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ABSTRACT

EXTERNAL GLOBAL FORCES THAT AFFECT
HIGHER EDUCATION INTERNATIONALIZATION STRATEGIES AND HOW
THREE U.S. UNIVERSITIES ADAPT TO THEM

Lauren Kathleen Kettler
Mary-Linda Armacost

When major transnational events occur, such as the 2015 economic crisis within Greece, the 2016 violent conflicts within Turkey, and the creation of political policies such as the 2017 President Trump Executive Orders on visa and immigration, the effects ripple throughout the field of international higher education. How higher education institutions take into consideration such external forces, ultimately, can affect their internationalization efforts, strategies, and successes.

This qualitative study explores what the external forces are that affect a university’s internationalization strategies, specifically in inbound and outbound mobility programs. It further examined in what way these forces are affecting their strategies and how universities adapt to these forces. Using data from the Open Doors: Reports on International Education Exchange and the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), three private universities were selected that demonstrate large internationalization, inbound and outbound mobility strategies: Boston University, Northeastern University, and the University of Southern California. Further, this study was grounded in Kim Cameron’s (1983, 1984) strategic choice and adaptation frameworks as a theoretical foundation, as the survival of the institution in today’s global age is dependent on how well the institution can adapt during times of change.
The findings in this study reveal common themes across the three institutions, which resulted in seven external forces, or the Internationalization Forces. These forces have positive and negative effects on universities, which are demonstrated and plotted on a coordinate plane resulting in four distinct quadrants: Beneficial, Stressful, Harmful, and Creative. Finally, each case demonstrated that they are adapting their strategies across Cameron’s (1983, 1984) three domains: Defense, Offense, and Creation.

Overall, the study underscores the impact that the external world has on higher education. Understanding the volatility of the Internationalization Forces can further assist higher education institutions in the facilitation of their internationalization strategies.
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CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

Higher education is a product of external forces. If the world around education was not interacting with it, what would we essentially be teaching our students in the classroom? If colleges and universities did not adapt to the external world, then what would it look like? The curriculum of, the objectives for, and even the location of higher education has evolved throughout time, where today, more and more universities and colleges are creating and expanding the sophistication of their internationalization strategies. Globalization, government policy, the economy, and the transnational political landscape are some of the external forces attracting the attention of higher education leaders and administrators. The effects of globalization, in particular, have increased the need for universities to think beyond the borders of their campuses to ensure operational success as global forces affect campus initiatives at different levels. Yet, how a university adapts to external forces can ultimately affect its response to and achievement in executing internationalization strategies.

This study looked at three private universities that have been leaders in international education by way of their volume of inbound and outbound mobility of students. It explored what key internationalization administrators at these institutions determined to be the key external forces influencing their internationalization efforts and examined how these universities adapted their international strategies as a result to such external forces. This research examined these questions through a case study analysis of Boston University (BU), Northeastern University (NU), and the University of Southern California (USC).
The Problem and its Context

Globalization is a term that is used to describe the “the economic, political, and societal forces” (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 290) that impact various sectors; however, in the case of higher education, these forces are “pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement” (p. 290). Internationalization, on the other hand, is a way to deal with globalization through “specific policies and programs undertaken by governments, academic systems and institutions, and even individual departments or institutions to cope with or exploit globalization” (Altbach, 2004, p. 6).

With globalization continuing to impact higher education, institutions are finding the need to reevaluate ways to achieve their missions, which includes the incorporation of internationalization initiatives. As they align their strategies with this need to internationalize, the landscape remains complex, often filled with events that impact the operationalization of such strategies. Some events are foreseeable, yet some are not, and institutions may find they are building a defensive strategy rather than an offensive one. What follows are examples of how events outside of a higher education institution have influenced inbound and outbound internationalization initiatives.

Greece

In the summer of 2015, Greece was about to become the first European country ever to default on a loan from the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The IMF (2016) is an organization whose purpose is to “ensure the stability of the international monetary system—the system of exchange rates and international payments that enable countries (and their citizens) to transact with each other” (para. 2). Greece, a member of the Eurozone (the countries that use the euro as their currency), had failed to make a €1.5
billion loan payment to the IMF by the deadline of June 30, 2015. To prevent a run on the bank, the European Central Bank (ECB) made the decision to freeze liquidity within Greece by limiting withdrawals from cash machines to €60 a day and then increased that amount to €120 a day for a period of 8 days (“Greece Debt Crisis: Eurozone Rejects Bailout Appeal,” 2015). In tandem to these decisions, the Greek government negotiated a bailout deal with the European Union resulting in stricter austerity measures for the country (Taylor & Malterzou, 2015). This period of economic uncertainty was known as “Grexit” by political and financial analysts who assessed the risk of Greece exiting the Eurozone and re-instating its former currency, the Drachma (Kirby, 2015).

The situation resulted in global panic and its impact was felt across many industries, including higher education. For students who were scheduled to study abroad in Greece that summer and fall of 2015, questions emerged. Would they have access to currency? Would they be able to leave Greece if an emergency occurred? Would they be safe during their time in Greece? Grexit required universities to understand, confront, and respond to complex political events outside of their campuses.

**Turkey**

In a city where East meets West, Istanbul has been a place of unique learning and discovery for thousands of years. As formal university-sponsored study abroad programs diversified their list of destinations to send students, Istanbul was added to many lists and became a study location that was promoted due to its rich history, stunning art and culture, and historical sites, such as the Grand Bazaar and the Hagia Sophia (Sadler, 2013). However, the civil war in Syria has increased in intensity since 2011, impacting bordering countries, including Turkey. As Arango and Schmitt (2015) wrote in *The New...*
York Times, the path to the jihadist group, the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS), is through the “porous Turkish border” (para. 7). The complex geopolitical situation became increasingly violent for Turkey, resulting in multiple terrorist attacks in Ankara and Istanbul in 2016. One of the most significant events that year was the June 28th Ataturk Airport bombing that killed at least 36 people and wounded over 100 others (Atassi, Botelho, & Tuysuz, 2017). As a result, many universities stopped promoting Turkish study abroad programs in that region due to increasing violence. Specifically, universities such as Boston University, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and the University of California responded by suspending study abroad programs and exchanges in Turkey until further notice (Whitelaw, 2016).

United States

After the January 20, 2017 inauguration of U.S. President Donald Trump, a series of contentious Executive Orders (EOs) were issued, some directly impacting internationalization efforts by higher education institutions. One in particular, EO 13769, known as the “Travel Ban,” was issued on January 27th and focused on creating stricter vetting measures for entry into the United States (The White House, 2017a). Specifically, EO 13769 banned “entry for 90 days by citizens from Iraq, Syria, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen” (Almasay & Simon, 2017, para. 5). Higher education leaders responded strongly and “criticized the ban for the disruption it caused to students and scholars and for confusion around the order and its implementation and, in many cases, expressed moral outrage” (Fain, 2017, para. 1).

Then, on March 6, 2017, President Trump signed EO 13780 (The White House, 2017b), which superseded EO 13769 by revising the list of banned countries, removing
Iraq and exempting “permanent residents and current visa holders, and [dropping] language offering preferential status to persecuted religious minorities, a provision widely interpreted as favoring other religious groups over Muslims” (Thrush, 2017, para. 4). After EO 13780 was signed, Redden (2017b) reported in *Inside Higher Ed*:

Higher education groups largely described the newly revised entry ban as an improvement from the original but still highly problematic for international educational exchange and research collaborations. The order could depress enrollments of new applicants to American universities from the six countries and will prevent universities and university hospitals from bringing in new postdoctoral scholars, visiting faculty members and others from the six countries who don’t already have visas for 90 days. (para. 4)

Between March and June 2017, there were a series of amicus briefs and lawsuits filed. The media coverage of these events signaled that there were many trying to interpret the impact of EO 13780 before it went into effect on June 29, 2017. Senior administrators from the U.S. Department of State who were joined by senior administrators from The White House and the U.S. Departments of Homeland Security and Justice, provided a background briefing on the EO at a press conference on this day. In speaking specifically on the issue of visa holders gaining entrance into the United States, a senior administrative official from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security stated:

In very clear language, what that means is persons who have visas and show up at the ports of entry on a flight, on a ship, or another method will be allowed to enter the United States unless there’s another reason for not being allowed in. So, someone who has a visa will be allowed to be admitted. If, for some reason, there is another basis, they will not. But, generally, and in almost all cases, that will not apply. We can give some examples if people need them, but this happens on a routine basis: people with visas who show up who there’s intelligence on them not being admitted, there’s criminal activity, fraudulent documents – just the normal course of business. (U.S. Department of State, 2017, para. 17)

This policy was in effect for 90 days until September 24, 2017 when President Trump issued a proclamation putting restrictions on new countries (Chad, North Korea, and
Venezuela) and removing restrictions from Sudan. The restrictions for the new countries went into effect on October 18, 2017 (The White House, 2017c).

Universities have been continuously reviewing The White House’s actions from January 2017. As a result, especially in regard to the entry of non-U.S. students into the United States, nearly every U.S. domestic college and university took a major role in speaking out. Specifically, statements were drafted by major associations, such as the Association of American Universities, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Council on Education, College Board, and NAFSA: Association of International Educators (Institute of International Education [IIE], 2017a). Further, “seventeen universities joined an amicus brief against the order, while 49 leaders of top universities signed a widely noted open letter” (Lynch, 2017, para. 3). Since the inception of the first Travel Ban, institutions have publicly discussed their views that international students and faculty bring value to their campus communities and the vital role they play in the intellectual life and success of their institutions (IIE, 2017a). While the actions taken by The White House were mainly viewed by universities as controversial, in essence the issue was that these universities found themselves assessing possible consequences to their internationalization strategies. Thus, recognizing these strategies were being impacted by forces outside their campus borders.

Stock markets fluctuate, terrorism shocks, and governments change policies. When major transnational events occur, such as Grexit, the violent conflicts in Turkey, and the revision of U.S. immigration policies, the effects ripple throughout higher education institutions around the world. How higher education institutions take into
consideration such external forces, ultimately, can affect their internationalization efforts, strategies, and successes.

**Purpose of the Study**

The U.S. government, through the work of the U.S. Department of State, specifically the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, has historically been dedicated “to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries by means of educational and cultural exchange that assist in the development of peaceful relations” (U.S. Department of State, n.d.-a, para. 3). This mission includes both the mobility of education into and out of the United States. When examining how many U.S. students go abroad each year and the number of international students enrolled at higher education institutions (HEIs) in the United States, data from the IIE’s annual statistical survey *Open Doors*, a published report of the statistical findings, confirm that the volume of students have indeed increased. Such data are useful to international educators, universities, and governments (IIE, n.d.). In this study, internationalization strategies applied to the outbound mobility of academic programs (e.g., study abroad programs) and the inbound academic mobility of students (e.g., enrollment of international students) at U.S. higher education institutions (HEIs).

**Mobility Outbound: Study Abroad**

In looking at the mobility of outbound U.S. students studying abroad since 1993, the number of students has increased. Figure 1, which demonstrates the percentage increase and decrease of U.S. students studying abroad from Fall 1993 to Spring 2016, allows for the examination of policy developments and their influence on student mobility under three U.S. presidential administrations with vastly different approaches to
Figure 1. Total U.S. study abroad students and percent of increase and decrease in change since Fall 1993. Adapted from “Open Doors 2016 Report on International Education Exchange” by C. Farrugia & R. Bhandari, 2016, p. 81.

international relations (Jackson, 2011). The year 1993 marked the start of the Clinton Administration, 2001 marked the start of the George W. Bush Administration, and 2009 marked the start of the Obama Administration. *Open Doors* calculates academic year, which starts and ends in the autumn months as opposed to the start of the calendar year when a new U.S. presidency term starts.

The data demonstrate that there has been a steady increase in the number of students studying abroad each year except for 2007-2008, where the total number of U.S. students who studied abroad decreased by 2,089 (2007-2008 equaled a total of 262,416 students compared to 2008-2009, which equaled a total 260,327 students; Farrugia & Bhandari, 2015). During that time period, the Great Recession shocked world economies, and while it could be assumed that this may have impacted study abroad participation,
further study is needed. Additionally, while more students studied abroad (over 300,000) during the Obama Administration, the rate of growth under the Obama Administration was not the same as it was under the Clinton or Bush Administrations.

Table 1 outlines the average growth of study abroad participation during each administration. During President Clinton’s administration, there was a 9.2% overall increase in the number of students who studied abroad. This is versus President Obama’s administration, which saw the smallest increase at 3.1%. The overall average growth from 1993-2016 was 6.2%.

