and other countries these students, um, study so hard and work so hard and many of them, you know, work themselves into tizzies, you know, when you’re pressured to commit suicide and they’re not accepted into the right school that’s going to get them the American education, so this is highly coveted among other nations in the world, to get a degree from an American university. It hasn’t always been like that, but I understand that is the case now. – Interview 3

while another spoke of her experience with a relative who is from Africa, saying, “I also realize that the American education standards are still very attractive in overseas countries.” – Interview 14.

So internationalization was defined largely in terms of international students coming to the U.S. Some of the participants also mentioned U.S. students going abroad, describing a two-way exchange of students, faculty, and learning:

So, the ones who coming here, and then also, the students here, going, going to learn abroad. For whatever reason, be it something that’s in their major or because they just want to broaden their horizons. I think it’s a fabulous thing. – Interview 2
…so you’re not just bringing those international students and faculty in, you’re also sending your students and your faculty out there. And you’re sending them not just to developed countries, you’re sending them to developing countries, you know, not your Paris, your England, your London, or places like that. You’re sending them to South American countries, Nepal, Cambodia, Caribbean countries, for them to actually, you know, get a good education of what the culture and the experiences are of, of those parts of the world. –Interview 5

Another participant set up a dichotomy between the student mobility aspect and the academic aspect of internationalization. This was interesting in that she recognized that there were other places within an institution where internationalization can take place, but really separated that from the student mobility itself:

Yeah, so I think it’s really - my understanding is twofold, one that there is, um, the push to increase the access to our institutions by international students, um, so that’s one piece of it, and then I think it’s also looking at our institutions and how are we creating, um, more of a sense of global connections in students’ academic work, um, and and also creating opportunities - more opportunities for students to have experiences that reflect a variety of different geographical locations from what they may have been used to or exposed to up to this point. Um, so I think it’s both sort of a recruiting and retaining students and then an academic, institutional culture issue – Interview 1

**Globalization definition.** Some of the participants who did not immediately focus their definitions on student mobility whether outbound or inbound talked about globalization and the need for institutions to respond to it. This participant, for example, as well as others, talked about increasing interactions between people in different countries, describing what he called a “global society”:

Well, I would - number one I would say it’s very important to higher education. Um, if you look at the way things are changing, we’re moving from, well, we’ve actually moved from a - from one country, the US, to more of a global country, not just in economic circumstance but also in education. Everything is global now. If you pick up the phone and call customer service for a major credit card company you’re speaking with somebody in India even if it’s an IT issue. So we’re a global, um, you know, society right now. There’s a lot of things that, even if you look at the stock market, a small thing that happens in Japan, basically, you know, affects the United States stock exchange. So if
you take that established concept and apply it to higher education I think we do a disservice to our students if we don’t bring the global community into the classroom on campus. – Interview 5

And this participant took it a step further to an “opening up of consciousness” and sense of interconnectedness, for which we must prepare and, presumably, prepare our students:

But what, what do I think about when I think of internationalization would be, um, an opening up of consciousness, um, that the world is large but ever smaller, you know, that thing I was trying to describe before? That we live in a huge place that is not defined by, um, one class of people in the United States of America. And yet, Americans have quite an influence on this larger world, and increasingly if we are going to be effective in our insularity, or I mean, you know, as insular Americans, and effective in terms of functioning worldwide, we are going to have to be, um, more fully aware of the whole world. I: Right P: You know, so it’s both a large world but also increasingly smaller, in that we are called to be aware of the world. We’re all really economically, especially, but increasingly socially, tied together. – Interview 13

**Broader perspective definition.** This participant had a definition that can be characterized as the “broader perspective” definition. It has to do with learning and knowledge, and getting into what the participant called “that international mindset”:

And in terms of, of definition, it’s… it’s… for me, it’s being able for people to understand outside of their own domestic experiences. And, when it comes to our students, I see that when our students here, especially at [Institution], a great percentage of our students, probably 80% of our students are from Connecticut, and they’ve never been outside of Connecticut. Um, some of them the furthest they’ve ever gone is New York or Boston, so having them have that international mindset, in terms of yeah, you may not, you may not have the finances to travel to another country, but pick up a book. Get to know someone from that country, join a club and organization, because our international students here have an international club. –Interview 18

So for this participant, whose students were not well-traveled and not familiar with the world, it was more about giving them that exposure and that knowledge rather than about the social and economic forces that presumably make this necessary.
Comprehensive definition. One participant had an understanding that internationalization should be comprehensive, which she revealed while describing that internationalization was not comprehensive at her own institution:

I’ve seen it’s not in the curriculum, or it’s not in programming or initiatives. Um, it’s not integrated into the college mission, although it’s in our mission, it’s… it’s… from my perspective I don’t see it being a foundation. It’s more bringing students here and having them teach their peers their culture and traditions. – Interview 12

So this participant believed that internationalization should be in the curriculum, in programming, initiatives, and the mission of an institution. She was correct that there is a mention of internationalization (in the form of a statement about global citizenship) in the mission statement of her institution. However, she was aware that its inclusion in the mission statement does not make it a reality across campus.

Institutional definitions. Institutional definitions were almost as varied as the general definitions. Interestingly, the participant in Interview 12, who had an idea of what comprehensive internationalization was, explained it in terms of what internationalization at her institution was not. She acknowledged that internationalization was included in the institution’s mission, but said it was only manifested in international students coming to the institution. Other institutional definitions centered around special institutional contexts, student mobility, assertions that internationalization was not happening at the institution, and one definition that was more comprehensive or at least included more elements than the general definitions did. Then the participants talked about their perceptions of some aspects of internationalization on their campuses.

Two of the institutions had a focus on particular global issues due to academic centers on their campuses, and one participant was in a unique situation institutionally
because she worked at a professional school within a university. A participant from one of these institutions said when asked about her institutional definition of internationalization: “because [a particular global issue] does have such a… prominent place on our campus, that’s another place where I think that that conversation may be showing up, certainly not only uniquely to [Institution], but uniquely in our, in our kind of cultural context.” (Interview 1). This was an institution with an academic center focused on a particular global issue. Another participant worked at a professional school with strict dictates as to who could be admitted, so the lack of international students made the picture of internationalization in her context quite different from that of the other participants’ contexts.

As in the general definitions, mobility was a focus of many of the institutional definitions. International students on campus were the most visible manifestations of internationalization to many of the participants, and their work with study abroad students also defined it for them. The answers they gave about their institutional definition reflected the phrasing of the interview question; I as the researcher tended to ask what internationalization “looked like” on their campuses in the context of the semi-structured interview.

I think what [internationalization] looks like here is… admissions. And getting them to the college. Beyond that I think there’s some challenges of supporting them. – Interview 12

Um, I think one is that the sheer number of international students, the increase in higher education, has played a significant role, so that impacts everyone at the institution including us. – Interview 16

It looks like people! It looks like people, it looks like programs, it looks like initiatives, it looks like, um, it looks like outcomes of that, but, but primarily it looks like our students.
That’s who we are. That’s how it shows up. Big time. – Interview 3; then went on to discuss getting cards in the mail from students who were abroad

One participant (Interview 10) talked in detail about all the activities students could do abroad. She thought about three quarters of the students at her institution go abroad. She talked about different programs they could do during the semester or summer, and mentioned the internships and volunteering they could do as well. This participant had visited one of the institution’s programs abroad. So, for many of these participants, the defining aspect of internationalization at their institutions was mobility of their students.

Some of the participants discussed their belief that there was no internationalization happening at their institutions. One of these participants worked at a regional comprehensive state university and the other two at community colleges. The university employee said:

To be honest with you, I don’t see it! (Since it’s confidential). I… I… I don’t see it at all. At all. It’s not even a conversation that I even hear at our senior cabinet meeting, ‘cause I know, you know, our vice president will sit with the president and different VPs from different areas, and that’s not even a conversation that, that’s ever brought up. You know, when I first brought it up to my supervisor, it was, it was a new concept and a new term to him, so in terms of an institutional goal? That’s not happening here. –Interview 18

The two participants I spoke with who worked at community colleges said that internationalization was not happening at their institutions. Each mentioned some initiatives that had been tried, including starting study abroad programs. One had a study abroad program that a faculty member was trying to introduce, which was no longer being supported. The other had heard in meetings about study abroad programs that were being developed by another staff member, but she was pessimistic about their being
approved or moving forward because of what she called the “bureaucracy” of a state school.