**Mobility Inbound: International Students**

International student mobility has also increased since 1993, but has not had a steady growth rate, similar to the IIE’s *Open Doors* Study Abroad data. In looking at the volume of international students who studied in the United States, the number of international students enrolled in U.S. HEIs from Fall 1993 until Spring 2017 has increased. Figure 2 demonstrates the annual percent of increase and decrease in international students enrolled in HEIs in the United States since Fall 1993. There has been a steady increase in international students since 2009; however, there are two major declines in enrollment, starting in 2001-2003 and then again in 2007-2008. Table 2 outlines the average growth of international students studying in the United States by presidential administration. The Obama Administration saw the largest year-on-year growth at 5.73%, where the Bush Administration saw the smallest annual growth at

---

1 Total International students reflects students with Optional Practical Training (OPT). OPT is defined by the Department of Homeland Security (n.d.-a) as “one type of work permission available for eligible F-1 students. It allows students to get real-world work experience related to their field of study.”
Table 1

Average Increase/Decrease in Study Abroad Participation by Presidential Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Percent Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clinton</td>
<td>1993-2001</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George W Bush</td>
<td>2001-2009</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barak Obama</td>
<td>2009-2017</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Average Increase/Decrease in Growth in International Student Enrollment by Presidential Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Percent Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Clinton</td>
<td>1993-2001</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George W Bush</td>
<td>2001-2009</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barak Obama</td>
<td>2009-2017</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Total international students in the United States and percent of increase and decrease in change since Fall 1993. Adapted from “Open Doors 2016 Report on International Education Exchange,” by C. Farrugia and R. Bhandari, 2016, p. 46.
2.4%. The average annual growth from 1993 to 2016 was 3.6% (Farrugia & Bhandari, 2015, 2016).

**Impact to Inbound and Outbound Mobility: External Forces**

Events outside of the university come in various shapes and sizes. How do universities perceive these forces and their impact on internationalization efforts? Before diving specifically into that question, we must understand what the external forces are. The purpose of this study was to understand how global external forces are understood by universities, how such forces are affecting their internationalization strategies, and how they are adapting to these external forces.

**Significance of the Study**

To prepare students to compete in the global marketplace, rather than just within their home countries, more universities now recognize the need to internationalize their institutions (Aoun, 2007). University campuses are transforming from a traditional brick-and-mortar environment to one that is now heavily networked and globalized. The survival of the institution in today’s global environment is dependent on how well that institution can adapt during times of change (Cameron, 1984). Universities are pressured to expand their strategies and policies to be inclusive of the international higher education. Such policies may include the consideration of legal and liability parameters for their students studying abroad.

If external forces are inevitably changing higher education, then the understanding and conceptualization of what is happening outside the traditional university campus is important to multiple populations within the institution, including the students, faculty, and staff. As an example, external forces can include globalization,
soft power, and transnational events, such as political or economic. By examining how select universities are adapting to global external forces, this study sought to assist HEIs who are uncertain about how to respond to these forces or seek to learn from other experiences. The results of this study provide a deeper understanding of how external forces affect internationalization and transnational initiatives at colleges and universities in the United States.
CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this literature review is to provide both context and an overview to discussions on the external forces affecting university internationalization strategies. The first part will provide a brief historical overview of U.S. students studying outside the United States and non-U.S. students studying within the United States. Then, it will look at globalization as a driver for internationalization initiatives, followed by an examination of general motivations by students, U.S. and international governments, and universities to increase their international efforts. Finally, it will examine the theoretical and conceptual frameworks used to guide this research.

**Brief History of Student Mobility**

Study abroad historian, William Hoffa (2007), observed that the mobility of students to learn elsewhere is not a new but rather an ancient concept. For centuries, people have sought from foreign lands knowledge that was unavailable in their home. The most famous examples range from students who traveled to learn from the Greeks and the Romans to the famous exploration journeys of Marco Polo and Christopher Columbus. The later examples demonstrate how expeditions of discovery were nationalistic strategies, funded by the monarchs of their respective countries to seek a higher return on their investment, which included acquiring new land, knowledge, prestige, and souvenirs such as gold (Vilches, 2010).

Other strategies included creating alliances with monarchs by sending family members abroad. Hoffa (2007) wrote:

As early as the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, one of the primary means for these future leaders to acquire the required world experience and edification they
would need was sending them on what became known, at least in England, as a “Grand Tour.” (p. 14)

However, Hoffa (2007) pointed out that “those who set out on a Grand Tour were not the wandering scholars of previous times . . . they pursued social, diplomatic, familial, and pragmatic ends much more than they sought anything resembling academic knowledge” (p. 15).

As the U.S. colonies were trying to become a nation, the encouragement to go abroad to study was not shared by the Founding Fathers. While both Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson held high esteem for higher education, so much that they were founders of their own universities, they were known to differ in their views on education abroad in Europe (Bevis & Lucas, 2007). Franklin, a longtime proponent of the European model, spent time in Europe to strengthen the newly formed U.S. education model, whereas Jefferson “strongly supported the building of a national identity distinct from European tradition and ideology” (Bevis & Lucas, 2007, pp. 32). As the young nation was trying to find its feet and become “united in the movement toward self-sufficiency and political independence from England in particular and the Old World in general, the need grew for truly ‘American’ modes of education at all levels” (Hoffa, 2007, p. 26). As described by Bevis and Lucas (2007) of that time:

Sending students to Europe for higher education was an unwelcome acknowledgement that the American institutions did not yet hold the same prestige; and for many Americans, any reinforcement of ties to Europe was unfavorable. One fitting illustration of popular opinion dates to 1750, when the Common Council on Philadelphia made a donation to Benjamin Franklin’s Academy. The Council optimistically expressed its hope that with the opening of Franklin’s new school, no young person would be ‘under the necessity for going abroad’ for their education. (p. 31)
As the United States strengthened as a nation, so did its higher education systems. Key milestones such as the Morrill Act of 1862 and the 1944 Servicemen’s Readjustment Act, otherwise known as the G.I. Bill, were catalysts in the system’s overall national expansion (Thelin, 2011). However, the volume of and interest in international education were influenced by events such as World War II and other cross-national events.

The formalized framework of studying outside the United States and recruiting international students to study at U.S. campuses later emerged as a more sophisticated evolution from earlier modes of exchange. As this study focuses on the student’s academic pursuit of knowledge for an undergraduate degree in a country that is not their home country, we must fast forward to the late 20th and 21st century where we start to find a contemporary internationalization framework emerging.

**The Beginnings of Contemporary Study Abroad**

World War I veteran and Assistant Professor of French, Raymond Watson Kirkbride, is often recognized for being the creator of the Junior Year Abroad (JYA) model, sometimes known as the Foreign Study Plan (Contreras, 2015; Hoffa & DePaul, 2010). Kirkbride approached University of Delaware President, Walter Hullihen, in January 1921 with the notion of the Foreign Study Plan where juniors would be allowed “to take a year of supervised study abroad (supervised to address the differences between European and American education)” (Hoffa, 2007, p. 72). The first program was launched on July 7, 1923, when eight male students, carefully selected by the university, sailed from New York City to France (Hoffa, 2007). The students first participated in immersive language training with a host family over the summer before starting courses at the University of Paris (Contreras, 2015).
Smith College, an elite all-women’s college in Northampton, MA, is also recognized for being one of the first faculty-led study abroad programs. In 1925, 37 women set sail for France. Smith’s framework for the JYA program resembled the Delaware model: immersive language training in the beginning of the program followed by courses at the Sorbonne (Hoffa, 2007). The program was deemed a success and expanded to Italy and Spain. Between 1925 and 1935, Smith College sent over 300 students to France alone (Contreras, 2015).

However, by 1935, external forces impacted the success of the Smith College program in Spain due to the onset of the Spanish Civil War. Hoffa (2007) wrote, “Concerns over student safety and security had to be dealt with, and especially parental fears” (p. 77). The college created an alternative plan for that semester that included sending the women to Paris, Italy and even looking to expand the program to Mexico the following year (Hoffa, 2007). Yet, both the Delaware and Smith programs were halted with the onset of World War II. “Thousands of young Americans became soldiers instead of students pursuing an undergraduate degree or even studying abroad” (Hoffa, 2007, pp. 103-104), and institutions shifted their pedagogical focus and campus efforts in response to the war (Hoffa, 2007). Studying abroad was not a priority for students at this time or for a period following the war, especially with the onset of the G.I. Bill, as more people entered college already having an international experience than ever before due to their overseas military assignments (Hoffa, 2007).

Between the 1950s until the 1980s, study abroad participation ebbed and flowed due to the onset of various global wars and economic crises, such as the Vietnam War and Cold War, and political policies, such as the creation of the Peace Corps and Title VI
of the Higher Education Act. While IIE’s *Open Door* reports were attempting to capture the study abroad data at this time, as Keller and Frain (2010) observed:

*Open Doors* student numbers for the geopolitical tumultuous 1975-1989 period are not complete. The counts for the years 1975/76 through 1978/79 are not available, nor are those for 1984/85, 1985/86, 1987/88, and 1989/90. The first available count for the period those for 1979/80, show 24,886 study abroad participants, a decline of more than one-third from the last available compilation in 1973. (p. 31)

Fast forward to the late 1990s and early 2000s where there were significant increases in study abroad participation. Specifically, the largest growth occurred between 1989 and 1999 where participation doubled, as recorded by *Open Doors*, with 70,727 students in 1989 and 143,590 students in 1999 (Farrugia & Bhandari, 2016).

**International Students in the United States**

As noted by Bevis and Lucas (2007) in their study, “International Students in American Colleges and Universities: A History,” there was an increase in students coming to the United States once U.S. universities received international recognition and prestige. Additionally, external events such as World War II and the Cold War were key pull forces that served as catalysts for the increased international student enrollment. Bevis and Lucas (2007) wrote:

Threatened with being stripped of their traditional prerogatives of academic freedom in teaching and writing, in some cases facing the prospect of compulsory service to socialist or fascist governments, prison, or even execution, large number of Europe’s leading intellectuals flocked the United States and elsewhere in search of a safe haven. (p. 102)

As study abroad participation decreased following World War II, Weller (2012) highlighted that “international enrollment began to grow dramatically in the World War II era, which also some of the largest migrations of immigrants to the U.S.” (p. 8).
Yet, it was the onset of the Cold War when the United States started to shift their policies to make intentional attempts to increase research and discovery. The Soviet Union launched Sputnik in the fall of 1957. To further enable the best and brightest to migrate into the United States, Congress passed the Fulbright-Hays Act, formally known as the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. The law streamlined many government internationalization efforts already occurring throughout higher education and additionally established the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in the U.S. Department of State (Bevis & Lucas, 2007). The law outlined the motivations for the United States to increase international education exchanges:

The purpose of this chapter is to enable the Government of the United States to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries by means of educational and cultural exchange; to strengthen the ties which unite us with other nations by demonstrating the educational and cultural interests, developments, and achievements of the people of the United States and other nations, and the contributions being made toward a peaceful and more fruitful life for people throughout the world; to promote international cooperation for educational and cultural advancement; and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic, and peaceful relations between the United States and the other countries of the world. (Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, 1961, Title 22, Section 2451)

While the tone of this act encouraged peaceful relations among nations, the reality was that the United States was competing with the Soviet Union in many arenas, including its space program. The U.S. space program was created under President Eisenhower’s administration in 1958 when he signed an act establishing the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) (Eisenhower Presidential Library, n.d.). However, in 1962, President Kennedy shared the U.S. space strategy in a speech at Rice Stadium. Known as the “Moon Shot” speech, Kennedy (1962) outlined the need to expand the U.S. space program to the moon:
We set sail on this new sea because there is new knowledge to be gained, and new rights to be won, and they must be won and used for the progress of all people. . . . We choose to go to the moon. We choose to go to the moon in this decade and do the other things, not because they are easy, but because they are hard, because that goal will serve to organize and measure the best of our energies and skills, because that challenge is one that we are willing to accept, one we are unwilling to postpone, and one which we intend to win, and the others, too. (para. 14)

Kennedy’s Moon Shot speech has been viewed as a bold and inspiring attempt to gain U.S. support of the ambitious space program. The term moon shot now refers to a “difficult or expensive task, the outcome of which is expected to have great significance” (Anthony & Johnson, 2013, para. 1). However, Kennedy’s Moon Shot speech was not a written strategic plan for the United States; rather, Moon Shot signaled to the world the need for innovative discovery and research. Its impact included the increase in inbound mobility of the world’s best scholars and scientists.

Another significant event that impacted the inbound mobility of students into the United States was the visit by President Nixon to China in 1972. When he published the article “Asia After Viet Nam” in Foreign Affairs in 1967, Nixon outlined the need to create a strategic relationship with China:

> Taking the long view, we simply cannot afford to leave China forever outside the family of nations, there to nurture its fantasies, cherish its hates, and threaten its neighbors. There is no place on this small planet for a billion of its potentially most able people to live in angry isolationism. (p. 121)

In February 1972, President Nixon landed in Peking, China after “nearly a quarter-century of non-communication” (Richard Nixon Foundation, n.d., para. 5). As Keller and Frain (2010) pointed out, this move began to open up a vast new area for educational and cultural exchanges with China. Yet, Altbach (2016) declared that such a move helped the “giants awake” and cited that it was during this period that we started to see not only
China, but also India make great strides to their own internationalization of higher education. Both China and India inherited “somewhat dysfunctional academic organizations” (Altbach, 2016, p. 259) due to the 20th century impact by the Soviets in China and the British in India, yet it is the issue of supply and demand that has caused the speedy expansion of internationalization (Altbach, 2016). Some estimates predict that “by 2025, each country will have a middle class of perhaps 500 million” (Altbach, 2016, p. 256), yet today we find in both countries that there is an “insufficient number of places in elite universities for the brightest students” (p. 264).

This emerging middle class in China and India has also created a population that can afford the expensive price tag of the U.S. higher education system. Unable to qualify for federal financial aid or the in-state tuition sticker price, international students provide additional revenue lines for universities. Thus, we are seeing an ever-growing enrollment of international students in U.S. HEIs than ever before. In his article, “Are International Students Cash Cows? Examining the Relationship Between New International Undergraduate Enrollments and Institutional Revenue at Public Colleges and Universities in the US,” Cantwell (2015) found that research and doctoral universities did indeed experience net gains in tuition revenue by enrolling international undergraduate students. This finding helps confirm anecdotal claims that in the early 21st century, more HEIs are recruiting international students for monetary purposes. This change in motivation to increase international student enrollment has taken a sharp turn from the geopolitical drivers seen in the 20th century.
Globalization as a Driver for Internationalization

The terms *globalization* and *internationalization* have sometimes been used interchangeably yet incorrectly, thus contributing to confusion on the meaning of the terms when applied to international higher education (Altbach, 2004; Altbach & Knight, 2007; De Wit, 2010; Knight, 2004; Scott, 2000). Understanding both terms in this context assists with further analysis of how universities are approaching international strategy and expansion.

**Globalization**

Used as a “popular buzz word in mainstream media” (Mitchell & Nielsen, 2012, p. 4), it is sometimes difficult to understand how globalization is incorporated within higher education. It is not a new term, as demonstrated by Friedman (2005). He discussed the contemporary phenomena as Globalization 3.0 where the “world is flat,” thus creating a level playing field where competition is equal due to technological advances (Friedman, 2005). While Friedman’s (2005) work focused more on political and commercial industry rather than education, it is important to note that under the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), the U.S. government recognizes education as a lucrative trading commodity as a service (Fefer, 2016; Knight, 2004). There are four modes for service delivery under GATS into which education falls:

- **Mode 1:** Cross-border supply
- **Mode 2:** Consumption abroad
- **Mode 3:** Commercial presence
- **Mode 4:** Temporary presence of natural persons (Fefer, 2016, p. 2).

The United States is not the only country to recognize education as a service, and as Ruby (2015) points out, “Over 50 nations have treaties or agreements that cover
aspects of education and many of them cover higher education. These legal provisions make it easier for institutions to sell educational services to students from other sovereign nations” (p. 344).

Altbach (2004), Knight (2004), and Ruby (2015) also view globalization as the cross-border trade of capital, whether it is economic, technological, intellectual, or human capital. Globalization can therefore encourage global competitiveness, including within higher education (Scott, 2000). The type and structure of the university becomes important to observe in terms of who can compete, as “the powerful universities have always dominated the production and distribution of knowledge, while weaker institutions and systems with fewer resources and lower academic standards have tended to follow in their wake” (Altbach, 2004, p. 7). Overall, when discussing globalization, Altbach and Knight’s (2007) definition will be employed. Globalization refers to “the economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement” (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 290).

Internationalization

As with the term globalization, internationalization also brings forth debate as there is a general lack of consensus on using one definition (Knight, 2004, 2008; Scott, 2000; Wadhwa & Jha, 2014). In “Internationalization Remodeled: Definition, Approaches, and Rationales,” Knight (2004) argues that there has been an evolution of the definition of internationalization since the 1980s and highlights that given the changes in the rationales, providers, stakeholders, and activities of internationalization, it is important to revisit the question of definition and ensure that the meaning reflects the realities of today and is also able to guide and be relevant to new developments. (p. 10)
Most definitions today are linked by defining an approach toward the culture and people of a country, which is a notion that contrasts with globalization. “Internationalization reflects a world-order dominated by nation states” (Scott, 2000, p. 6), whereas globalization reflects discourse and competition, resulting in a phenomenon where order and alliances are redrawn and shifted (Scott, 2000).

Qiang (2003) also pointed out that there are many definitions of internationalization, but when defining the term, it should be narrowed to focus on “the ways a country responds to the impact of globalization, yet at the same time respects the individuality of the nation” (p. 249). Further, Qiang (2003) wrote that the “key element in the term is the notion of between or among nations and cultural identities” (p. 249). Building on this concept, Knight (2004) crafted a working definition to include specific key terms to indicate that internationalization is continuous and ever evolving: “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (p. 11). When discussing internationalization, Knight’s definition is employed to examine how universities are internationalizing their education programs due to globalization.

Internationalization is a way to deal with globalization, which can include “specific policies and programs undertaken by governments, academic systems and institutions, and even individual departments or institutions to cope with or exploit globalization” (Altbach, 2004, p. 6). To further distinguish between globalization and internationalization in regard to education, “internationalization is seen as something higher education institutions do [emphasis in original] while globalization is something that is happening to them [emphasis in original]” (Mitchell & Nielsen, 2012, p. 3).
Globalization, as Scott (2000) argues, is “perhaps the most fundamental challenge faced by the University in its long history” (p. 5); however, the response and even a product of globalization is the internationalization of higher education (Ilieva, Beck, & Waterstone, 2014). Such a response has resulted in the creation of new administrative structures and privileges that the university may never have created (Stromquist, 2007). Simply put another way, “internationalization is changing the world of higher education, and globalization is changing the world of internationalization” (Knight, 2004, p. 1).

**Terminology and types of internationalization.** The complexity of terminology surrounding globalization and internationalization is demonstrated in Table 3 (Knight, 2008). The table outlines the evolution of terms in three different categories: traditional, existing, and new terms in the 1990s. Through this chart, Knight (2008) allows us to examine the historical and current trends in internationalization. However, as her chart was published nearly 10 years ago, more analysis is needed on the emersion of new terms and definitions, such as global engagement and global networks. Many of the terms in the following section will be used throughout the analysis.

The terminology of international education grows more complex as the research of this phenomena increases. The generic terms outlined by Knight (2008) are sometimes not defined in the literature and have an assumed understanding. Knight (2016) later clarified that transnational education (TNE) means “the mobility of an education program or higher education institution (HEI)/provider between countries,” but she recognizes that even that definition is limiting and prefers cross-border higher education (CBHE), as it is a “more explicit and perhaps a stronger and more descriptive term” (p. 36). Yet, other existing terminology implies the interaction of students and HEIs with a nation’s border.
Table 3

**Evolution of International Education Terminology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Terms</th>
<th>Existing Terms</th>
<th>Traditional Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last 15 years (Since 1990s)</td>
<td>Last 25 years (Since 1980s)</td>
<td>Last 40 years (Since 1960s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generic Terms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>Internationalization</td>
<td>International education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderless education</td>
<td>Multicultural education</td>
<td>International development cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross border education</td>
<td>Intercultural education</td>
<td>Comparative education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnational education</td>
<td>Global education</td>
<td>Correspondence education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual education</td>
<td>Distance education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization “abroad”</td>
<td>Offshore/overseas education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization “at home”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Terms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education providers</td>
<td>International students</td>
<td>Foreign students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate universities</td>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>Student exchanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalization of educational services</td>
<td>Institutional agreements</td>
<td>Development projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Partnership projects</td>
<td>Cultural agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual universities</td>
<td>Area studies</td>
<td>Language study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twinning and franchise programs</td>
<td>Double/joint degrees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Education Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Adapted from “Borderless, Offshore, Transnational and Cross-Border Education: Definition and Data Dilemmas,” by J. Knight, 2005, p. 4.*

Kosmutzky and Putty (2015) outline four such terms that fall on a continuum related to borders: (a) *borderless education* points to the blurring and disappearance of geographical borders (but also boundaries in time, disciplines, and concepts); (b) *offshore* and *transnational higher education* emphasize the location of the student, which is different from the location of the institution providing the education, without putting much emphasis on nation-states or national higher education systems; and (c) *cross-border* emphasizes national borders, which are of ever-growing importance when it comes to regulatory responsibilities such as quality assurance, funding, and accreditation (Knight, 2005, as cited in Kosmutzky & Putty, 2015, p. 9). As demonstrated in Table 3, as international education has become more dynamic and sophisticated, there has been an
increase in the number of terms used to describe the industry over the past 40 years.

Specifically, on the use of the terms globalization and internationalization, Knight (2005) describes the phenomenon within the higher education:

As the term internationalisation was being adopted, the notion of globalisation started to gain more popularity. At first, the two terms were being used interchangeably in the education sector. But soon efforts were made to distinguish between globalisation and internationalisation of education by situating globalisation as a phenomenon that was touching all aspects of society—including education—and internationalisation was situated as both a response to and an agent of globalization. (p. 5)

In examining the research literature, Kosmutzky and Putty (2015) concurred with Knight (2005) that there is an overwhelmingly high increase in terms being used in the literature without a consensus on what the terms mean, thus creating a “fuzziness” and a sense of “chaos” in the research and in practice. As this study sought to examine the mobility of education across borders, it was cognizant of the sensitivity surrounding the need for a common definition and use of terminology to describe such phenomena, especially related to the terms internationalization and globalization.

When discussing internationalization efforts of a university, there are two categories: at-home strategies and abroad strategies. At-home strategies reflect campus-based efforts where the focus is to help increase intercultural competencies; abroad strategies focus on the international education abroad or cross-border education (Knight, 2008). Knight (2015) further expanded on abroad strategies by discussing three different International University models: (a) classic, (b) satellite, and (c) internationally co-founded (see Table 4). All three international university models are not distinctively used by a university and can be intertwined throughout its internationalization activities. For example, a university may have a classic study abroad model, have three international
### Table 4

*International University Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Classic</th>
<th>Satellite</th>
<th>Internationally Co-Founded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>University with multiple international partners and activities.</td>
<td>Overseas offices, research centers, and branch campuses.</td>
<td>Internationally co-founded or co-developed universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td>Agreement between a U.S. institution (home institution) and a non-U.S. institution (host institution) to send home institution students to take credit-bearing classes and study at the host institution, such as University of Southern California and Institut d’Etudes Politiques (Sciences Po) in Paris, France</td>
<td>New York University’s International Branch Campus (IBC) in Abu Dhabi</td>
<td>Nazarbayev University partnership with University of Pennsylvania and Cambridge University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from “International Universities: Misunderstandings and Emerging Models,” by J. Knight, 2015, pp. 110-117.

branch campuses, and be engaging with an international university as its co-founder (see Table 4 for examples of these types of models).

### Deglobalization

The concept of deglobalization has generally been applied in business and economics literature (e.g., Hillebrand, 2010) and has rarely been applied to international higher education. As noted earlier, globalization has increased competitiveness across markets and industries—including higher education—and with such competitiveness comes inequalities, therefore creating an uneven playing field. Thus, the reversal of globalization, or deglobalization, is the isolationist or protectionist approach to the negative aspects created by globalization. After President Trump won the election in 2016, *Forbes* magazine brought light that “political support for globalization policies of
free trade and cheap labor is waning fast” (Rapoza, 2016, para. 3). Thus, business historian, Geoffrey Jones, believes we have entered a second wave of deglobalization driven by policy: “The first one was the Wall Street crash that lasted until the 1970s. There was Communism, extreme regulation and controls that we had seen in that period. Think we are probably repeating that now” (as cited in Agarwal & Piramal Raje, 2017, para. 4). In examining the radical results of recent global elections, Blyth (2016) wrote, “The era of neoliberalism is over. The era of neo-nationalism has just begun” (para. 16). In other words, there seems to be brewing a movement of retraction that is a shift from the usual trend of global collaboration and inclusion. What does this mean for international higher education? As universities seek to further their internationalization efforts, it is essential to understand their motivations and determine if they are juxtaposed or aligned with this possible new phase of deglobalization.

**Motivations for Internationalization**

In the context of international higher education, internationalization motivation can be compared to a three-legged stool, where three major players are interwoven, connected, and needed for balance; these players include: (a) universities/institutions, (b) students, and (c) government policy (Croom, 2010). Simply put, universities help students study abroad, and a government’s policy helps or hinders the facilitation of both. Without one of these three categories, the stool is off balance and the implementation of internationalization efforts can be impacted. While examining the motivations of these three players, the focus of this study will be on U.S. universities.