Two participants had more comprehensive definitions of internationalization at their institutions. The first (Interview 9) was fairly robust. She mentioned study abroad, working and engaging with alumni, institutional partnerships, international student admissions, diversity in international students, parents, fellowships, research abroad, area studies, and service projects. She said that international or global initiatives were really a focus at her institution, and this was reflected in her relatively exhaustive list of international activities on her campus. The second participant thought that internationalization was so much a part of her campus that it was difficult for her to talk about as a distinct initiative:

…and – ‘cause we have such a large international population, it’s like, you - everything we do is concerned with “inter…” I guess that’s the word, I don’t know what that means, still, but, um, yeah, so, it’s something, it’s just integrated into the fabric here. –Interview 10

When asked to define what internationalization looked like on their campuses, some participants discussed their own perceptions of certain aspects of internationalization. One participant said she felt like her own work had taken on more of an international dimension because of changes in the roles of international offices:

…international offices, what they used to be known as has drastically changed. A lot. From my perception, um, more about, like, uh, people’s legal papers, and that kind of thing, so that has changed the dynamic drastically, cause I think international offices used to approach it more like how we do: advocacy, taking care of the students, um, you know, maybe involved in study abroad but sometimes that was, that was separate. So it used to be a little different, um, than now, and I think now is more of that split entity, more defined in my perception. –Interview 16
Another participant talked about the students she worked with at her professional school as different from herself. This discussion is important in the context of this study because it does show some tension, at least within this participant herself, between the original or perceived purpose of her position and the current realities:

We have this question all the time. Um, a lot of our students now, I’m going to say Black students, a lot of our Black students are not traditional, are not um, underrepresented as far as affirmative, what affirmative action was created for, so most of our Black students now are African students that came over and did their four years and now they’re …[unintelligible], or, very few are Caribbean, some are Caribbean, but barely any of them are African American that came over through slavery. And um, we talk about that all the time, like where are the true African Americans like me? Where are the true African Americans? And it comes up in admissions at a lot of [professional schools] that, the students that we’re taking, and we’re saying yes we’re taking African American students, they are African American because - well they, they’re Black. But Black does not mean you’re African American. You know, and so, but, where are the - you know, we have this constant conversation: where are the African American students? And - they’re not in [professional school]. Um, a lot of them …..about graduating from college, maybe going into higher education, um, a lot of the immigrants that are coming from, you know, various countries, they come in with a different hunger, and we’re not doing it. They’re- they’re tearing us apart on the [college and professional school entrance exams] and their GPAs, so, and this is what we’re really saying, that we’re not really looking at - we’re not really looking at the, um, students who are African American, because our test scores are not high enough. That does not mean that we cannot be good [professionals].

**Engagement**

Research Question 2 was: In what ways are multicultural student affairs professionals at selected higher education institutions engaged in internationalization? In what ways are they not engaged?

In order to investigate Research Question 2, the interview included questions on the international dimension of the participants’ work and the internationalization activities in which they engaged. The researcher also observed the offices and campuses of the participants for physical manifestations of their engagement. The interviews also
included questions on collaboration between the participants and those on their campuses whose main function was international education. All participants did have some degree of engagement in internationalization, whether or not they perceived an international dimension to their work, participated in internationalization activities, manifested international themes in their offices, or collaborated with their international education counterparts.

**International dimension.** Only one participant said there was not an international dimension to her work, though four said the international dimension was a small part or not the main focus of their work. All of these participants did engage in some kind of internationalization activity despite these statements. At this point in the interview, some participants informed me that there was an international office on campus that did more of this work, and recommended I speak with employees there. The majority of the participants said there was an international dimension to their work, and described it in various ways. These ways included their mindset while working, the student populations they served, and the nature of the programming their offices planned and executed.

One participant talked about a mindset she is careful to cultivate in her work:

So for me, as far as the internationalization of the work, I think it just makes me make sure I’m thinking on both the macro and the micro level, and not just United States. I also believe it’s about making sure you’re looking at an issue from multiple lenses, um, but I think some ways intersectionality kind of does that for me, um and that’s a, that’s a concept that I grasp, I understand, but always still trying to figure out what that still looks like in a practical sense. Um, but I also, I just think we cannot do this work… uh, I want to make sure that I’m not just always coming from my ethnocentric perspective. – Interview 16

So she mentioned “intersectionality,” a word associated with multicultural education more than international education, with its origins in Black feminism (Crenshaw, 1989).
Crenshaw (1989) identified intersectionality as a problem, meaning that a Black woman was oppressed due to two aspects of her identity, because she was both Black and a woman. This combination of two aspects of identity, the intersectionality, is important. Here this participant brought an international dimension into that concept. She had to keep in mind that an LGBT student might also be an international student or a religiously identified student, and that this would affect how she worked with them. One example of this was when she talked about her students’ religious or cultural identities, and how she had to keep in mind how these intersected with their LGBT identities.

One recurring theme in the interviews was whether the participants’ student constituents included international as well as domestic students. Many participants did see their roles in this way. One participant’s center is officially named the “Asian-American Student Center” (center name slightly altered for anonymity) but she speaks of it as the “Asian and Asian-American Student Center.”

Not the official name. But that’s how I say it. All our publications and all our website will say [“Asian American Student Center” or AASC], but when I introduce myself I make sure I say that. Because the groups are, if you just literally clicked on a tab, you’ll realize, oh, the groups aren’t just Asian American. They’re actually inclusive. So I wanted to make sure that, like, when they’re meeting me, or our staff, we say those words. –Interview 9

Also, the message is important, because “we had a long discussion, and Asian Americans will come to an Asian alumni reunion, but Asians won’t come to an Asian American alumni reunion.” She works with many international students and international alumni as part of her job, and she estimated that one third of the students who engage with her center are international students.
Several participants mentioned that the heritage of their students, even if their students were mainly domestic students, provided an international dimension to their work. They mentioned Asian-American, African-American, and Latino students, and how they dealt with their identities as first-generation or immigrant students, or with their more distant heritage. Here is an example from a participant who works with African-American students:

Because we serve students of, primarily students of the African diaspora. And they are from every island you can think of, every country you can think of in Africa, um, in all over the world. You know how a diaspora works. Uh, and we have many, many students who represent, well, they’re not just native African, African Americans born in Africa, I’m sorry, born in the US, you name it, we, I probably have students from that country. – Interview 3

Others mentioned a gap in services between the international students and immigrant students; international offices only serve students on student visas, and the multicultural offices might not be equipped to deal with immigrant students who may have some of the same issues as international students. Undocumented students were also mentioned as a newer category of student who do not have a particular category of student affairs professional that deals with them specifically.

One participant (Interview 18) mentioned study abroad first when I asked about an international dimension to her work. She talked about collaborating with the study abroad office on recruiting students of color to study abroad. This type of collaboration between multicultural and international offices will be discussed below.

Women’s center staff in particular spoke of an international dimension in the programming they do or cosponsor that is international in theme, such as the Bandana Project to raise awareness of sexual harassment of female farm workers, screenings of the
film *Girl Rising*, and performances of the play *The Vagina Monologues*, as well as speakers and other events. Other participants also initiated or helped with programming such as international festivals and fairs, speakers, etc.

**Activities in which participants did engage.** I provided a list of internationalization activities developed through the literature review. The participant, on hearing each activity mentioned, was to answer whether this activity happened on campus, and, if so, if this participant was a part of this activity. There was no activity on the list provided that no participant had engaged in, and there were a few activities that were not on the list that were supplied by the participants. There were some activities in which nearly all of the participants had engaged, and some in which very few had. The most common activities were individual student advising, internationally-themed programming, and advising student organizations. Some participants had served on committees or task forces related to internationalization. Very few participants had traveled internationally for work.

Most participants talked about individual student advising as part of their work. They had specific examples of international students they had advised, and specific challenges related to working with international students. One participant who worked with LGBT students said:

And it, it gets tricky too, because, you know, what does it mean, like, to affirm a Muslim student who may come from a more conservative background, how do we handle that in and affirm them as much as, you know, trying to make it progressive, or keep a progressive, or open and affirming, environment as well, for both Muslim and non-Muslim students, so, it’s very interesting. But I think we have to do a lot more checking on our Christian, um, conservative, perspective as much, because that has impacted the international lens on LGBT issues in a much worse way, I think, than any other religious group. So, for me, it’s keeping that… I don’t know, the ethnic-centric view in check, I think. –Interview 16
Another participant, working in a women’s center, said:

We certainly have from the individual advocacy perspective worked with, um, international, um, faculty, international graduate students in particular, I think, are a population of folks that we are, um, seeing potentially having difficulty in terms of the way that they’re either treated, either in the classroom or in terms of their graduate work, that issues of harassment or, um, potential bullying, maybe not rising to the level of bullying, but, um, particularly, um, female international students, women identified international students, so certainly from the individual advocacy perspective we’ve worked with individuals over the years, to help, um, kind of navigate some of those situations. –Interview 1

So these participants worked with international students individually, just as they would with domestic students, but the international aspect of the students’ identities presented particular challenges.

Participants also advised students going to study abroad. One participant talked about assuaging students’ fears about going to another country:

This particular lady left last summer to go to Ireland, and uh, she was so convinced that she would be the only Black person in the whole country, um, and that was not the case. And I had another student who went to Korea, um, and she was concerned about that. That, that… “how am I going to fit in,” and they get, and they enter these other countries, and oh my gosh, so much English is spoken and it’s, everything is so Americanized, there’s a Kentucky Fried Chicken and all sorts of other - Starbucks, you know. The world is so small. –Interview 3

Another participant talked about working with students going to study abroad much as a study abroad adviser would, even helping the students secure visas in the host country. Many participants recalled names of individual students they had advised who went abroad, along with the specific destinations where they went, which gave the impression that it happened not often enough to be a routine, mundane part of their jobs, but they did consider this advising to be a part of their jobs.
International programming was an activity often claimed by the participants; see for example the brief discussion of women’s center and other staff above. International fairs and festivals, speakers, student-organized events, events showcasing one particular cultural heritage such as Diwali or Chinese New Year celebrations, all were mentioned by participants when they were asked about an international dimension to their work or when this activity was mentioned as part of the list. Participants either planned and hosted these events as part of their work, or the student organizations planned and hosted them, or they cosponsored them with other organizations or offices, or they attended them when put on by other offices.

The participants had varying levels of experience in working with internationally-themed student organizations in different capacities. Some advised these organizations directly, and some worked with the organizations on co-sponsorships of events. The organizations varied as well. One participant mentioned a club with a focus on China whose membership was made up not of Chinese students but of domestic students who were taking Chinese or had an interest in China. Another talked about a Muslim student association that had a larger international student membership than other student organizations, and others talked about organizations specifically of international students. There were also Asian, African, Latino, and Caribbean student associations (or Black, African American, Asian American, etc. student associations), which varied in terms of their memberships’ makeup of international, immigrant, and domestic students. One participant discussed this as follows:

We try to reach out, um, and try to bring… I know specifically with Asian students, trying to bridge that gap with students that are international students and then students that are Asian American students. Um, and as a multicultural center, helping them bridge the gap, to work with each other around – (mentions name of student organization) - um,
working with those students and see how we can get them to program better, to break down some of the barriers that they have where “you’re not Asian enough” or “you don’t understand American culture.” So that’s been an ongoing process for us. – Interview 11

Eight participants mentioned committees on campus that had to do with international issues, and of these eight, seven actually served on these committees. One committee advised the international students office; one was a combined race, ethnicity, and international status committee; one was a task force on globalization in general; one was a committee that was about sexual violence on campus but specifically addressed the needs of international students. As this is a higher-level activity, it shows that multicultural student affairs professionals do work in internationalization at different levels, from the individual student to the institutional policy level.

Sixteen participants mentioned intercultural training, so almost all of the participants either engaged in this regularly or had done so within the course of their careers at their current institutions. However, intercultural training does not always qualify as an internationalization activity. Two participants even mentioned that they conduct this type of training, but never specifically address “international needs.” That the participants did this kind of activity is significant to this study, because the At Home in the World report (Olsen et al. 2007) mentions intercultural training as a space where international and multicultural education converge. The intercultural training that the participants did included diversity training for faculty and staff, which is state mandated in Connecticut; diversity training in student orientations; diversity training for resident assistants/advisers; training of diversity peer educators; safe space training; and social justice mediation training. One participant had done an orientation for international
students years ago, and one participant’s office had been approached for culture specific training for students wanting to work in Asia after graduation:

A couple years ago the business school came to us, um, because they had issues with their students going to countries and not understanding cultural, um, methods that they should know if they are going to live and work in these countries, so we attempted with the business school to start this um, program called “[Name of program],” where we would bring people in and focus on a particular, um, culture place, and I and um this is what you really need to know if you go to, um, Korea, China, Hong Kong. –Interview 2

In general, the participants did not engage in international travel as part of their duties at their institutions. Many mentioned barriers to this type of activity: financial, job-related, and cultural identity barriers were mentioned. There were some exceptions to this, including two participants who traveled for personal or family reasons and used that opportunity to do some work: one visited alumni in the country where she was traveling.

Three participants had presented at or attended international conferences. Another exception was a participant who led several “delegations” to countries where some of her students had come from, bringing faculty members, other university officials, and people from the community. Two participants who worked at the same institution had each gone to one of the institution’s study abroad sites, one to do volunteer work and one on a site visit along with other institutional and community representatives:

Every year she would take a different group of people. And it was [study abroad administrator]’s idea that I would have interaction with students, and it would be good for me to know what the experience held for students. And she was right! I never forgot that experience… [description of touristic site visit activities]… so it was an experience like I’ve never experienced in my life. –Interview 13

So these participants had engaged in internationalization activities at all levels, despite some of them saying there was not really an international dimension to their work. The most important activity was individual student advising, followed by international programming and advising student organizations. Participants served on
committees and task forces driving policy as well. Only a few traveled internationally as part of their work. These activities show a convergence between internationalization and multicultural student affairs. However, the lack of support for international travel from most of the institutions shows that the synergies between the two fields may not be priorities financially.

**Office/literature observations.** The office observations and literature analysis revealed the participants’ engagement in another way. Many of the offices and websites of the participants had décor or imagery that was internationally themed, but not many had information on international programming or for international students. There was some mention of international students or study abroad in some of the literature made available by the offices. These observations revealed that the engagement of the participants in internationalization activities was sometimes, but not always, reflected in the products of the offices studied.

Eight of the ten institutions where the participants worked had internationally themed décor, and this was located in cultural houses and “general” multicultural offices alike. This included flags, international artifacts such as African and Korean masks, statues and other objects, artwork depicting life in other countries, and design elements such as pillows and a Japanese style screen. The décor represented the heritages of the students served or the programming that they did. One participant had a sheet of paper with her name in Chinese calligraphy, one of which I also have and which is often something done at international festivals or festivals focusing on Asian culture. One participant mentioned décor when discussing the heritage of her students:

They may be second generation, but they certainly have come from all over, their family histories are from all over the world. And they claim them. You know from time to time
we will have, um, flags representing all the countries. They tend to disappear over the years…. but little miniature flags in the windows representing all the countries, and it’s quite a lot. –Interview 3

So this is reflective of this participant’s focus on the heritage of her students as part of the African diaspora.

Advertising for and information about international programs was not common in participants’ offices. One general multicultural office did have an entire table full of information on study abroad programming, including brochures for various programs and a brochure on financing study abroad programs. One office had a poster featuring the international festival that she and her colleagues in the international office run together, but these items were relatively rare. This is in contrast to the engagement that these professionals had with international activities at their institutions, but consistent with their occasional hesitancy to claim an international dimension to their work. Advertising and information about international programs was slightly more prevalent outside the participants’ offices; this was not necessarily placed there by the participants but was allowed to remain, and students or others who visited the offices would see it.

In some of the literature and websites produced by the participants’ offices, international programs and themes were featured or mentioned. This was more prevalent than the presence of information on international programs in the offices, but less prevalent than the international imagery in offices and in literature and on websites. One multicultural center featured study abroad students in two of its newsletters, and an international student in another. This same multicultural center mentioned “foreign-born” students as constituents it served. Two participants’ offices’ websites listed international students in their diversity statistics (these statistics were not provided by the office of
every participant). One women’s center’s learning outcomes for its student staff included explicit global and international themes.

**Collaboration/relationships with international offices on campus.** Many participants spoke of their relationships with the offices on campus that dealt mostly with international education activities. I asked many of them whether they thought internationalization was a priority or whether they felt like their own work was a priority institutionally. I also asked the participants in the interviews about the history of their collaboration with these offices, and they told me about the activities on which they collaborated with study abroad or international student offices. Some participants felt that their own work was a high priority on campus, and some felt that it was not. The same could be said for international education. The participants talked about their relationships with the international offices, expressing either that they worked together very closely or that they did not. Some participants’ offices had been combined with international offices before, and they expressed reservations about this type of combining. The activities they collaborated on were mostly orientations, individual student advising, and programming.

Many of the participants thought that their own work as multicultural student affairs professionals was a priority on campus. They felt supported by their administrations and by their institutions. Two of the institutions had had recent issues on campus, one with racism and one with sexual assault, and said that there was renewed emphasis on their work in a multicultural and a women’s center respectively. A few of them said that they did not feel supported. Two of the participants talked about the priority of their work as opposed to the priority of the work of the international office on campus:
I think that when it generates money, um, it becomes a priority, um, but when there is no revenue, you know, it’s in a similar state as the multicultural center, um, but other than that. –Interview 12

Um, let us put it this way… maybe internationalization will have more support, in that it brings revenues to the institution, any institution, because at the end everything is about money, right, so that might have more support, I think, um, than multicultural education. –Interview 15

**History of collaboration.** Most of the participants did have a history of collaboration with the offices on campus that were responsible for international student services or study abroad. Some had been together in the same administrative unit, and most collaborated on certain activities. Some were uncertain about the future of their collaboration:

We, when the [international office] had the other people [staff she had mentioned before who had been “pushed out”], um, we… we were in close contact all the time, and um, we knew about the events they were doing, and they asked, um, you know, for students to come over and meet, you know, so they could blend international students with, with…American students and um, we, we did what we could, helped where we could, um, so, I don’t know where that’s going to go…” –Interview 2

Some participants had not done a great deal of collaboration with the international offices. Two of these were at the same institution, and one expressed a desire to do more, because of a personal project he wanted to work on. The other said that she expected to collaborate with the international student office more, because it was just about to move under the same administrative unit as her office. She expressed some trepidation about the combination of the two offices, and uncertainty about what would be expected of her. Though some of the participants expressed that they did not think multicultural and international offices should be combined (Interview 6, Interview 2 – see below), no one expressed that they did not desire to collaborate with international offices as a separate
unit, and some expressed that they would like to do more with their international offices. Three participants mentioned that talking about collaboration in the interview was making them think about how they could work together more.

**Relationship with those offices.** Seven of the participants talked about their strong relationships with the offices on campus responsible for study abroad or international student services, or both. Some were physically located close together, making it easy to have conversations or even collaborate. Two participants mentioned the physical proximity of the offices as a reason that they were able to work together closely. One other mentioned the proximity of the offices as a reason they should work together more, and yet another mentioned that the office would be coming under the same structure administratively and also physically move closer, so she imagined she would work with them more in the future. Several of the participants mentioned one particular employee in the international or office with whom they had struck up a friendship, and found ways to collaborate because they wanted to work with that person.