Altbach and Knight (2007) highlighted that, on a macro level, the motivations for internationalization “include commercial advantage, knowledge and language
acquisition, enhancing the curriculum with international content, and many others” (p. 290). Yet, Hudzik’s (2011) NAFSA report, *Comprehensive Internationalization*, tightens up this list by combining the frameworks of Knight and De Wit, thus outlining four overall motivations for internationalization of higher education: (a) *academic*, or the global (universal) search for truth and knowledge; (b) *sociocultural*, or cross-cultural knowledge and understanding; (c) *political*, or the ability to maintain and expand influence; and (d) *economic*, or improving local/national competitiveness in the global economy and marketplace (p. 13). Hudzik’s framework transcends across the three major players in international education, where most attention and research has been given to the university and the student as dependent variables.

**Motivations by Students to Study Abroad**

The motivations for why students consider studying abroad also vary. According to NAFSA (2009), studying abroad results in some key benefits, including: (a) enhancing global awareness and academic learning, (b) developing leadership skills, (c) advancing one’s career, (d) experiencing personal growth, and (e) learning another language. As BaileyShea (2009) outlines, “Other than three unpublished doctoral dissertations (see Booker, 2001; Miller, 2004; Peterson, 2003), and one article about understanding the choice process (Salisbury, Umbach, Paulsen, & Pascarella, 2009), no other theoretical models about how students decide to study abroad were found” (pp. 33-34). Because of this, BaileyShea’s (2009) research focused on the following question: “What individual and institutional factors are important for determining what differentiates study abroad participants from non-study participants?” (p. 18). Her research focused on the student’s choice and decision-making through a quantitative study.
Since BaileyShea’s research, Perna, Orosz, Jumakulov, Kishkentayeva, and Ashirbekov (2015) added to the research by examining the student’s decision-making process to study in a foreign country by incorporating human capital theory and sociological theoretical perspectives. Citing the founder of human capital theory, Perna et al. (2015) wrote that HCT “predicts that students engage in foreign study when they conclude that the net benefits (the benefits less the costs) exceed the net benefits of pursuing other activities (Becker, 1993)” (p. 175). They found that students indeed will participate in a program if they perceive the benefits exceed the costs. This finding is important as other student motivations could fall under the umbrella of this theory. In his comprehensive literature review of study abroad participation, Nguyen Voges (2015) found motivation-related themes, such as: (a) a student’s major, (b) opportunities provided by the institution to study abroad, (c) financial access, (d) academic concerns of host institution, (e) family perceptions, (f) safety concerns, and (g) social networks, to name a few. Additionally, IIE found in their 2015 Open Doors Report on International Education Exchange that the destination is a “key ‘pull’ factor in students’ decisions about where to study” (Farrugia & Bhandari, 2015, p. 15), and other factors may include “institutional reputation, strength of academic programs, and in-country work opportunities upon graduation” (p. 15).

An area that is not explored in the research, but that deserves attention, is examining the implicit bias of students and its impact on their decision to study abroad, and if they do choose to study abroad, where they go. According to McNutt (2016), “Implicit bias is, by definition, subconscious, making it an easy issue for any individual to overlook or not even realize, and thus difficult to address” (p. 1,035). For example,
how a student subconsciously perceives another country, race, or culture can impact the
decisions they make in participating in a study abroad program.

**Motivation by Governments to Increase Internationalization**

Governments are the second leg of the stool of motivations for
internationalization. In its 2012 report, “Approaches to Internationalisation and Their
Implications for Strategic Management and Institutional Practice,” the Organisation for
Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) outlined the importance of higher
education’s relationship with government policy: “It can facilitate or hinder the
internationalization of higher education. Through internationalization strategies
universities can impact their national competitiveness by attracting international research
initiatives, corporate partnerships and facilitating the mobility of student and faculty
talent” (Henard, Diamond, & Roseveare, 2012, p. 10). Further, as internationalization
captures the concept of outbound and inbound activity, and as education is a tradeable
commodity, it is viewed as a public good by most countries. However, according to
Farrugia and Bhandari (2015):

> While large-scale public investment in domestic education is the norm, such
> investment is not typical in international education for either sending or receiving
countries. International student mobility is usually structured as a private good for
> the individual student, with students and their families investing heavily to earn
> degrees overseas. (p. 34)

Recruitment of the best talent from another country can certainly have positive effects for
both the home and host country, especially if the student’s home country does not have
the academic infrastructure. However, as Altbach (2013) pointed out:

> 80 percent or more of Chinese and Indians who have obtained their advanced
degrees in the United States for almost a half-century have remained in country. It
is hardly an exaggeration to point out that a significant part of Silicon Valley has been built with Indian brainpower. (p. 41)

While this example demonstrates the inbound mobility of students into the United States, it also demonstrates that U.S. immigration policies may have helped facilitate the “brain drain” from Asian countries. For many students, the U.S. student visa, F-1 OPT, has been an attractive option due to the work component. Optional practical training, or OPT, is outlined by the U.S. Citizen and Immigration Services (n.d.) as:

- temporary employment that is directly related to an F-1 student’s major area of study. Eligible students can apply to receive up to 12 months of OPT employment authorization before completing their academic studies (pre-completion) and/or after completing their academic studies (post-completion). However, all periods of pre-completion OPT will be deducted from the available period of post-completion OPT. (para. 1)

This aligns with the 2012 OECD report aimed at examining the interwoven relationships between governments and higher education institutions. In its guide, it highlighted the following:

- Government policy might be motivated by the desire to attract skilled workers, to export education services, to promote development or to exercise “soft-power.” Governments also know that the nation’s credibility will be affected if its higher education institutions are abusing their international trust. The involvement of governments in internationalisation is therefore twofold: supporting the expansion of internationalisation and safeguarding its quality. (Henard et al., 2012, p. 9)

Overall, it is important to note, in the context of the U.S. federal government, there are four key departments that each directly impact international higher education: (a) the U.S. Department of Commerce, (b) the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, (c) the U.S. Department of State, and (d) the U.S. Department of Education. HEIs must stay aware of these departments, their missions, and the strategies they have in place that may impact international higher education (see Table 5 for the missions of these departments).
Table 5

Mission of Federal Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Commerce</td>
<td>To create the conditions for economic growth and opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Education</td>
<td>To promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Homeland Security</td>
<td>With honor and integrity, we will safeguard the American people, our homeland, and our values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of State</td>
<td>Lead America’s foreign policy through diplomacy, advocacy, and assistance by advancing the interests of the American people, their safety and economic prosperity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Soft Power of Higher Education

Soft power theory also important informs government policy. First coined by Nye (2008), soft power “rests on the ability to shape the preferences of others. If I can get you to want to do what I want, then I do not have to force you to do what you do not want” (p. 95). Nye first applied the concept to the public diplomacy of nations. Since then, the term has been applied more broadly, by Nye and others, to encompass higher education.

When universities create a presence in or engage with a different country, they create relationships and ties within the host community. This internationalization of higher education is a form of policy soft power. The recruitment of students to the United States from around the world relies on the reputation and brand of the nation’s higher education institutions. Changes in how a country or its institutions are understood can impact the attractiveness of that nation as a destination or service provider, which, in
turn, impacts its soft power. For example, Altbach and Peterson (2008) used the U.S. higher education system to demonstrate this point:

> When America’s admirers perceive the country to be less open or more dismissive of the rights of others than it has been in the past, meeting the challenge to the attractiveness of American and its institutions may be the biggest test of the soft power of the United States. (p. 51)

For some countries, education is not viewed as a competition and rather it can have a collaborative, transnational approach with other countries, ending in a positive sum game rather than a zero-sum game. Nye (2011) argued:

> Soft power can be used for both zero-sum and positive-sum interactions ... it is a mistake to think of power—the ability to affect others to obtain preferred outcomes—simply as “power over” rather than “power with” others. (p. 90)

Yet, such power has become more important for institutions and countries as the impact of globalization has increased. Thus, some claim the need to measure soft power has also becoming an increasingly important task.

*Soft Power 30*, a report published by the University of Southern California’s Center on Public Diplomacy, attempted to provide a “clear and accurate measurement of a nation’s soft power resources” (McClory, 2016, p. 10). The report claimed that we are in a period of “global rebalancing” and looks to the recent elections in the United Kingdom and the United States as indicators that such rebalancing is accelerating. Specifically, they highlight three distinct features of global rebalancing: (a) a devolution of power, (b) the growing importance of digital platforms as modes of communication, and (c) an increase in sudden and volatile geopolitical shifts (McClory, 2016). Further, despite these changes, they found two themes: (a) everyone matters, which includes everyone from governments, NGOs, and non-state actors to individuals; and (b) soft power will be more critical for future global challenges (McClory, 2016). Yet, the report
Despite the rise of non-state actors, national governments are still the primary movers in global affairs and hold most of the cards. For them to utilize their soft power, they must start with an accurate account of the resources they command and build the appropriate strategies to make the most of them. (McClory, 2016, p. 12)

Thus, the motivation by governments to internationalize higher education may be interpreted as their strategy to strengthen their soft power. Nye (2005) added that the soft power of a country relies on its culture, political values, and foreign policies. Yet, the *Soft Power 30* reports expanded upon this by adding that one of the key measurements of a country’s soft power is education. According to Altbach and Peterson (2008), “Higher education has always served as an international force, influencing intellectual and scientific development and spreading ideas worldwide” (p. 37). Whereas hard power seeks to convince or compel other nations to adopt democratic values through threats and force, soft power uses tools, such as the classroom and experiential learning, to help “explain the American values to the rest of the world” (Altbach & Peterson, 2008, p. 37). The *Soft Power 30* report found that U.S. institutions continue to be “unrivalled in higher education, cultural production, and technological innovation, [so it is] no surprise that the U.S. attracts more international students than anywhere else” (McClory, 2016, p. 45).

The soft power of other nations can be viewed through the recruitment of U.S. students studying outside of the United States. As more and more countries have seen the economic benefits from international students coming into their countries, they too have tried to increase their soft power. This has been seen via their higher education programs.

---

2 Other measurements within the *Soft Power 30* report include enterprise, culture, digital, government, and engagement (McClory, 2016, p. 30).
through conscious efforts to create policies to attract and retain foreign students and to invest in processes that facilitate student mobility into their countries. Government-sponsored organizations, sometimes known as cultural institutions—such as Education in Ireland, the British Council, and Education USA\(^3\)—are charged with increasing partnerships with countries, universities, and business organizations. As an example, Education in Ireland, which is managed by Enterprise Ireland, is a “national brand under the authority of the Minister of Education and Skills. Enterprise Ireland is responsible for the promotion of Irish Higher Education Institutions overseas” (Education in Ireland, n.d., para. 1).

Further to this example, on December 6, 2016, former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State, Evan Ryan, and Ambassador of Ireland, Anne Anderson, signed an agreement to extend the Ireland Work and Travel (IWT) Program for an additional 3 years. This agreement allows U.S. and Irish students to work and live in each other’s respective countries under the Work and Holiday Program. The Exchange Visitor Program has attracted more than 150,000 Irish students to the United States since it began in 1966 (Arnold, 2016).

Governments are aware of the strong economic impact of such programs and policies. *Open Doors* reported that the “974,926 international students who studied in the U.S. in 2014/15 contributed $30.8 billion to the U.S. economy” (Farrugia & Bhandari, 2015, p. 34), and a “similar financial impact is seen in other large host countries such as Australia, the United Kingdom, and France” (p. 34). As an example, “International

\(^3\) Further research is needed on cultural institutions, specifically a definition and common terminology. It is important to note that their role is important however the literature is limited in terms of looking at their impact to student mobility and transnational education (TNE) programs.
students in the UK spent a total of $14.4 billion in tuition, fees, and living expenses in 2011/12” (Farrugia & Bhandari, 2015, p. 34).

U.S. students studying abroad is good for the United States. Assistant Secretary Ryan’s remarks to students at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy in 2014 outlined the U.S. political agenda for increasing study abroad initiatives:

We also need U.S. colleges and universities to play a larger role in American public diplomacy efforts. We have an international crisis within our own borders. Only 1 percent of undergraduates in the U.S. study abroad. Nearly as many Chinese students studied in the United States last year as the total number of Americans studying around the world! International experiences not only about broaden perspectives—it’s good for our economy and your job prospects. Sixty-five percent of Fortune 1000 executives stated that global awareness is very important or absolutely essential in order to be ready for a career. And, in a survey done by the Institute of International Education of senior managers across industries, 60 percent of respondents reported that the hiring and promotion strategy of their companies acknowledge the importance of a study abroad experience. America must do better if we want our young people to be able to compete in a globalized world. You still might be thinking, what does relationship building have to do with national security? America’s relationships around the world underwrite our national security. (U.S. Department of State, n.d., paras. 37-42).

Overall, her remarks focused on three reasons why the U.S. government values study abroad: (a) it combats U.S. isolationism, (b) it increases the human capital of U.S. students, and (c) it builds relationships that strengthen U.S. national security.