**History of offices being together/fears about combining offices.** Two institutions (representing six participants) had previously had the international and multicultural offices together under one structure, and one institution (with another two participants) was on the verge of bringing them together. Some participants who worked at these institutions expressed dissatisfaction with or fear of such an arrangement. This participant worked at an institution where one small office had done all of the multicultural and international education administration:

The focus more was international or study abroad. There were programs that were put on, in terms of diversity, but that was pretty much - in terms of the mission and the learning outcomes and creating the peer diversity educator program, and having the multicultural leadership council, because she was, she had so much on her plate, the multicultural,
intercultural center, being a resource and having that inclusive space, that piece kind of took a backseat to the international student study abroad program. –Interview 18

This participant worked at an institution that previously had grouped its international office along with the multicultural offices, and now did not want to combine even with other multicultural offices:

When you, when you say that word “multicultural,” I just - I just - bristle a little bit, and I just want to explain that… one thing that worried us, and one thing that they kind of hold over our heads… what we have seen over the years is various schools collapsing their individual centers into “multicultural centers.” … but just watching it on other campuses and um - So some people, they hear, “oh, you know, they, they have a multicultural center, they have it for everybody,” it just - I - a lot of students don’t realize what they have here, and they don’t realize it until they leave, and one go to another school, where they think they’re going to walk into an ______ -American culture center, and it’s going to be like home, and there isn’t any. Or they walk into a multicultural center, and it’s kind of, everything - I hate to use the term - has been, it’s been whitewashed. It’s just, there’s no, doesn’t really celebrate any culture. It just, you know. And - and not that that’s bad, but what we, what we try to do here is, it’s not, um, it’s not that we’re promoting a culture but we’re sharing what that, what that experience is so people understand… so the word “multicultural,” as wonderful as it can be, sometimes it gets scary, because it, it just takes away all that we’ve been trying to do. Because each of the, each of our ethnic communities have issues that are so important in their particular, um, community that to try and bring that all together I don’t think any of them will be served. And I don’t think any of them will be helped. –Interview 2

This participant worked in a multicultural office that was about to be combined in some way with the international student office, and expressed reservations about what would happen to her programming and her work:

Uh, well like I said, um, we do the best that we can, we try to - I mean, in all honesty we went from a department of five to a department of one and a half. Um, and so, like I said, you know, diversity is important to us, but to what extent? Um, I think that that’s something we’ll have to continue to revisit, um, and I think moving forward, um, and I can’t speak for every institution, I can only speak for this one, that, um, because we’re going through a structural change, a lot of or some of the responsibilities of this office, particularly of me, may be transitioning into other areas. And therefore we may not have a robust amount of programming and committees and you know, advising that may occur
in our office because it’s going to be, sort of, um, our positions will be redefined, and you
know the goals will be changing, so. –Interview 8

Activities participants collaborate on with international offices. Since so many
of the participants’ offices were collaborating with the international offices on campus,
they listed many activities they worked on together. Orientations were a common
activity, both for students preparing to study abroad and for international students
arriving to the U.S. Individual advising was also common, with participants meeting with
their counterparts in the international offices to help students. Participants also mentioned
attending each other’s events, whether as a show of solidarity with the international
offices or as special, invited guests. They also mentioned programming – they worked
together on planning programs or co-sponsored each other’s programs, and students in
student organizations they advised also worked together on programs. One participant
mentioned that she worked together with different offices on campus, including the
international student office, to make sure that international students had several spaces on
campus where they could feel comfortable.

So, for the cultural center, we really do want international students to be a big part of the
community, but we also know like a lot of the international students also have the
[International Student Office], um, so we want to make sure, um, that they feel like
they’re welcomed in both places. Um, if there is a religious dimension to the group that
we also know that they may be very active in the Chaplain’s office, so we make sure that,
like, the heads, the three of us are talking, and we’re making sure and almost advocating
for the students to feel comfortable in all the spaces and not just pick one. –Interview 9
Two participants mentioned working specifically on promoting study abroad among
students of color. One invited her friend from the study abroad office in to speak, and the
other took more initiative on her own:

… I also support the study abroad students and the international students. I do. We work
very closely together. So one of the programs that I’m working on is when I pulled the
research I learned a lot of our students of color, they aren’t going to study abroad. At all.
And, you know, when we did some of the focus group one of the concern is financial. But a lot of our students are not exposed and again they may not have parents that attended college, they don’t understand that if you do study abroad and you pick one of the university that’s in the system, you pay the same tuition as you are payin at [Institution], so I work very closely in getting our students of color to change their mindset in terms of studying abroad because this world is becoming so global. –Interview 18

So these professionals were collaborating with international and study abroad offices in many ways, from merely co-sponsoring each other’s programs to inviting each other in to speak or help solve problems.

**Engagement summary.** All participants engaged in internationalization at their institutions. This was apparent in their descriptions of the international dimensions of their work, the appearance of and themes in their offices, websites, and literature, and the activities in which they participated. They engaged in international activities on their own and collaborated with the offices on their campuses that were more directly responsible for internationalization activities. Their engagement was at all levels, from the individual student level to the institutional policy level, but different participants had engaged to different degrees and in different ways.

**Motivations and Barriers**

Research Question 3 was: How do multicultural student affairs professionals describe what motivates them to engage in the internationalization of the selected higher education institutions where they work? How do they describe the barriers to their engagement?

In order to investigate question 3, I included questions in the interview on the origins of the activities the participants engaged in, and also asked them directly about what motivated them to participate in the activities they did. I also asked them whether
there had been activities they had wanted to engage in but had not been able to, or
whether they wanted to do more internationalization activity but could not for some
reason, and I asked them to name those barriers. The origins of their participation in the
activities varied, from their initiating the activities themselves, to students requesting that
they do this work, to their being asked by international education staff or upper
administration to do an activity. The motivations ranged from very practical to
philosophical, and the barriers mostly had to do with time, personnel, and money.

**Origins of participation in various activities/collaborations.** The participants’
engagement in internationalization activities was very often student driven, but
participants also initiated activity themselves or were invited by administration. Activity
also originated out of relationships and collaboration between these professionals and
their counterparts in the international offices, and out of the physical or administrative
locations of the offices themselves.

Many times, students were the driving force behind participants engaging in
international activities. One participant described the budding involvement of
international students in her center as follows:

Oh wow, the center exists, I should go find out how I can get funding! And funding
sometimes then creates, like there’s this great story of a student who got super involved
this year and now she’s - she went spring semester to study abroad - she’s Malaysian!
And I’ve been reaching out to the Malaysian students’ group every year, some years
they’re very active and other years they’re not as active in the center, and, you know, she
was just curious, came to the retreat after we reached out, then became very, very
instrumental in sort of shaping the conversation. At least the first semester of her
engagement, and hopefully when she comes back she will. So it’s really based on
students’ engagement, right, and us not saying, oh, you checked the Asian-American box,
you’re clearly international. – Interview 9
So this Malaysian student really got involved through her own initiative in the center, apparently lured by the possibility of funding, and this engagement with an international student who also studied abroad was engagement in internationalization for this participant. Another participant described students actually initiating a program that was a collaboration between her center and the study abroad office:

The study abroad really came from student organizing. We have um, three students who were taking a Women’s Studies course, and as part of that they had to do some sort of an activism project, and two of those students were in our peer education program. All three of them had done study abroad and had concerns about the lack of information that had been available to them, um, so they came to us, they went to Study Abroad, um, and really said, like, here’s something we’d like to do around this, they had put together some suggestions for, um, at that time we were, um, our Title IX office was developing a website, which is sort of our comprehensive resources around gender-based violence, and they had made some suggestions around what to include specifically from a study abroad perspective, so they were sort of the catalyst, and then as departments we’ve continued that collaborative relationship moving forward, as, um, you know, programs have changed, and we’ve added new things, and that kind of thing. – Interview 1

So this student-driven engagement for the participants was important, and occurred on an individual student level and at the administrative level. In the one example the participant engaged with one student who became very involved, and in the other the participant engaged in a larger activity that now includes a sustained collaboration with the study abroad office.

Some participants initiated internationalization activities themselves for various reasons. One (Interview 13) invited the study abroad office to come and speak at orientations for her students, because study abroad was such a part of the culture on campus and she wanted to have all the important campus offices represented. One (Interview 18) heard about a great program about diversity and international students, and thought it was important to bring that to campus because of the large international student
population at her institution. One (Interview 17) even collaborated with her upper administration to plan and execute two study abroad programs, because the President was in favor of internationalization and the participant saw the opportunity to do something she also thought was important. Others spoke of their relationships with members of the international student or study abroad office staff, and cited that as a reason the activity came into being. For example, one participant’s good friend in the study abroad office just happened to ask her one day in conversation why not many students of color studied abroad at her institution. She said

“Well, [study abroad adviser], they don’t think they can afford it.” So she said, “Oh!” I said, “Well then you need to come, because I can’t tell them what your job is. They’re going to ask me questions that I can’t answer. So the smartest thing for you to do, if you are really interested in helping them to, to take advantage of the opportunity, is to come to the meetings.” And so she did. – Interview 14

So these activities happened in an organic way, originating with the participants themselves or out of relationships they had. Other activities originated from external sources. There are the examples of student-initiated activity above, but the activities also originated from staff.

In some cases, the international office(s) approached the participants to work together on initiatives. One participant described a large-scale convening of the cultural centers and study abroad office that had taken place on her campus. I asked her who initiated this, and her response was:

They - it started because they [the study abroad office] approached the cultural centers. We had a major meeting, and they just wanted to hear our thoughts, they wanted to, ah, they wanted to hear our perspective on their work, and then I think, um, and then it was some follow-up to that, so.

Researcher: So what was the, um, sort of, reception of that, um, among the cultural centers? Were you guys like why are they asking us this, or were you really like, yeah, finally!
Participant: Well, initially I think we did have some questions, but I thought it was great. I think we knew, like that kind of connection needs to happen. We just didn’t know what the agenda wasn’t initially clear to us, until we got there and then it, we, it became very clear. So it was wanting our perspective, them sharing their perspective, um, and talking about needs, but also how can we get more of our populations involved in student - study abroad. – Interview 16

Other participants discussed being invited to serve on a study abroad committee, to participate in a site visit to a study abroad program location, to participate in international student orientation, to present on sexual violence to students and staff going to other countries, and to help plan trips and activities for international students. These invitations were based sometimes on access to the populations these participants served, and sometimes on the expertise of the participants in serving on committees or discussing things particular to their areas.

As mentioned above in the discussion about the relationship between multicultural and international offices, physical proximity was mentioned as an impetus for working together or for expecting to work together more. Similarly, administrative structures allowed for the offices to work together as well. At one university, the cultural centers and international office used to be part of the same unit, so at that time they worked together more. Another institution was bringing the offices under the same umbrella, so that participant expected to work more closely with the international office.

Just one participant said that he was invited by upper administration to engage in internationalization activities. He was not sure how he came to be invited to serve on a study abroad committee, but suspected that it was because he was known to be interested in internationalization and this is why the Provost appointed him. So the participant
perceived this invitation to be less a result of his current job responsibilities than of his known affinity for international issues.

So the participants became involved in their internationalization activities in many different ways, whether through student demand, colleagues’ invitations, their own initiatives, or simply physical or administrative proximity. They became involved at all levels, from the individual student level to the policy-making, administrative level. Their reasons for becoming involved were just as varied and will be discussed next.

**Motivations.** In order to better understand why these professionals engaged in internationalization, I asked the participants not just how their engagement originated, but also what motivated them to engage. There were philosophical, personal, and practical motivations for these professionals to engage in internationalization activities. The philosophical motivations were the most often mentioned, so this was a large factor in these participants’ engagement. Participants’ personal backgrounds also played a part, as did practical considerations.

Philosophical motivations included thoughts about the nature of diversity and the everyday work in which the participants were engaged, their desire to learn and bring international perspectives to their students, and one participant’s religious motivation. One participant, when I asked whether she consciously incorporated an international dimension into her work, stated her motivation to do so:

For me, having an international perspective is key in diversity. So I’m intentional in terms of working with our study abroad, working with our international students, even though that’s not a part of my job description. –Interview 18
This reflected her thoughts on the nature of diversity itself and therefore the foundation of her own work. Another participant expressed this same sentiment in a more complex, theoretical way:

…and then I think the other piece has been our commitment, we operate from an anti-racist, feminist, um, pros-, uh, perspective, and for us that means that we recognize that in this cultural context race has a particular salience and that’s why we make sure that we’re talking about the intersection between race and, racism and sexism, but again, our overall approach has been there is no monolithic gendered experience, and so if we’re going to be true to honoring the diversity of, um, gendered experiences, um, the experience of folks, um, who are international students but also sort of situating that within the larger global context, like, that just has to be part of how we approach our work. –Interview 1

Other participants had a desire to learn more and to add perspective for themselves and their students. There were several who mentioned this; here is how one participant expressed it, weaving international themes into her own work:

With regard to, like doing different programs, um, that really sort of deconstruct the lives of, of, um, international women, I think that that motivation comes from, um, us recognizing, um, how violence, um, is used, um, and a way for people to show that they, they have power, and, and sort of the, the misuse of power, and um, being able to - I don’t want to say expose, because I think it’s already been exposed as to how, um, different forms of interpersonal violence, like sexual assault for instance is, is used as a weapon of war, um, and those are just conversations that I believe students need to be aware of. They need to be aware of what’s happening in our own back yards, with, um, human and sex trafficking, and, um, you know, we, we turn on our news, we could turn on CNN or whatever station people look at or listen to, and hear about the experiences of many women. And then we say, OK, that’s only happening here. Well, we have things that are happening in our own back yard that we have no idea what’s happening. Um, and so, sometimes it’s great to, to talk about what’s happening around the world, um, but also to be, be able to come back and say and this is what we did to, to aid that, to - this is how we were a part of that, um, but also, this is what’s happening here and this is - sometimes different things that we do here impacts those people, right? And so we need to have those uncomfortable, um, conversations. So I think I, I don’t know, motivation? Um, I think we all just need to be more aware. And I think by becoming more aware, we, um, can then really recognize what our responsibility is. Once you have the awareness you can no longer say well I didn’t know that that’s what I was doing or that’s what was happening. –Interview 19
So this participant wanted to bring a global perspective to students because the nature of her work in a women’s center is global, and she wanted students to recognize this.

Another participant said, more simply:

“And I think, personally, um… any institution that does not have that international focus, either in course offerings, program of study, students, representations, et cetera, and faculty, is… to me, missing the boat. Because you cannot, you cannot expand, you know, students’ knowledge if they are only interacting with the same students they went to high school with.” –Interview 17

The next participant expressed a deeply held religious belief that motivated her:

If we believe in God- see, I teach- religion, so I have to go there. If we believe in God, and we believe that God created this beautiful planet, and put different fruits, and flowers, and climates, and et cetera, it is for us to experience all of that, right, and appreciate that. Um, and so, we cannot stay in our small corner and say this is all we have. There’s so much more. And that’s what motivates me. –Interview 17

So these philosophical motivations were a large factor in these professionals’ engagement in internationalization.

Participants were also motivated by their own personal backgrounds. Six of the nineteen participants in this study mentioned that they were born outside the United States. Most of these described their being born outside the country or their experiences as international students or immigrants as a motivating factor in their desire to participate in various internationalization activities. One participant said that since she was from a different country, “It amazes me how many of our domestic students do not have passports.” (Interview 18). So this motivated her to bring an international perspective to these students. Only one participant (Interview 12) mentioned that she had studied abroad. She said that it was influential in motivating her to engage in internationalization; it helped her to understand her own privilege, which she experienced differently when
she was abroad from how she experiences it in the U.S. Her experience of that motivated her to explore and celebrate other cultures, and to bring this awareness to her students as well. Two of the participants had worked previously in international education before transitioning to multicultural student affairs. This was a factor in their continued interest.

Still other participants were motivated not just by philosophical beliefs or their personal backgrounds, but by the necessity to perform their jobs and help students.

I mean again I think it’s, you know, it’s the reality of people’s experience. So, um, as I mentioned we do have quite a focus around issues of gender-based violence, discrimination and harassment, and so, um, you know, as students, international students, international faculty or staff were, um, either having these experiences or coming into contact with students who were having these experiences, um, you know, making sure that our, our educational programs, our response was culturally competent. Um, so that’s certainly a piece of it. –Interview 1

Some of the participants had a more difficult time thinking of their motivations when asked, because it was so natural to them that they would engage with international students or other international activities. This participant took a long time to answer the question:

Um [long pause] I don’t, it’s just what I do? It’s, it’s, it’s really, I mean, my work is to work with students. Um, and, so, if you’re a student you’re a student, and, and that’s what I’m, I’m going to do and I think it’s important for all students to know - if one student knows what their rights are then I think all students know what their rights are. –Interview 19

The next participant had a degree of awareness about the changes being brought about in higher education as a result of internationalization. Her motivation was also a practical one, but it was more along the lines of preparing herself and her profession for these changes:
Gaining insight, perspective, and information. I love education. So, um, and I also feel like this interna-, like internationalization of our work is real. Like so we need to really gain, like perspective, best practices, information, to inform our work. –Interview 16

These professionals were motivated by their philosophical beliefs, their personal backgrounds, and the necessities of their jobs to engage in internationalization. These motivations were powerful factors in their engagement, but there were also barriers preventing the participants from engaging more.

**Barriers to engagement.** Nearly all participants expressed interest in doing more in terms of internationalization, whether that entailed working with international students, working with study abroad, or simply attending more events and programs. Barriers to these activities varied, but the ones mentioned most often were time/personnel barriers. Others were lack of institutional support, the perception that this was outside the scope of their jobs, cultural barriers, and financial barriers.

When asked what the barriers were to their engagement in internationalization, many participants said that they were just too busy to do as much as they wanted to. Some said they did not have time, and some that they did not have personnel in order to do the activities they wanted to do. Many expressed this in a way similar to what this participant said:

I think the fact just because of my, my work here, because I have so much to do. Um, whereas, um, you know, if I were to just do international, I would be happy to just do international things, I would, but I am the Director of [Office]. –Interview 7

So this participant would like to engage in more international activities, but he did not have time and acknowledged that this was not the primary function of his job. There were many other participants who said largely the same thing: that they would like to engage
more, but a lack of time and personnel kept them from doing what they saw as secondary or marginal to their primary functions.

A lack of institutional support was also mentioned as a barrier to internationalization. One participant (Interview 15) said that she perceived this lack of support not only at her own institution, a community college, but in U.S. higher education in general. Another participant listed things (Interview 17) that she and her colleagues had wanted to do, such as start study abroad programs, which had been blocked by administration. This same institution had cut its English as a Second Language courses, so this participant saw that as a lack of institutional commitment to internationalization.

Another participant did not see resources going to help international students:

Cause when we talk about diversity here in the United States, I think we keep it very surface, um, we talk about, you know, race, religion, socio, socio-economic status, but we’re not incorporating the international experience. So being able to train our students and our faculty more on interacting with international students and being able to provide a resource not just a pocket of people, cause right now I feel like just, well you can count how many of us are supporting our international students on one hand. And I would like for that number to be a little bit bigger. –Interview 18

So she would like to be able to do more with the international students as well as have help doing so.

Another barrier described by participants can be characterized as having to do with whose job certain international activities are to do. Some participants described “silos” in their institutions that kept them from engaging as they wanted to:

…um, not particularly, um, cause they have uh, their whole own office over there, and um, we’ve got- We got a couple silos here at ______, where people just, they don’t understand the meaning of collegiality. Um, I don’t know if it’s fear of job, I don’t know if it’s, I don’t know what it is, but uh, it’s, they just really don’t know how to share. And they thought, and they don’t want to admit that maybe somebody else has an idea that, that they could use! So that’s um, yeah. –Interview 2
Other participants, as mentioned above with the time/personnel barrier, considered internationalization to be outside the scope of their jobs, or at best secondary. They would have liked to do more, but as it was not in their job description they could not make it a priority, with the limited resources they had. This participant, while engaged to a certain degree in internationalization, did not see it as part of her job at all. Her barrier to engagement was within herself:

No, because honestly I’ve never really thought about the international office in that way. I think for me being, um, multicultural I’ve more thought about how can I help, um, because the focus was really working with, um, our Latinos, our Native Americans, our African American students, um, and our Asian students. Cause it’s a smaller percentage here on campus. We’re 62%, we’re, is Caucasian students, um, 16% African Americans, 10% Latinos, and then it gets even lower from there. So the focus when the center started was what can we do to, you know, help these students feel accepted and appreciated and also share their culture with the university so that people can connect and learn about each other. So now instead of having that focus, it’s really now is OK, not just, um, our cultural populations, but what about the other things we have in common? Like our LGBT issues, like our religious issues, how do we connect and come together and help people appreciate everything else that we have to offer. So my focus really has now been on that spectrum, and not so much international. –Interview 6

Interestingly, Interview 6 was born outside the United States, a circumstance that had motivated other participants to engage more. She said at the end of the interview that the conversation had caused her to think of ways she could engage in internationalization and collaborate with the international office on her campus. She just had not thought of this before as part of her job.