U.S. higher education can also be examined in regard to status quo power, a term from international political science related to power transition theory. Originally coined by Organski in 1958, Krugler, Tammen, and Swanianth (2001) expanded on the term power transition theory when they wrote that it “conceptualizes the international system of hierarchy that remains stable when a dominate, satisfied nation manages to assemble a coalition of nations with similar preferences toward the status quo [emphasis in original]”
Organski’s work claimed that transition of power in the 21st century will fall in the favor of India and China, giving them the potential to become the major world powers (Organski, 1958; Tammen, 2008). His work was seen as bold, as it was “against the backdrop of the Cold War and the ideological economic challenge of the Warsaw Pact, postulating into the 21st century while discounting the then current dangers of Russian imperialism” (Tammen, 2008, p. 315); at that time, such a claim “was nothing short of nonsense” (p. 315).

The United States entered the 21st century as a major power, but it is also important to consider its current role in the international community. The United States has been categorized as a hegemony, or even as a quasi-hegemony (Choi & James, 2016). Applying the theory of hegemonic stability to the economic, national, and global security roles the United States asserted in the late 20th and early 21st century led one observer to argue that

the presence of a single, strongly dominant actor in international politics leads to collectively desirable outcomes for all states in the international system. Conversely, the absence of a hegemon is associated with disorder in the world system and undesirable outcomes for individual states. (Snidal, 1985, p. 579)

While there is increased geopolitical volatility, the notion of hegemonic stability can be used to support the assumption that if the United States has been a dominant actor for the last 40 or more years, then the government’s charge to increase U.S. student participation in study abroad should not be affected by other prominent international actors. While the United States remains the perceived leader in higher education globally, international student demand of U.S. higher education should also not be relatively constant, at least in numerical terms. While in the future we may see shifts in international student
enrollment, in the meantime, we can assume that the status of the United States can be held constant when examining whether other forces are impacting the inbound and outbound mobility of students.

**Motivations by Universities to Increase Internationalization**

The motivations and rationale for internationalization initiatives by universities is the final area of focus, and the literature is extensive (see Altbach & Knight, 2007; Dixon, Slanickova, & Warwick, 2013; Girdzijauskaitea & Radzeviciene, 2014; Knight, 2004; Qiang, 2003; Wilkins & Huisman, 2012). The discussions on why universities would venture to create or advance internationalization efforts is sometimes seen as a choice they have—one driven by a desire to increase their presence globally. However, as Bartell (2013) outlined, motivations by universities can be a responsive reaction to the external environment that has created a “need for internationalization” (p. 48).

Knight’s (2004) framework includes five rationales driving internationalization efforts by universities: (a) international branding and profile, (b) income generation, (c) student and staff development, (d) strategic alliances, and (e) knowledge production. Such motivations have been viewed as being heavily focused on entrepreneurship motivations for education. Mars et al. (2008) expanded on Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) concept of academic capitalism by addressing the “new roles” universities absorb as they expand their institutional infrastructure for commercialization purposes. Academic capitalism claims that in the postindustrial economy, universities are focusing on maximizing education as a tradable commodity, thus shifting the focus of the university from being a public good to a private good (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). This is demonstrated when “top U.S. universities concentrate on enhancing their research reputations by using their
financial muscle to recruit the best international research faculty and the best students” (Dixon et al., 2013).

For example, in the case of a university growing its international branding and profile, Maddox (2016) found in his case study research focused on New York University (NYU), that while NYU’s rankings had not changed for nearly two decades, “the reputational visibility and perception of NYU as globally engaged has enhanced the ability to recruit students and strong faculty, both instructors and researchers” (p. 135). This aligns with Knight’s (2004) framework that highlights how institutions may be motivated to increase the institution’s international profile and brand and have an impact on student and staff development. These motivations can align with a university’s internationalization strategy and consequently encompasses all four categories in Knight’s framework.

Internationalization of the curriculum is also a motivation. According to Croom (2012), “Faculty have been the cornerstone of efforts to internationalize the curriculum and more recently, in developing new programs in study abroad, encouraged, at times, through various grant programs” (p. 109). However, the motivation is to increase the learning outcomes for students across all internationalization models. As Dixon et al. (2013) highlighted, if done well, university internationalization will enhance the learning environment for all students; it will give more international focus to research and through the vehicle of an internationalized curriculum that will help graduates to develop a global rather than blinkered domestic focus as they prepare to enter employment in the global economy. (p. 198)

Further, using Knight’s (2015) framework of the different international university models (i.e., classic, satellite, and internationally co-founded), each bring other
dimensions to why universities are motivated to increase internationalization efforts. For example, under the satellite model, Wilkins and Huisman (2012) outline that branch campuses are sometimes viewed as “revenue-generating activities of entrepreneurial HEIs” (p. 628). Wilkins and Huisman (2012) also found that universities had other reasons, which included “legitimacy, status, institutional distance, risk-taking, risk-avoidance and the desire to secure new sources of revenue” (pp. 1-2).

Finally, there are substantial financial implications to international students studying in the United States as outlined by an analysis conducted by NAFSA that used sources from the U.S. Department of Education, U.S. Department of Commerce, and the IIE’s Open Doors Report. NAFSA found in the 2016-2017 academic year that there were 1,078,822 international students studying at U.S. colleges and universities, a population that contributed $36.9 billion to the U.S. economy and supported 450,331 jobs (NAFSA, 2017). Further, the report highlighted, “For every seven international students enrolled, three U.S. jobs are created and supported by spending occurred in higher education, accommodation, dining, retail, transportation, telecommunications, and health insurance sectors” (NAFSA, 2017, para. 1).

Yet, when the goal to increase mobility is not cost effective for HEIs, other internationalization strategies can be implemented. For example, the State University of New York’s Center for Collaborative Online International Learning (SUNY-COIL) is an alternative internationalization strategy. As a “teaching and learning methodology which provides innovative cost-effective internationalization strategies” (SUNY-COIL, n.d., para. 1), SUNY-COIL seeks to foster “faculty and student interaction with peers abroad through co-taught multicultural online and blended learning environments emphasizing
experiential student collaboration” (para. 2). The COIL attempts to bring internationalization inward for the university through a cost-efficient model by focusing on pedagogy and curricula. Hudzik (2011) noted that such changes can be deterrents for institutions to internationalization as it increases the “overarching pressures for change” (p. 29) in HEIs, yet through his study, Comprehensive Internationalization, he provided tools and advice to help move the concept “into action.” Overall, as De Wit (2011) noted, rationales and motivations for institutions vary over time and by country/region, they are not mutually exclusive, and they lead to different approaches and policies. Currently, changes are taking place at a rapid pace in many parts of the world, and rationales are becoming more and more interconnected. (p. 245)

Theoretical Framework

To further examine how university strategies consider external forces to increase student mobility, this study employed theoretical frameworks to “frame and contextualize the domain or focus of inquiry and the setting and context that shape its exploration” (Ravitch & Carl, 2016, pp. 46-47). The heart of this discussion was on how universities are thinking about and responding to the world outside their campus, specifically external forces and how those forces affect their internationalization efforts. For universities to successfully participate in internationalization initiatives, they must demonstrate adaptation to such forces, that is, “modifications and alterations in the organization or its components in order to adjust to changes in the external environment” (Cameron, 1984, p. 123). Thus, Cameron’s adaptation theory will be used as the framework for this study.
Adaptation Framework

In “Strategic Responses to Conditions of Decline: Higher Education and the Private Sector” in 1983 and “Organizational Adaptation and Higher Education” in 1984, Cameron discussed organization adaptation with the conceptual notion that different types of adaptation will be necessary for HEIs in the future. In 1983, Cameron focused on decline, as during that time, “most predictions about the future of colleges and universities as organizations include conditions of decline” (p. 359), and that “most managers and administrators in higher education are not generally prepared to cope with or to manage effectively conditions of decline” (p. 359). Shifting the attention of decline brought by external forces, Cameron uses the tobacco industry as an example. In the 1950s, the tobacco industry was starting to experience conditions of decline due to health reports that smoking was linked to cancer. The tobacco industry responded, which Cameron outlined as the industry’s way to adapt.

While Cameron’s (1983) study focused mainly on examples of conditions of decline in the tobacco industry and higher education, he applied the domain framework to illustrate that by thinking about strategies in terms of their emphasis on domain defense, offense, and creation, administrators are able to determine appropriate responses to conditions of decline that are more consistent with theoretical prescriptions and have a long-term potential for success. (p. 375)

Thus, this study employed Cameron’s framework to guide the research and further understand how universities adapt to external forces. Figure 3 outlines the three different domains in Cameron’s organization adaptation framework.
Using Cameron’s (1983) example of the tobacco industry, domain defense occurred when strategies by the tobacco industry included hiring lobbying groups and employing health researchers, which ultimately “bought themselves time to determine more long-range, proactive strategies to strengthen the industry” (p. 370). Domain offense strategies occurred when the tobacco industry focused on effectiveness by expanding their products as a response to the market, such as creating low-tar cigarettes and women’s cigarettes. Finally, domain creation strategies were implemented due to the resources allocated from domain offense strategies. Thus, the tobacco industry created new domains to “diversify or to spread the risk” (Cameron, 1983, p. 371), which occurred “through the acquisition of other firms such as Miller Brewery, 7-Up, Del Monte foods, etc.” (p. 371).

Strategy, as a concept, is a “means for organizations to address changes in the environment” (Croom, 2010, p. 9), is “multifaceted, and has evolved to a level of complexity almost matching that of organizations themselves” (Chaffee, 1985, p. 89). When external forces outside the university affect the university’s internationalization efforts, the university often must adapt its strategy, otherwise known as organizational
adaptation, which is defined as the “modifications and alterations in the organization or its components in order to adjust to changes in the external environment” (Cameron, 1984, p. 123). Further, Cameron highlighted multiple models to adaptation; however, this study focused on the strategic choice approach discussed by Miles and Cameron (1982). The strategic choice approach encompasses three factors: domain defense, domain offense, and domain creation, in incremental order.

Organizational Framework

Looking at the university as an organization requires the application of organization theory. There are multiple approaches to categorizing organizations where “researchers have popularized a colorful vocabulary to describe such organizations: ‘garbage cans’ and ‘organized anarchies,’ ‘decoupled organizations,’ and ‘loosely coupled systems’” (Ingersoll, 1993, p. 82). Weick (1976) defined loose-coupling systems as the linkages within organizations where “coupled events are responsive, but that each event also preserves its own identity and some evidence of its physical or logical separateness” (p. 2). Further, Weick (1976) highlighted how loosely-coupled organizations can handle the need to adapt: “If all the elements in a large system are loosely coupled to one another, then any one element can adjust to and modify a local unique contingency without affecting the whole system” (p. 6).

If an organization is loosely coupled, then there is an assumption that the organization maintains a substantial amount of control over its environment, which links to Cameron’s (1984) framework that posits two approaches to managerial influence: (a) assuming little or no managerial influence, and (b) assuming substantial managerial influence. To engage globally, universities with the resources to expand their
internationalization efforts are situated to better adapt in delivering their international initiatives (Altbach, 2004). According to Cameron (1984), “Organizations are not assumed to be at the mercy of an immutable environment; rather, they can act and influence their environment” (p. 127). By taking all of this into consideration, the examination of organizational change focused on universities as organizations with the following attributes: (a) extensive internationalization efforts, (b) loosely-coupled organizations, and (c) substantial managerial influence.

It is important to note, however, that institutions in this category may have more resources to sustain such an identity than other universities. This notion conflicts with Friedman’s (2005) globalization concept that there is an “even playing field” as all universities may not actually have equal resources to help with their internationalization strategies. Therefore, “the world of globalized higher education is highly unequal” (Altbach, 2004, p. 6). As a result, both globalization and internationalization are causing universities to become more “corporate and less collegial” (Ilieva et al., 2014, p. 877) by focusing on the capital outcomes rather than traditional higher education outcomes. As more and more universities are finding it imperative to increase their internationalization efforts due to globalization, there are differences in the ability, scope, and intensity to internationalization, which “might affect the competitiveness and even the survival of higher education institutions” (Cohen, Yemini, & Sadeh, 2013, p. 24).

When it comes to strategic planning, Kotler and Murphy (1981) wrote, “Most colleges and universities are not set up with a strategic planning capacity. They basically are good at operations, that is, efficiently doing the same things day after day” (p. 470). Mintzberg (2007) agreed with this, claiming that strategy is thus a pattern that is
“consistency in behavior over time” (p. 1). Further, he highlighted that the pattern is actions taken by the organization, and the next steps are to assess if they are deliberate or emergent actions. Deliberate is about controlling the environment with a plan for how to implement it, while an emergent plan is one that develops as a reaction to the environment or from something that has been learned (Mintzberg, 2007). Thus, the strategic choice framework can be applied to both deliberate and emergent actions based on the external environment.