Some participants talked about cultural barriers to engagement. One of these was language. Two participants discussed language and cultural barriers to communication with international students and faculty – not that the international students and faculty did not speak English well, but that the words they used and the ways they expressed
themselves were different from their own. This was a challenge in trying to serve these populations. One LGBT center professional said:

…just taking trad, traditional, binary gender issues can be very challenging… so if you know that, throw in sexuality and then the gender s-, identity and um, and and expression spectrum, I think some barriers can be: language and communication, outreach, so like some students may not even conceive or understand we would even have a place like this. Some international students have been blown away that we have a designated space. I am paid full-time to do this work every day. –Interview 16

She talked about outreach to students who would not think to come to a center like this, and helping them express gender and sexuality here in the U.S., but then realizing that it will be different for them when they went home. This made it more challenging to do her job, and was a barrier in that she did not feel like she was always effective or did enough for them.

Some of the participants perceived international students as difficult to reach and get to engage with their centers or offices. One said:

They may come to a program every now and then, but they tend to be in a world of their own. Which they try to keep intact because you want to practice your religion and your culture in a strange country, so that you can feel as comfortable as you can in a new environment.” –Interview 14

Another participant described her efforts to reach out and invite international students to her programs, but said they did not participate or get involved and that this was very frustrating (Interview 2). At some of the institutions many of the international students were graduate students, so that was another factor that kept them from being involved in many student activities. This was a barrier for the participants, because if the international students did not come to their centers this limited their opportunities to engage with them.
One participant admitted to a lack of knowledge and experience about international students, which she thought was a barrier.

I think there, there has been barriers. Cause I, I often feel like this is a population that I know little about… Um, and so I don’t feel competent to either create a program or service, or, um, support these students in the way they need. Um, just because of my lack of experience or research, which, um, around the international population. Cause all of my research has been more students of color, specifically domestic students of color. Um, and so I think my barrier, one is kind of my own, you know, lack or little knowledge and experience. –Interview 12

This participant was the only one who expressed this explicitly, but this lack of knowledge and experience was true for other participants as well, for example in the discussion above by the LGBT center director who did not always feel as though she understood the cultural aspects of international students’ concerns, and in the frustrations of feeling that the international students keep to themselves and not being able to reach them.

Financial barriers were also a limiting factor in engagement. These financial barriers were either for the professionals themselves or for their students. Many participants said that they would do more internationalization activities if they had more funding. These statements ranged from simply, “Budget. It’s a very small budget for such a large operation,” (Interview 2) to mentions of what participants would do with more funding. Some would travel internationally, and one mentioned that he was aware of opportunities that he could not take advantage of:

I would, I would say I mean, funding is always a barrier. Um, if there was, I mean if there was, there was enough funds you would be able to, ah, seek out opportunities to expand your, um, your knowledge and your interest and your contribution to internationali-, to the internationalization of, of, you know, your campus, your community and, and things like that, you know, so it’s always, ah, funding. Cause there are opportunities out there. –Interview 5
Other participants mentioned a lack of funding for students, mostly related to study abroad. Several participants mentioned that students at their institutions and the students they served specifically did not have the funds to study abroad, so they themselves did not work with study abroad because it wasn’t happening to their students. Some, however, mentioned trying to help students find this type of funding, so it was less a barrier and more an opportunity to serve the students.

Thus, the barriers to engagement for these professionals mostly had to do with lacking the time and personnel to do what many saw as a secondary function of their jobs. They also had cultural barriers, from the language they used to talk about their work to difficulties reaching international students and a lack of knowledge about international students. Their budgets and the budgets of their students were also barriers, preventing their offices from doing what they wanted to do and preventing their students from engaging as well.

**Summary**

All of these participants were engaged in internationalization. Most had not discussed internationalization as a trend in higher education and indeed had not heard the word “internationalization,” but all were able to express what it meant to them and to their work. They largely defined it in terms of student mobility, and mostly international students coming to the U.S., though there were also definitions in terms of globalization, a broader perspective, and one more comprehensive definition. Institutional definitions followed a similar pattern but were more specific.

The participants’ engagement was at all levels of internationalization, though most were engaged at the individual student level. The engagement at the student level
was through student and student organization advising, as well as programming for students. Many participants had engaged at a higher level, serving on committees related to internationalization on their campuses.

The participants’ motivations to engage were philosophical, personal, and practical. They engaged due to their beliefs and values, to their backgrounds as immigrants or study abroad students, or the needs of their students. The origins of their engagement were student-driven, driven by their own motivations, or by colleagues or administration inviting them to participate in activities.

The barriers that kept the participants from engaging more in internationalization were time and personnel, their own or others’ perception that this was not part of their job, cultural, and financial. Most participants wanted to do more with international students, travel internationally, internationalize their work, or engage in other ways, but many were held back by these factors.

**Chapter Five: Discussion and Conclusions**

**Introduction**

In this study, I sought to understand how multicultural student affairs professionals engage in internationalization. The purpose of this study was to explore the engagement of multicultural student affairs professionals in the internationalization of the selected higher education institutions in which they work. I used a basic, interpretive, inductive qualitative design in order to discover the meaning that these professionals made of internationalization at their institutions.

I interviewed 19 multicultural student affairs professionals in the state of Connecticut. I drew this sample from the population of identified multicultural student
affairs professionals in the state, using purposeful sampling to select these participants. They represent public and private institutions, community colleges, baccalaureate institutions, master’s, and research institutions. The offices where they worked included cultural centers, general multicultural offices, and others. The findings from these interviews were at times surprising but at times consistent with the existing literature. The findings provide a basis for several directions for future research, including quantitative research on the same topic, research on multicultural student affairs in general, more exploration of the intersections between multicultural and international education, and research on how the racially charged events on college campuses in the fall of 2015 have affected multicultural student affairs practitioners’ engagement in internationalization. The findings also lead to several recommendations for practice and policy, including institutional prioritization of both multicultural student affairs and international education, cross-training for practitioners in both fields, and recommendations on the structural organization of these units on campuses.

**Discussion of Key Findings**

The findings in this study are generally consistent with those of the very few similar studies available, but there are some new findings that emerged as well. In this study, the definitions of the term “internationalization” were similar to definitions identified in previous studies, though it was surprising that most participants in this study had not heard the term. The activities in which participants in this study engaged most often were different from those engaged in by the participants in other studies. This is most likely due to the fact that this study focused on the very specific population of multicultural student affairs professionals rather than one of the groups in the other
studies – faculty members or student affairs professionals in general. One finding, that students sometimes initiated or fueled internationalization activities, is a new finding not present in the existing literature.

The first research question was “How do multicultural student affairs professionals at selected higher education institutions define and describe internationalization?” This study found that though many of the participants had not heard the word “internationalization” before, all were able to articulate a definition of what it meant to them. These definitions were largely about student mobility: international students coming to the United States or U.S. students going to study abroad. They also gave other definitions, including those having to do with globalization and bringing a broader perspective to students.

Based on the volume of literature on collaborations and/or tensions between multicultural student affairs and international education professionals (Cole, 1984; Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999; Cortés, 1983, 2002; Noronha, 1992; Olson et al., 2007), as well as the profound impact that internationalization has had on higher education in general (DeWit & Merkx, 2012; Jones & DeWit, 2012) and, to a lesser extent, on student affairs specifically (Ludeman, 2008) I had expected to find that the participants had a well-considered understanding of the term “internationalization.” Therefore, I found it surprising that many of them had not heard the word prior to the interviews, and relied on a basic understanding of the suffix “-ization” to construct their definitions. The definitions themselves, however, were consistent with previous research, in that they focused on specific aspects of internationalization, rather than a comprehensive definition encompassing more dimensions and functions of higher education (Knight, 2004).
Friesen’s (2013) participants, faculty members who were asked to differentiate internationalization from globalization, also had varying degrees of understanding and different definitions for the two terms. Samano’s (2012) participants also discussed ambiguity in the concept of internationalization. It is important to note that the fact that the professionals in the current study had different definitions is not an indication that they are missing something fundamental about their jobs or about higher education in general, or that their definitions are “incorrect.” Consistent with the constructivist, interpretive orientation of this study (Merriam, 2009) and the nature of internationalization itself (Knight, 2004), these different definitions are constructed by the participants themselves, and it is appropriate for them to define the term based on their own experiences.

The second research question was “In what ways are multicultural student affairs professionals at selected higher education institutions engaged in internationalization? In what ways are they not engaged?” The finding from this study is that these professionals were engaged in internationalization activities at every level, from the individual student level to the policy making level of their institutions. The most common activities in which they engaged were individual student advising, international programming and events, and advising internationally themed student organizations. They were less involved in traveling internationally as part of their work, though some did. At a higher institutional level, some of the participants served on committees related to internationalization. The participants had internationally themed décor in their offices, but most did not visibly promote international programs in their workplaces or on their websites. They collaborated in a variety of ways with their colleagues on campus who
were responsible for international education, but many expressed that working with international students or students going abroad was the job of those other individuals and not the main focus of their own work.

The findings of this study support those of Di Maria (2012), who found that student affairs professionals (not only multicultural student affairs professionals) regarded international education professionals as the ones primarily responsible for dealing with international students. A new finding in this study is that the participants did not engage to a great extent in traveling internationally for work. This is in contrast to the findings of studies on faculty engagement in internationalization (Beatty, 2013; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Friesen, 2013), which showed that faculty engaged more in international travel. The participants in the current study were also engaged more in individual student advising than those in the faculty engagement research (Beatty, 2013; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Friesen, 2013). This might be ascribed more to the nature of these participants’ jobs, which are more directly involved with advising than with conducting research or going to conferences which would require one to travel overseas, than to inconsistencies in the findings.

The third research question in this study was “How do multicultural student affairs professionals describe what motivates them to engage in the internationalization of the selected higher education institutions where they work? How do they describe the barriers to their engagement?” The findings on this question are that participants became engaged in international activities through student involvement, initiating the activities themselves, and being invited by others. Some of their motivations were philosophical, reflective of their thoughts on the nature of diversity and the realities of their jobs. Other
participants were motivated by their personal backgrounds. Many had been born outside the United States and ascribed their motivation to engage in internationalization to this. Some participants were motivated primarily by practical concerns: international students need help just as any other student would. The barriers to engagement were mostly time and personnel, but participants also cited a lack of institutional support, the perception that this was outside the scope of their jobs, cultural barriers, and financial barriers.

The findings on motivations and barriers are largely consistent with those of previous research. Again, the research that most closely aligns with the current study was on other groups’ engagement in internationalization. Faculty participants in Friesen’s (2013) study were highly motivated to engage in internationalization for philosophical reasons similar to those expressed by participants in this study. The barriers found in previous research are even more similar to those identified in this study. One study on faculty engagement (Beatty, 2013) found similar barriers to engagement: a lack of time and personnel, fragmented institutional efforts, and “silos.” The factors encouraging engagement in Beatty’s study were more institutional than motivational. This is likely due to the case study methodology used in Beatty’s research: he was studying faculty members in different parts of the same institution, rather than administrators at completely different institutions. Dewey and Duff (2009) found similar barriers as well, citing a lack of coordination and scarce resources, including personnel and funding.

The barriers described by the participants, coupled with the desire they expressed to “do more” or learn about the reality of the internationalization of their work, represent a different kind of tension from what I had expected to find. These participants did not see internationalization as an opposing force that threatened to make their jobs obsolete,
as the literature had seemed to suggest (Cortés, 1983, 2002; Noronha, 1992; Olson et al.,
2007), but did see it as an influence that needed to be dealt with. They largely found
themselves unable to do so, because of the time/personnel, lack of institutional support,
perception that this was outside the scope of their jobs, cultural, and financial barriers.
The tension and conflict was not with the practitioners of internationalization or
international education, but with the institutional structures and the nature of their work.
This type of tension was also discussed in Samano’s (2012) study on student affairs
administrators at the University of Minnesota. The qualitative portion of Samano’s
research reveals the difficulties and successes her participants had had in collaborating to
internationalize student affairs (2012).

Student involvement was a large factor motivating engagement in this study.
However, it has not been a factor found in any of these other studies. Mazon (2010)
found that student affairs professionals had a very narrow focus in their jobs, because of
what students wanted to focus on. None of the studies on faculty engagement (Beatty,
2013; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Friesen, 2013) cited student involvement or demands as a
motivating factor. The finding in this study that students sometimes initiated or led
internationalization efforts may reflect a more recent trend, the difference in the nature of
multicultural student affairs professionals’ jobs, or it may be an anomaly not
representative of how these activities usually originate.

Limitations

The primary limitations of this study include the sampling method and several
biases that were somewhat unavoidable, including social desirability bias and other biases
related to the identities of the researcher and participants. The sampling method, which
was necessary in order to gain trust and establish rapport with the participants, yielded a small number of participants in a restricted geographical area. The diversity in the participants and in their institutions (see Chapter 3) was still valuable, but the sample could have been more robust.

I was aware before the interviews that a social desirability bias might be present when I talked to the participants, and I did see possible evidence of it in some of their responses. Since my work is in international education, and internationalization was the subject of the interviews, the participants could have been expected to be more enthusiastic about internationalization than they would otherwise have been. It is impossible to know whether this was the case, but the participants generally were enthusiastic, and did not make negative comments about internationalization.

I did not see evidence, however, of the participants holding back in their responses because of my cultural identity relative to theirs. They appeared to discuss issues of race, privilege, gender, sexuality, and other topics that might be considered sensitive in other settings, quite freely. I did follow a strategy of trying to identify with them as higher education administrators and express respect for their work in the interviews. However, I attribute their openness and candor not to this strategy but to the fact that these professionals have to discuss issues like this with diverse audiences as part of their jobs on a day-to-day basis. So what I feared might be a bias was mitigated – not through any skill of my own but through the professionalism of these multicultural educators.

**Implications for Future Research**
There are several directions for future research that can be taken from this study. First, quantitative research on the same topic would be useful, as would further qualitative research with different participants. Second, more research on multicultural student affairs in general would help to provide more understanding of these individuals, their work, and the contexts in which they work. Third, as these two fields continue to grow and play such pivotal roles in higher education, more research is needed on the increasingly complex intersections between them. Lastly, the events on U.S. college campuses of the fall of 2015, precipitated by the events leading to the formation Black Lives Matter and other movements, have undoubtedly had an impact on multicultural student affairs in the U.S., and probably have had an effect also on these professionals’ engagement in internationalization. Future research could explore these effects.

Because this study was qualitative in nature, and the sample was neither large nor random, the findings are not generalizable to the larger population of multicultural student affairs professionals in United States higher education. In order to understand how the larger population engages in internationalization, quantitative research would be helpful. The study, along with others in which different groups’ engagement in internationalization have been explored, could provide a basis on which to build a quantitative study, which could show trends and statistics on what internationalization activities these professionals are engaged in, their attitudes and beliefs about internationalization, or other aspects of the topic that would deepen our understanding. In addition, further qualitative research on different participants would be helpful. The sample could be chosen in a different way such as identifying participants who are well-known to be engaged in internationalization, which may yield different results.
Beyond the intersections with internationalization, more research is needed on multicultural student affairs in general (Dalton & Sullivan, 2008; Di Maria, 2012; Stewart & Bridges, 2011). In the interviews for the current study, I asked participants about the histories of their offices and of their positions. I did this in order to analyze the participants’ responses for themes related to internationalization, but the responses could have been analyzed instead for themes related to the origins and evolution of such offices. For example, I noticed that many of the offices had their origins in student activism and/or as a response to negative incidents happening on campuses. Stewart and Bridges (2011) had done quantitative research on multicultural student affairs offices before, but further, qualitative study on this would be fascinating. This type of analysis was decidedly outside the scope of the current study.

More salient to the current research are the participants’ discussions of the ways in which they collaborated with those on their campuses who were primarily responsible for international education. One aspect of this discussion which is more tangential to the current study are the ways in which the offices have collaborated, been combined, and otherwise intersected, and what processes or entities have influenced this. Was it fiscal expediency, strategic planning, grassroots organizing, top-down orders? This larger view of the phenomenon of internationalizing multicultural student affairs or multiculturalizing internationalization is also necessary to our understanding. A study undertaken at this higher level of internationalization would add to the literature.

The timing of the current research was such that the interviews were conducted in the summer of 2015. In the fall semester following that summer, campuses across the United States, perhaps most notably the University of Missouri and Yale University,
experienced protests against racism on campus and in society. These protests and the student movements arising around them have had enormous impacts on colleges and universities. Multicultural student affairs professionals have certainly been affected by these events (Scott, 2015). These professionals may have had to focus more on issues of discrimination and microaggressions than on internationalization. However, international students have been part of these movements along with domestic students (Durden, 2016). Many of the demands made by student organizations of administration at their institutions call for services and an end to discrimination for international students (WeTheProtesters, n.d.). Conducting follow-up interviews with the participants in this study on the effects of the events of fall 2015 on their engagement in internationalization would be interesting, and any research on multicultural student affairs from fall 2015 will certainly be affected by these events.

Implications for Practice, Policy, and Theory

It was clear to me in speaking with these student affairs professionals that they were aware of their jobs being affected by globalization. Their and their institutions’ responses to the forces of globalization are what internationalization represents (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Jones & de Wit, 2012; Knight, 1994). Though most of them had not thought much about internationalization or articulated it what it was before, they all engaged in it. They did not, however, feel that they were always doing as much as they should or wanted to (see Chapter 4). Following are several recommendations for enhancing the effectiveness of these professionals’ efforts. These are consistent with recommendations for collaboration found in the literature (Baker, 1999; Cole, 1984;
Cornwell & Stoddard, 1999; Cortés, 1983, 2002; Merryfield, 1996; Noronha, 1992; Olson et al., 2007).

The barriers that the participants cited to further engagement were time and personnel, related to the feeling that internationalization was not a central part of their jobs. There were also, however, acknowledgements that “internationalization of our work is real,” (Interview 16), so more needed to be done. Based on this, I would recommend that upper administration and the multicultural student affairs offices themselves recognize internationalization as work that cannot be neglected or marginalized. Each institution must determine and articulate its priorities with regard to multicultural education, diversity, and internationalization. This must be articulated at the institutional level (Friesen, 2013; Mazon, 2010; Olson et al., 2007). I do not recommend waiting until racially charged incidents on campus throw multicultural student affairs into the spotlight (as happened at Interview 11 and 12’s institution just before the interviews) to make it a priority. Similarly, I do not recommend waiting until an LGBT international student is in a crisis of identity (Interview 16) to take the time to figure out the priorities and how these areas will work together. Internationalization should be a priority in multicultural student affairs, and multicultural education or diversity should be a priority in internationalization. And both should be institutional priorities and given resources and personnel in order to function effectively.