Kezar and Eckel (2002) argued that, for such strategies to be successful, they should be “culturally coherent or aligned with the culture” (p. 457) of the institution. Thus, in the interest of institutions looking to further expand their internationalization activities or act in response to the external environment, there should be a focus on their own institutional culture. For example, does expanding abroad or increasing the enrollment of international students align with the mission and vision of the HEI? In the case of internationalization initiatives where the external environment shifted the university’s strategic plans, some universities are now moving toward proactive strategic approaches to respond to external—rather than reactive—factors, which has had an impact on the evolution of the focus, scope, and content of their programs (De Wit, 2010).

**Global External Forces**

To help frame what is meant by external forces in this study, Table 6 summarizes the concepts of global external forces that are brought into this discussion. These factors
Table 6

Global External Forces Affecting Higher Education Internationalization Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Forces</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>“Economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement” (Altbach &amp; Knight, 2007, p. 290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deglobalization</td>
<td>Isolationist or protectionist approach to the negative aspects created by globalization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization activities</td>
<td>“Internationalization is a way to deal with globalization which can include “specific policies and programs undertaken by governments, academic systems and institutions, and even individual departments or institutions to cope with or exploit globalization” (Altbach, 2004, p. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Power of higher education</td>
<td>“The ability to shape the preferences of others. If I can get you to want to do what I want, then I do not have to force you to do what you do not want” (Nye, 2008, p. 95).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The perception of the hegemonic role of the United States</td>
<td>“The presence of a single, strongly dominant actor in international politics leads to collectively desirable outcomes for all states in the international system” (Snidal, 1985, p. 579)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnational events (political and economic)</td>
<td>Events that expand across boundaries of a nation, such as terrorism, the Great Recession, and visa policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

have been considered in the literature as variables that have impacted internationalization strategies.

Conceptual Framework

The literature is limited on how external forces affect internationalization efforts by HEIs. Therefore, the conceptual framework presented in Figure 4 helps to guide this study. The first box highlights the different concepts related to global external forces. The second box highlights the type of institution that will be examined in this study: universities with extensive internationalization efforts that are loosely coupled organizations and have control of their internal environments. Thus, this type of institution will determine the extent to which a university can implement change. Finally, the third box outlines the organizational theoretical framework, specifically focusing on Cameron’s (1984) adaptation and strategic choice framework.
As university campuses have expanded beyond their traditional campus borders, there are more external forces that interact with a university than ever before. Institutional strategies may be affected as universities look to increase their internationalization efforts. This section examined the brief history of international education, globalization as a driver for internationalization, motivations for institutions to increase efforts in internationalization, and the theoretical and conceptual frameworks used in this study.
CHAPTER 3 – RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to understand how global external forces are understood by universities and how such forces are affecting their internationalization strategies. Internationalization strategies in this study applied to the inbound (into the United States) and outbound (outside of the United States) mobility of students. This research looked at three large, private universities that are leaders in this area of higher education: Boston University (BU), Northeastern University (NU), and the University of Southern California (USC). The following research questions were used to guide this study:

1. What external forces affect a university’s internationalization strategies?
2. In what ways do external forces affect a university’s internationalization strategies?
3. How does a university adapt to external forces that may have affected or may affect their internationalization strategies?

Qualitative Study

The attempt to understand the phenomena of external global forces and if the HEI will or has changed its strategy as a result of these forces, requires a holistic examination of the organization. By seeking to understand why and how institutions adapt their internationalization strategies due to external forces, other factors within the organization were researched. As Kezar and Eckel (2002) found, university strategies are deeply aligned with the culture of the institution. Thus, to understand how and why institutions adapt their strategies, I sought to understand how the multiple layers of the organization, such as the goals, mission, protocols, and experiences of those who are charged with overseeing internationalization strategies and influence the institutions response to external forces. Therefore, I conducted a qualitative study, which Ravitch and Carl
(2016) define as “based on the methodological pursuit of understanding the ways that people see, view, approach, and experience the world and make meaning of their experiences as well as specific phenomena within it” (p. 7). In a qualitative study, the researcher is the key instrument, as they “collect data themselves through examining documents, observing behavior, and interviewing participants” (Creswell, 2013, p. 45). I collected the stories of these three universities to better understand if they adapted due to external forces. Each story is different as there are myriad ways universities approach and respond to external forces. Qualitative studies “attempt to understand individuals, groups, and phenomena in their natural settings in ways that are contextualized and reflect the meaning that people make out of their own experiences” (Ravitch & Carl, 2016, p. 2). Therefore, as there is not a single reality to be uncovered, but rather multiple and complex realities, qualitative research is the most appropriate approach for this study.

**Paradigm of Inquiry**

The paradigm of inquiry for this study is a constructivist paradigm utilizing the epistemological approach to understand and interpret the experiences universities have when adapting to external forces. The constructivist paradigm was developed as an alternative to the positivist and postpositivist traditions of research due to the emergence of studies in social science research (Creswell, 2013; Ravitch & Carl, 2016). Generally, a quantitative approach to research employs a statistical analysis through the examination of data by mathematical means (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). However, the constructive (or sometimes called the interpretive approach) is more appropriate for this study. As Creswell (2013) outlines, the researcher’s goal is to “is to make sense of (or interpret) the meanings others have about the world” (p. 25). Researchers interpret the data and thus,
their “own background shapes their interpretation, and they ‘position themselves’ in the research to acknowledge how their interpretation flows from their own personal, cultural, and historical experiences” (p. 25). While I am aware of the “paradigm wars” discussed in the literature, the comparison of research approaches—such as positivism versus constructivism—is not intended to add to the dualism within the literature. Rather, it is to highlight my thoroughness in selecting the most appropriate research methods. This study sought to examine many methodological approaches to identify the best fit to answer the research questions.

To further guide this research, the epistemological perspective was employed. As Creswell (2013) outlines, “With the epistemological assumption, conducting a qualitative study means that the researcher tries to get as close as possible to the participants being studied” (p. 20). Further, the epistemological constructivism perspective is viewed as if our understanding of this world is inevitably our construction, rather than a purely objective perception of reality, and no such construction can claim absolute truth. . . we recognize that what people perceive and believe is shaped by their assumptions and prior experiences as well as by the reality that they interact with. (Maxwell, 2013, “The Value (and Pitfalls) of Research Paradigms,” para. 6)

Table 7 outlines Guba and Lincoln’s (1994) basic beliefs of the constructivist paradigm of inquiry that helped guide this study. As universities are complex organizations, there are multiple realities that this study uncovered. Further, by interviewing those who work directly in implementing internationalization strategies, the findings were assessed by implementing semi-structured interviews, a method that aligns with the epistemological approach.
Table 7

Constructivism Paradigm of Inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Constructivism</th>
<th>Implementation Within This Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Epistemology | Transactional/subjectivist; created findings  
- The findings are literally created as the investigation proceeds | Findings are discovered and created through semi-structured interviews. |
| 2 What is the aim or purpose of inquiry? | Understanding and reconstruction  
- The criterion for progress is that over time, everyone formulates more informed and sophisticated constructions and becomes more aware of the content and meaning of the competing constructions. | Examining how three large, private, research universities adapt to external forces can assist other universities and the field of international higher education. |
| 3 What is the nature of knowledge? | Individual reconstructions merging around consensus  
- There is relative agreement among those competent to interpret the phenomena | Identifying “interpreters” of the phenomena along these criteria was key in site selection. Universities were selected based on the number of outbound and inbound students for internationalization efforts. |
| 4 How does knowledge accumulate? | More informed and sophisticated reconstructions | As there is little in the literature that discusses the effects of external forces on internationalization strategies, knowledge was accumulated to add to the discussion. |
| 6 What criteria are appropriate for judging goodness or quality of inquiry? | Trustworthiness: criteria for credibility  
Authenticity: criteria for fairness | Outlined in the sections Validity and Reliability |
| 7 What is the role of values in inquiry? | Included formative  
- Etic versus emic constructions | My own work in international education could impact values within this study as my views may conflict with those interviewed. It was important to give equal consideration to all those who may participate. |
| 8 What is the place of ethics in inquiry? | Intrinsic because of the inclusion of the participant values in the inquiry | Because of my identity and role in the field of international education, inquiries may result in “special and often sticky problems of confidentiality and anonymity as well as other interpersonal difficulties” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 115). Thus, it was important to be open to questions and discussion with participants of any interview protocols and consent forms. |

Note. Adapted from “Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research” in Handbook for Qualitative Research by E. G. Guba and Y. S. Lincoln, 1994, pp. 105-117.
Multisite Case Study and Site Selection

For this qualitative study, a multisite case study approach was used to investigate what external forces are identified by institutions to influence their institutions and how such forces are affecting their internationalization strategies. The main objective was to understand the salient context within the phenomena of global external forces (Yin, 2014). As external forces are complex and multidimensional, the use of multiple case studies as the unit of analysis in this study allowed for an examination of themes that emerged across top internationalization universities. As a result, this created a deeper contextualization of how universities are perceiving or not perceiving external forces and their ability to adapt to them. As Yin (2014) outlines, multiple cases require an intentional approach:

The simplest multiple-case design would be the selection of two or more cases that are believed to be literal replications, such as a set of cases with exemplary outcomes in relation to some evaluation question, such as “how and why a particular intervention has been implemented smoothly.” Selecting such cases requires prior knowledge of the outcomes, with the multiple-case inquiry focusing on how and why the exemplary outcomes might have occurred and hoping for literal (or direct) replications of these conditions from case to case. (p. 61)

My site selection was purposeful by selecting three institutions that have very similar success based on the volume of students who participate in study abroad programs and the volume of international students enrolled at their institution.

Site Selection Distillation Process

Yin (2014) outlines that sometimes it is “straightforward” to select a case because one has either unique access or has selected an “unusual case” for their study. However, for this study, there were hundreds of cases from which to choose, so I employed what Yin calls a “two-phase approach” in selecting the cases. In this study, the process is
called the site selection distillation process. The first stage consisted of “collecting relevant quantitative data about the entire pool” (Yin, 2014, p. 95), which included two datasets: *Open Doors: Reports on International Education Exchange* and the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). The second phase included comparing remaining cases to criteria created for this research. This assessment process resulted in the selection of three institutions for this case study analysis: BU, NU, and USC.

**Stage 1: Descriptive Data Analysis**

In the first stage, a descriptive data analysis was conducted using two datasets—*Open Doors* and IPEDS—to determine which institutions had the largest number of outbound and inbound students studying abroad in relation to their total population.

The IIE’s *Open Doors* Report was used to measure the total number of study abroad students and the number of international students studying in the United States (Farrugia & Bhandari, 2016). *Open Doors* is a published report of their annual statistical survey and has been “long regarded as the comprehensive source of data on trends in the enrollment of international students in U.S. higher education [and] U.S. students studying abroad” (Farrugia & Bhandari, 2016, p. 129). Further, since 1972, the IIE “began receiving support from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the United States Information Agency (USIA), now part of the U.S. Department of State” (Farrugia & Bhandari, 2016, p. 129). Related to the data collected in these surveys, Table 8 outlines the data definitions as outlined by *Open Doors*.

Data from IPEDS was used to examine the overall enrollment at institutions listed in the *Open Doors* reports. This study used the data report, *Institutions by Total Number of Study Abroad Students: Top 40 Doctorate-Granting Universities 2014/15*, which ranks
Table 8

2016 Open Doors Data Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Category</th>
<th>Open Doors Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection</strong></td>
<td>The 2016 survey was administered in winter 2015 to 2,818 institutions with follow-ups continuing through summer 2016. As in the past, closed (non-active) institutions and long-term non-respondents were excluded. This year, 1,765 institutions responded to the survey, yielding a 62.6 percent response rate. Data imputation is also carried out to account for non-responding institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Study Abroad Definition and Survey</strong></td>
<td>The U.S. study abroad population is defined as U.S. citizens and permanent residents enrolled for a degree at an accredited, degree-granting higher education institution in the United States, who received academic credit from their home institution for study abroad during the 2014/15 academic year (including summer 2015). Data reported for the U.S. Study Abroad Survey lag one year behind data reported for the International Student Census due to the time required for credit transfer to take place after the students return to their home campuses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Student Definition and Survey</strong></td>
<td>For the purposes of the International Student Census, an international student is defined as an individual enrolled for courses at an accredited, degree-granting higher education institution in the United States on a temporary visa that allows for academic study, and who is not an immigrant (permanent resident with an 1-151 or Green Card), a citizen, an undocumented immigrant, an individual with deferred action status, or a refugee asylee. Since Open Doors 2007, individuals holding a student visa who are participating in Optional Practical Training (OPT) have been reported separately. These students are considered students in the Department of Homeland Security’s Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) and are also included in the Open Doors international student totals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


“institutions by the overall number of students (including graduate students) that are studying abroad” (J. Baer, Research Officer for the IIE Center for Academic Mobility Research and Impact, personal communication, March 23, 2017). As data reported in

---

4 The two Open Doors reports were used to assess institutions outbound and inbound mobility were: Institutions by Total Number of Study Abroad Students: Top 40 Doctorate-Granting Universities, 2014/15 (Outbound mobility) and Top 25 Institutions Hosting International Students 2015/16 (Inbound mobility)
Open Doors include both undergraduate and graduate students, data were pulled from IPEDS to include the undergraduate and graduate enrollment data of the institution listed for that year. As Table 8 indicates, there is a 1-year lag in the Open Doors Study Abroad data. For example, in reports that show institutions hosting international students, the most recent 2016 report from IIE demonstrates reported data for the 2015-2016 academic year. The IIE’s 2016 Open Doors Study Abroad report reveals that data from the 2014-2015 academic year “lag[s] one year behind data reported for the International Student Census due to the time required for credit transfer to take place after the students return to their home campuses” (Farrugia & Bhandari, 2016, p. 133). Therefore, IPEDS data was collected for both the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years and collated with the appropriate data from the reports.