Based on some of the statements shared by the participants in this study (Interviews 12 and 16 in particular), as well as on some of the literature (Di Maria, 2012), multicultural student affairs professionals do not always feel competent or confident in working with international students. They also may not know what challenges the
students they serve on campus – whether students of color, LGBT students, women, men – face when going abroad. I also know from personal experience in my work as an international educator that members of my field are not always conversant with the concepts that multicultural educators work with, such as power and privilege, social justice, or intersectionality. Willis (2015) refers to microaggressions experienced by Black women during study abroad programs and relates them to intersectionality. So the multiculturalization of our work as international educators is also real. The lack of knowledge about each other’s work points to the need for collaboration of the type that occurred in Interview 16’s institution (see Chapter 4), in which the study abroad office and cultural centers came together to discuss how they could work together. This is the type of collaboration also fostered by the At Home in the World project from ACE (Olson et al., 2007).

There also should be diversity and intercultural training for both multicultural student affairs professionals and international education professionals. This would help to make the other field central in each professional’s job and therefore a higher priority. Following the principles of comprehensive internationalization or a systems approach to internationalization (Hudzik, 2011; Mestenhauser, 1998, 2002, 2011), as well as multicultural transformation (Banks, 2001; Boyer, 1995), this training needs to be extended, as well, to all faculty and staff. Since one of the goals thought to be held in common by both multicultural education and internationalization is intercultural development (Bennett & Bennett, 1994, 2004; Olson et al., 2007, Olson & Peacock, 2012), these areas could work together on developing and implementing this training across campus.
The final recommendation from this study is based on fears expressed by some participants (notably Interview 2) and in the literature (Cortés, 1983; Olson et al., 2007) about losing something by combining offices. It is also based on the finding, however, that physical or administrative proximity fostered greater collaboration between the participants and those on their campuses responsible for internationalization (see Chapter 4). I recommend that the offices responsible for multicultural student affairs and internationalization be brought together or combined administratively and physically, but remain separate entities. Their roles should remain differentiated even as they increasingly work together. They should each be represented equally; one should not take over the other. Ideally there would be a Senior International Officer and a Senior Diversity Officer, reporting to the Vice President of Student Affairs, Academic Vice President, or President, and each office should have a similar and equal administrative structure.

**Summary**

The purpose of this study was to explore the engagement of multicultural student affairs professionals in the internationalization of the selected higher education institutions in which they work. Through interviews and observations, I investigated how a selected group of multicultural educators in the state of Connecticut defined and described internationalization, what internationalization activities they did and did not engage in, and their motivations and barriers to engagement.

The investigation found that these professionals all engaged in internationalization, though they had not all heard the term or articulated a definition before. Their definitions had to do with student mobility, globalization, a broader
perspective, and one more comprehensive definition, though many focused on international students coming to the United States. The participants were engaged in internationalization at all levels, with most engaged at the individual student level through student and student organization advising, as well as programming for students. Many participants had engaged at a higher level, serving on committees related to internationalization on their campuses.

The participants were motivated to engage for philosophical, personal, and practical reasons. Their beliefs and values, their backgrounds as immigrants or study abroad students, and the needs of their students were all motivating factors. Their engagement was driven by students, by their own motivations, or by colleagues or administration inviting them to participate in activities. A new finding in this study was that students were very often the catalyst for these activities.

The participants identified time and personnel, their own or others’ perception that this was not part of their job, cultural, and financial barriers to their engagement. Most participants desired to engage more in internationalization activities, but these barriers held them back and frustrated their efforts.

The findings provide a foundation for future research on this topic with a different methodology, or studies on various aspects of multicultural student affairs as well as its intersections with internationalization. Also, recent race-related events in the U.S. and on its college campuses have had an impact on the work of multicultural student affairs professionals, most likely affecting their engagement in internationalization along with other aspects of their work. Research is needed on these effects.
The implications for policy and practice are fairly consistent with previous literature, but this study provides research in support of recommendations made previously based on experience or anecdote. Upper administration should acknowledge the forces of increased diversity and globalization, and respond with support for both multicultural education and internationalization efforts, including the internationalization of multicultural education and multicultural transformation of international education. This would include training for practitioners in both of these areas and other personnel across the institution. Additionally, the offices responsible for managing the processes of internationalization and multicultural transformation should be brought closer together administratively and physically, but remain separate so that their individual missions are not diluted.
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Appendix A

Consent Information Sheet

The Engagement of Multicultural Student Affairs Staff in the Internationalization of Connecticut Higher Education Institutions

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research study on the engagement of multicultural student affairs professionals in internationalization. You were selected as a possible participant because of your work as a multicultural educator in the state of Connecticut. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before the interview begins.

This study is being conducted by: Emily Gorlewski, Ed.D. candidate, Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development, the University of Minnesota.

Background Information

The purpose of this study is to explore the engagement of multicultural student affairs professionals in the internationalization of the selected higher education institutions in which they work.

Procedures:

You will be interviewed for approximately one hour regarding your work as a multicultural student affairs professional. The interview will be audio recorded. By agreeing to start the audio recording, you give your consent to participate in the study. The researcher will ask whether you agree to participate in the interview after the recording begins. The researcher will also ask you for any printed material or website links that are relevant to the study, and your context and environment will be observed. This observation includes the campus, and the appearance and location of your office.

Risks and Benefits of being in the Study:

There are no direct risks or benefits to participating in this study.

Compensation:

You will not receive any compensation for participation in this study.

Confidentiality:

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report that might be published, no information will be included that will make it possible to identify a subject.
Research records will be stored securely and only the researcher will have access to the records. The audio recordings used in the study will be stored only on the researcher’s computer and on an external hard drive stored in the researcher’s home, and will be erased after the completion of the researcher’s dissertation, expected to take place in 2016.

**Voluntary Nature of the Study:**

Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the University of Minnesota. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

**Contacts and Questions:**

The researcher conducting this study is Emily Gorlewski, doctoral candidate in Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, **you are encouraged** to contact the researcher’s dissertation advisors, Professor Karen Seashore and Professor Andrew Furco at OLPD, 330 Wulling Hall, University of Minnesota, (612) 624-1006, kloius@umn.edu; afurco@umn.edu.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), **you are encouraged** to contact the University of Minnesota’s Research Subjects’ Advocate Line, D528 Mayo, 420 Delaware St. Southeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455; (612) 625-1650.

*You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.*
Appendix B

Semi-Structured Interview Guide

1. Tell me about yourself and your work at this institution.
2. Do you have any learning outcomes, or a mission, you can share with me?
3. What do you know about the history of your position and your office here on campus?
4. Added after data analysis started: Is your work a priority on campus?
5. How long have you been in your current position?
6. How long have you been in what you consider to be your current field?
7. Is there an international or global dimension to your work? What is it?
8. What is your understanding of internationalization? How would you define it? Added after data analysis started: Is that a word you have heard or used before?
9. What does internationalization mean at this institution?
10. I’m going to read you this list of activities [included after questions] associated with internationalization. Please tell me if you know whether any of these activities are happening here at _________, and, if so, the extent to which you have been involved.
11. Are there any other internationalization activities I didn’t list, that you know go on here, and/or in which you might have been involved?
12. When you participated in _____, how did that come about? How did you decide to do this? (sometimes incorporated into the list of activities so they could talk about this right after describing the activity)
13. You mentioned that ________ does go on here at your institution, but you are not involved. Can you tell me why?
14. What factors have motivated you or inspired you to engage in internationalization?
   a. What colleagues, faculty or students have motivated you or inspired you to engage? (did not generally use)
15. What factors have been barriers to your engagement in internationalization? Added after data analysis started: Have there been activities you wanted to participate in but didn’t?
   a. What colleagues, faculty or students have been barriers to your engagement? (did not generally use)
16. What is the history of collaboration between your area and those on campus mainly responsible for internationalization?
17. Is there anything I haven’t asked that you think I need to know about your work, or about your engagement in internationalization?
18. Do you have printed materials regarding anything I have asked about, that I can take or photograph?
19. I have also met with/have meetings scheduled with _________. Are there other colleagues doing this kind of work here on campus that you think I should talk to?
List of activities

1. Working with international students, international faculty, spouses or families of international students or faculty, or international student organizations in any capacity
2. Serving on campus committees or working groups with a focus on internationalization
3. Intercultural training – facilitating or participating
4. Hosting international visitors to campus
5. Facilitating or attending any international programming – festivals, film series, lectures, classes
6. Anything associated with study abroad – leading programs, assisting study abroad office with recruiting students, etc.
7. Working with or supporting students learning languages – English or others – or holding conversation hours, etc.
8. Traveling out of the country for any reason – research, conference, meeting, teaching
9. Participating in faculty or staff exchange – traveling or hosting
10. Consciously incorporating an international dimension into your mission, learning outcomes, or other work
Appendix C

Observation Guide

Overall campus

What and how many international/global/multicultural/diversity materials are visible around campus?

How do the international and multicultural offices compare with each other?

Where are the offices situated on campus? What is their relative visibility?

Participant and setting

What is the office of the participant like?

What types of international/global themed literature, decorations, information, or materials are visible in participant’s office?

What is the participant’s general demeanor and body language throughout the interview?

What are the participant’s surroundings in general, and how does the participant interact with them during the interview?