Although Open Doors accounts for only U.S. students studying abroad in their datasets and does not count non-U.S. students in the dataset, this is only a “proxy estimate” (Farrugia & Bhandari, 2016). Further investigation on how non-U.S. students are calculated within the IPEDS enrollment datasets was conducted to try to create as close of a match as possible to the Open Doors data. However, two variables were identified within the IPEDS data:

1. Nonresident alien:
   a. A person who is not a citizen or national of the United States and who is in this country on a visa or temporary basis and does not have the right to remain indefinitely.

2. Resident alien (and other eligible non-citizens):
   a. A person who is not a citizen or national of the United States but who has been admitted as a legal immigrant for the purpose of obtaining permanent resident alien status (and who holds either an alien registration card (Form I-551 or I-151), a Temporary Resident Card (Form I-688), or an Arrival-Departure Record (Form I-94) with a notation that conveys legal immigrant status such as Section 207 Refugee, Section 208 Asylee,
Based on this finding, the IPEDS data used for this analysis does include both the resident alien and nonresident alien data.

To select cases that would be most appropriate for this study, data were distilled down to a list of institutions that appeared on both the Open Doors “Top 25 Institutions Hosting International Students” and “Institutions by Total Number of Study Abroad Students: Top 40 Doctorate-Granting Universities.” Figure 5 outlines the 4-step process for Stage 1 of the site selection distillation process.

Using both datasets, two tables were created—one for the total number of study abroad students and the other for the total number of international students enrolled (see Appendix A, Table A1 and Table A2). These tables were then used to calculate the total percentage of enrolled students who studied abroad and the total percentage of enrolled students who were international students. This was calculated by dividing the IPEDS data by the Open Doors data. Once the enrollment percentage was calculated, the list was sorted by highest percentage of enrollment to lowest percentage of enrollment.\(^5\)

The total percentage of enrollment in both charts was used as a benchmark for site selection by determining if a university was ranked in both the study abroad and the

---

\(^5\) Some institutions were later discovered to have two different IPEDS numbers and reported international enrollment data to IIE from both IPEDS numbers, such as Northeastern University and Northeastern University’s Professional Advancement Network and Columbia University and The Teacher’s College at Columbia University. The enrollment percentage was later recalculated for Northeastern and while the final enrollment percentage did shift, it did not impact the final case selection for this study as it the university remained in the top 7 cases. Northeastern’s international enrollment percentage shifted from 58.7% to 38.4% as the enrollment total was 30,419 under both the “Northeastern University” and “Northeastern University Professional Advancement Network” IPEDS.
international student list. Those not listed in both lists were eliminated, and from there, a new list of 24 universities was created. The data were then re-sorted by highest percentages, and the top 10 institutions were considered (see Appendix B, Tables B1 and B2). However, in both top 10 lists, only seven institutions were present in both the study abroad and international student lists. The tables in Appendix A and B list the institutions that were distilled in this process. Table 9 lists the final seven institutions (in alphabetical order) that appeared on both *Open Doors* reports. Each of the seven sites were examined in Stage 2 of the site selection distillation process as possible case studies for this study.

*Figure 5.* Stage 1 of site selection distillation process.
Table 9

*Data Distillation Process Step 4: Institutions That Appear in the Top 10 Open Doors Lists*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank: Top 40 Universities Hosting International Students</th>
<th>Top 40 Doctorate-Granting Institutions: Study Abroad</th>
<th>Institutions That Appear in the Top 10 of Both Open Doors Lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Boston University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin Madison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stage 2: Assessment and Analysis of the Top Seven Institutions**

From the list of seven institutions, it was important to identify three cases from that list to provide a very close “apples to apples” analysis for this study. That is, the selected institutions—as much as possible—needed to be similar in substantial number of categories. Criteria selected to conduct a further analysis included the institution’s rankings in various domestic and global ranking metrics such as *Times Higher Education*, *U.S. News & World Report*, and the QS Ranking. Further, it was important to select three cases that all either had or did not have international branch campuses (IBCs), as IBCs require a more robust internationalization strategy. Using the data from the Cross-Border Education Research Team (C-BERT) at the time this analysis was conducted, NYU was the only institution with an IBC in operation. While NU is listed in C-Bert’s Branch Campus list for their Toronto campus, the list does say that the campus is “under construction” (C-BERT, 2017). Further, private, non-Ivy League institutions were preferred for this research. Table 10 outlines the assessment of the top 7 sites.
Table 10  

Assessment Qualities for Site Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Qualities</th>
<th>Boston University</th>
<th>Cornell University</th>
<th>New York University</th>
<th>Northeastern University</th>
<th>University of Pennsylvania</th>
<th>University of Southern California</th>
<th>University of Wisconsin-Madison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 US News QS Rank</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE (World) Rank</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE (US) Rank</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Doors SA Rank</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total enrollment</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Doors Intl Student</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrl Rank (out of 40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total enrollment</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that Intl students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founding Year</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Branch</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


While this list does not necessarily reflect a causal relationship that high percentages in study abroad and international student enrollment indicate strong internationalization adaptation strategies, it was, however, used as an indicator to determine the selection of universities with strong internationalization, cross-border, and transnational strategies. Using the data and the site distillation process as outlined earlier, three universities were selected for this study. Table 11 outlines various comparison factors of the three institutions used for this study: BU, NU, and USC. This chart includes
Table 11

Assessment Qualities for Final Three Case Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Qualities</th>
<th>Boston University</th>
<th>Northeastern University</th>
<th>University of Southern California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 US News Rank</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 US News Rank</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 QS Rank</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 THE (World) Rank</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 THE (US) Rank</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16 Overall Enrollment (IPEDS)</td>
<td>32,158</td>
<td>19,940</td>
<td>43,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Doors SA Rank (out of 40)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total enrollment who SA</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Doors Intl Student Enrollment Rank (out of 40)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total enrollment that Intl students</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founding Year</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Branch Campus</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 Tuition + Fees</td>
<td>$52,082</td>
<td>$49,497</td>
<td>$54,259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

factors, such as the 2017 *U.S. News & World Report* ranking and the tuition and fees for 2017 (as listed in *U.S. News & World Report*).

**Data Collection**

Yin (2014) outlines six types of sources to be used for case study evidence: (a) documentation, (b) archival records, (c) interviews, (d) direct observation, (e) participant-observation, and (f) physical artifacts. As Creswell (2013) outlines, “Unquestionably, the backbone of qualitative research is extensive collection of data, . . . from multiple sources of information, [and the] four basic sources of qualitative information [are] interviews, observations, documents, and audio-visual materials” (p. 52).

As my conceptual framework outlined, organizations are more susceptible and adaptable to change if they already have extensive internationalization efforts. Therefore, I attempted to investigate in my interviews, or examine accessible documents, that demonstrated past internationalization efforts by the institution. While the primary data...
source for my research was interviews, other data used for research in this study are listed in Table 12.

I conducted semi-structured interviews as a primary data source using the same interview protocol throughout the study (see Appendix C). The interview protocol was piloted prior to the research. As noted in Chapter 2, this study used Cameron’s (1983, 1984) strategic choice and adaptation framework as a theoretical foundation, as the survival of the institution in today’s global age is dependent on how well the institution can adapt during times of change. Cameron (1983, 1984) outlines that there are three adaptation strategies organizations can implement to adapt to external forces—domain offense, domain defense, and domain creation—and they are implemented in sequential order. Thus, this theoretical framework helped to guide the creation of the interview protocol for this study, which ultimately helped guide the coding and analysis. The interview questions were divided into four sections, as outlined in Table 13.

Two key groups of people were identified for this study: (a) groups inside the institution that work directly with internationalizations efforts, and (b) areas outside the institution. The two external participants include: (a) an international educator who has been in the field for over 20 years, and (b) the Vice President for Client Management at Lewis-Burke Associates (LBA), the government relations firm used by all three institutions in this study. Government relations firms or interest groups play a role in the U.S. political process as a nongovernmental actor. In his study about the relationships of interest groups, HEIs, and politics, Tandberg (2010) found, “Because of its susceptibility to political influences, higher education may stand to benefit the most from its involvement—or lose the most by refusing to engage—in state political and budgetary
Table 12

Data Sources Used for Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source Type</th>
<th>Data Collected for this Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>University reports, letters, proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>News articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Websites, university videos, speeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reports from International Education organizations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• National Association of International Educators (NAFSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Institute for International Education (IIE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Forum on Education Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• American Council on Education (ACE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival Records</td>
<td>Open Doors Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IPEDS Enrollment Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>University administrators from the following areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic international education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Study abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• International student services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• University external or federal affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Admissions or enrollment management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals outside the university that work in international education:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• University lobbyist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Members of international education organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Conference participation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IIE Generation Study Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Forum on Education Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus visits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

processes” (p. 442). In the case where HEIs cannot directly be involved in Washington, it has been in their interest to have someone close to lawmakers to represent their interests on their behalf. This has especially been salient as HEIs rely heavily on the appropriations from state and federal budgets. Thus, firms like LBA can be beneficial to institutions that are not physically located in Washington DC, such as the cases in this study: BU, NU, and USC.

As Ledford shared about the 25-year-old company, it “represents non-profit organizations involved in science research and education. Principal universities are the
Table 13

**Structure of Interview Protocol**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background of the</td>
<td>• To provide context and an understanding as to how long the individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>had been at the institution and in the field of international education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>• To provide context as to where the work they do is stationed with or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>within the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Past</td>
<td>• Questions were designed to understand the individual’s perspective on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the history of internationalization strategies within the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Questions aligned with Cameron’s theoretical framework by asking why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strategies were created, what was done within this framework to expand,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and what was done beyond the framework to expand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Present</td>
<td>• Questions were designed to understand what individuals perceived as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>global external forces shaping international education and their thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on managing international programs at this point in time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

bulk of our clientele in many respects.” With regard to the cases in this study, LBA has represented USC since 1998, and NU and BU for just over 5 years. Ledford shared about LBA’s relationship with the universities:

For a period of time, we were [USC’s] only Washington presence. Now they have an entire DC office. We are of counsel to that office and working for a senior vice president back on campus. For . . . Northeastern University . . . we work for the senior vice president in charge of all of external affairs. We are their only outpost in Washington . . . they have a vice president for federal relations, he also is routinely here doing a lot of the work and so we’re advising and working with them, both on the research side, the education side, and on the government relation side. The third one is BU . . . they also have a Washington office and we report to the government relations side [of the university].

For this study, it was important to speak to LBA to get an understanding of what they perceive as external forces, especially as they are advocating on behalf of universities that seek their assistance, usually in responding to such forces.

Prior to this study, approval was given by the University of Pennsylvania’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). As Creswell (2013) outlines, the IRB is an important part of the research process as evidence must be provided to demonstrate that humans in
the study are not placed at risk. Participation was voluntary and outreach emails were sent to individuals requesting their participation in the study. Potential participants were asked to share their perspectives of what external forces are, how they affect their institution, and how their university has adapted to such forces. If the individual agreed to the interview, the interview was conducted in a place convenient for them, either in person, by phone, or via Skype. Prior to the start of the interview, all individuals received the study framework and the list of interview questions.

After conducting a number of interviews, several admissions officers and a university president were named as other participants to consider. This is referred to as “chair referral sampling” or “snowball sampling,” which is when participants refer the researcher to other individuals to include in the study (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981). For example, after conducting a number of interviews, admissions officers and a university president were added to the interview list. Table 14 outlines the final list of those interviewed along with the total number of years they had worked at the institution.

Data Analysis

All interviews were recorded and transcribed using a transcription company called Rev.com, and all individuals were given the opportunity to review the transcript and redact any statements they wished to omit from the analysis. Individuals who requested anonymity were granted it. All transcripts and data were securely stored on a University of Pennsylvania storage tool affiliated with Internet2. As a student of the University of Pennsylvania, this storage was free, and the storage size was unlimited.

Maxwell (2013) highlights three general options for analyzing data: (a) memos, (b) categorizing strategies (such as coding and thematic analysis), and (c) connecting
Table 14

*Interview Names, Affiliations, and Years at Institution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Years at Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>Jennifer Grodsky</td>
<td>Vice President for Federal Regulations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gareth McFeely</td>
<td>Executive Director of Study Abroad</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly Walter</td>
<td>Associate Vice President for Enrollment and Dean of Admissions</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willis Wang</td>
<td>Vice President &amp; Associate Provost for Global Programs, &amp; Deputy General Counsel</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
<td>Susan Ambrose</td>
<td>Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education &amp; Experiential Learning</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Aoun</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tim Leshan</td>
<td>Vice President External Affairs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luchen Li</td>
<td>Dean, Office of Global Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philomena Mantella</td>
<td>Senior Vice President of Enrollment Management and Student Affairs &amp; CEO of the Professional Advancement Network</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marina Markot</td>
<td>Director, Global Experience Office</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern</td>
<td>Anthony Baily</td>
<td>Vice President for Strategic and Global Initiatives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Timothy Brunold</td>
<td>Dean of Admissions</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Lamy</td>
<td>Former Associate Dean, Dornsife College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sean O’Connell</td>
<td>Director, International Business Programs, World Bachelor in Business, Marshall School of Business</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tony Tambascia</td>
<td>Executive Director, Office of International Services</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis Burke Associates</td>
<td>Michael Ledford</td>
<td>Partner &amp; Vice President for Client Management</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Caroline Donovan White</td>
<td>International educator in the field of international education</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

strategies (such as narrative analysis) ("Strategies for Qualitative Data Analysis," para. 3).

Further, he highlights that there is not one correct way to analyze data and that reading and thinking about your interview transcripts and observation notes, writing memos, developing coding categories and applying these to your data, analyzing narrative structure and contextual relationships, and creating matrices and other displays are all important forms of data analyses. (Maxwell, 2013, "Strategies for Qualitative Data Analysis," para. 3)

In this study, these three techniques were used.
Memos were frequently used to help sort out initial thoughts about adaptation examples, external forces, and other themes that might be viewed as an initial outlier to the study. Further, transcripts were reviewed after each interview, and memos were written to outline key points or themes from each interview. Categorization strategies were applied by coding the data first by hand, as

during this initial stage of bringing order to and making sense of the data, a close line-by-line reading of the data is often suggested in a search to identify as many ideas and concepts as possible without concern for how they relate. (Given, 2008, p. 86)

Then, all transcripts were uploaded into the qualitative software package NVivo, which was used to further analyze the data by creating categories/themes. As the interview protocol was created to help guide the coding, themes naturally emerged to align with the theoretical framework. Yet, it was important to remain open to emerging themes that deviated from the initial theoretical and conceptual frameworks, as demonstrated in the findings of this study. Specifically, coding Research Question 1, when an interviewee identified an external force, this information was recorded and coded in the software package Excel. Two hundred and sixty-seven different answers were provided, and these responses were assessed and coded. Using the original framework in Chapter 2 as a guide for the themes helped to identify commonalities among answers. When new themes did emerge, they were noted in memos and in other node categories in NVivo and categorized in Excel. They were then analyzed to create new themes and subthemes within each major theme. Finally, these themes were meshed together, which is outlined in the Findings section of this study. Overall, seven themes emerged.
Validity and Reliability

To achieve validity, this study used both data and theory triangulation. Data triangulation entails the process by which researchers take different data sources and bring them together for analysis, whereas theory triangulation is the “inclusion of a range of theories to frame the study topic in context and is, actually, rarely achieved” (Ravitch & Carl, 2065, pp. 194-195). Further, as Ravitch and Carl (2016) outline, there are multiple ways to attempt and achieve validity in qualitative research. Table 15 outlines a variety of validity strategies I used for this study and how I implemented them.

Overall, the aim of the constructivist approach, as outlined earlier, was to present an understanding of how key individuals interpret a phenomenon—external forces and the adaptability of internationalization strategies. This study sought to understand individual’s perspectives of external forces affecting international education strategies.

Researcher Bias

My identity is important to the context of this study as the tacit theories may impact my research. Ravitch and Carl (2016) refer to tacit theories as the “informal and even unconscious ways that we all think about, make sense of, and explain the world and the various contexts and people within it” (p. 42). Professionally, my lens is one of an administrator in the Northeastern region of the United States who works at a private institution with clearly defined internationalization strategies. While Northeastern University was identified as one of the case studies for this dissertation, it is important to note that my history with the institution is extensive. I received two degrees from the university, and during the time of this study, I worked at the institution in international academic affairs. Specifically, I have led the international operational development for an
Table 15

Strategies to Achieve Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Validity Strategy</th>
<th>Applied to this Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triangulation</strong> (i.e., multiple sources, investigators, methods)</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews, IPEDS data, <em>Open Doors</em> Data reports; NVIVO was used to confirm triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant validation strategies</strong> (e.g., members checks)</td>
<td>This was achieved by having participants review transcripts of interviews and asking participants to confirm if the transcripts reflect what was discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soliciting feedback from insiders and outsiders</strong> (e.g., peer debriefs/ inquiry group/ critical friends)</td>
<td>This was achieved by discussing findings with colleagues who are familiar with the field of international education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thick description</strong> (i.e., does the reader draw the same conclusions)</td>
<td>As outlined in my findings, thick descriptions will provide a detailed analysis that will hopefully allow the reader to draw the same conclusion from my research as well as pivot and apply the findings to other areas in research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Situating your study in relationship to theory, larger contexts, and other research</strong></td>
<td>This study used the theoretical framework of Kim Cameron’s strategic adaptation and look to understand individual’s perspectives of external forces affecting international education strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from “Qualitative Research: Bridging the Conceptual, Theoretical, and Methodological” by S. Ravitch & N. M. Carl, 2016, pp. 103-104.

international program for first-year students. Because of this, it was important to not let my work dilute the data that came from all of the interviews, whether from Northeastern or outside the university. Additionally, as a student at the University of Pennsylvania, I recognize that my participants did not always perceive me by this identity and instead viewed me by my professional reputation. For example, there is a “friendly” competition between BU and NU. Thus, my own work identity was sometimes acknowledged over my student identity by some participants when collecting data.

As I set forth with this study, I continuously used member checks to try to capture the perspectives of those outside this realm. Overall, it was important to keep these
various biases in mind when I conducted interviews and interpreted and analyzed the overall data for this dissertation.
CHAPTER 4 – CASE STUDY OVERVIEW

The following chapter provides an overview of the three different cases examined for this study: Boston University (BU), Northeastern University (NU), and University of Southern California (USC). Each university is briefly examined, and an overview of the institution’s history and its contemporary internationalization structure and strategies is provided. As outlined in Chapter 3, each university was selected based on a level of their internationalization efforts—specifically inbound and outbound mobility of students. However, while they each have distinct histories and methods to execute their internationalization strategies, it is their uniqueness in these areas that has led them to become the successful internationalization institutions they are today.

**Boston University**

*This university was founded and has lived on dreams of doing the difficult, the unprecedented, and even the impossible.*

– President John Silber
Commencement Address to the Class of 1996 (Boston University, 2015)

**Institutional History**

In looking at the beginnings of BU between 1839 and 1867, the college community was transient, having moved from Newbury, VT to Concord, NH and then to various buildings throughout Boston, MA (BU, n.d.-b). At the 1996 BU Commencement, Silber addressed the graduates by reflecting on the history of the university:

In 1839, a group of New England Methodists met in a building in downtown Boston and planned the first college for the education of Methodist ministers. 30 years later, William Fairfield Warren, Lee Claflin, Isaac Rich, and Jacob Sleeper set in motion a new dream—the first American university to combine the model of a New England undergraduate college with that of the German university. (0:16-0:46)
The United States was still a new and growing nation at the time. As higher education historian, John Thelin (2011), describes, educational developments focused on “the small, underfunded church-related liberal arts college” (p. 44), which was the “prototype of the first half of the nineteenth century” (p. 44). BU certainly falls into this category with its Methodist foundation, especially as the agrarian culture of the Northern states was made of “subsistence farming, in contrast to the plantations of the South” (Thelin, 2011, p. 53) and resulted in a “‘surplus of young men” (p. 53) who had limited professional options. Thus, to diversify their professional possibilities, “teaching and the ministry, for example, were professions that needed educated recruits. The ‘nontraditional’ college students—older and poorer than the traditional college men—responded earnestly and enthusiastically to the opportunities” (Thelin, 2011, p. 53) of this time period.

Specifically, related to the New England Methodist School, Issac Rich “became determined to establish a Methodist university in Boston” (BU, 2013, 1:08) due to his own gratitude for his faith. The University’s charter was then established in 1869 when the Boston Theological Society established its first university department—other developments quickly followed, which included the School of Law in 1872 and the School of Medicine in 1873 (BU, n.d.-b). William Fairfield Warren agreed to become the first President of the University in 1873 under the conditions that the university “combine undergraduate, graduate and professional training and that it be open to all qualified applicants, male, female, [B]lack, and [W]hite, without regard to their faith” (BU, 2013, 1:46-2:00; see Table 16 for a list of all Boston University presidents).

When looking at the state of the United States during BU’s earlier days, the ability for BU to sustain (and even survive) into the 20th century is impressive. Thelin
Table 16

Presidents of Boston University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boston University President</th>
<th>Years in Office</th>
<th>Total Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  William Fairfield Warren</td>
<td>1873-1903</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  William Edwards Huntington</td>
<td>1904-1911</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Lemel Herbert Murlin</td>
<td>1911-1924</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Daniel L. Marsh</td>
<td>1926-1951</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Harold C. Case</td>
<td>1951-1967</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Arland F. Christ-Janer</td>
<td>1967-1970</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  John Silber</td>
<td>1971-1996</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Jon Westling</td>
<td>1996-2002</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Aram V. Chobanian</td>
<td>2003-2005</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Robert A. Brown</td>
<td>2005-Present</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(2011) described this as an “antebellum” period in U.S. history by illustrating two key events occurring between 1860-1890:

The Civil War (1861 – 65) looms as a pervasive influence on the entire life of the nation, and the Morrill Act of 1862 stands out as path-breaking legislation that signaled the entrance of the federal government into public policy dealing with creation of the land-grant colleges. (p. 74)

Yet, many milestones and “firsts” were achieved by the University in these early days, which included the establishment of new schools throughout Boston, the awarding of degrees, and breakthroughs in significant technology. For example, in 1876, BU Professor, Alexander Graham Bell, revealed the world-famous invention of the telephone, which transmitted “sound to the Boston Athenaeum from Professor Alexander Graham Bell’s University office” (BU, n.d.-b, “1876: Telephone Invented”). Further, while at that time it was generally known as an “urban” university rather than the global university it is known as today, other key firsts for BU included the first graduate student
from Japan, Takeo Kikuchi, who graduated from Boston University’s School of Law in 1877 (BU, n.d.-b). This milestone was one of many in BU’s internationalization efforts.

Fast forward to the early 20th century and Boston University continued to grow and find a place to call “home” in the area along the banks of the Charles River. By 1938, under the leadership of BU President, Daniel L. Marsh, the Charles River Campus was officially inaugurated and launched a 28-year effort (complete in 1966) to consolidate all schools and colleges of the University in this area of Boston (BU, n.d.-b). This consolidation plan was only delayed by the onset of the world wars at the time. Freeland (1992) wrote, “For decades, BU had operated in buildings scattered throughout the city, and Marsh regarded the creation of a proper home as an essential basis for raising academic stature” (p. 235).

In this post-war era, the University had high ambitions but struggled with its reputation as a primarily urban, commuter school. For Marsh, he remained optimistic and driven, constantly pushing the University toward being a nationally recognized research institution. Freeland (1992) described Marsh’s efforts during what he called the Golden Age of higher education:

The impulse to build BU into a national university was a consistent theme of [Marsh’s] presidency. He frequently observed that BU was the first proper university in the United States because it first combined British and German traditions. He began early to build dormitories for students beyond the Boston area, never missed an opportunity to associate BU with Harvard and M.I.T., and drew attention to every hint of national or international recognition. In depicting BU in such terms, however, Marsh was aware of being more hopeful than descriptive. He knew that his institution functioned principally as an unselective, urban, commuter university. (p. 235)

Yet, BU’s most significant and cavalier developments of the 20th century came under the presidential leadership of John Silber. Arriving in 1971, Silber had a large task on his
hands, as at the time, “the campus had only 66 education and research buildings and 42 residence halls, the library had less than a million books, and most critically, the University was operating at a budget deficit of $8.8 million” (Ko, 2012, para. 8). Silber served the institution for nearly three decades, stepping down as President in 1996, and then served as the University’s Chancellor until 2003. In 2002, Silber reflected on his arrival to BU:

“When I came here, we didn’t have a list of our alumni,” Silber told the University’s weekly newspaper, the BU Bridge, in 2002. “We didn’t have a balanced budget. We didn’t have a computerized payroll system. We were raising only about $2.5 million a year. Back then, running Boston University was like trying to fly a 747 without avionics, without an instrument panel. (as cited in Ko, 2012, para. 9)

Comments such as these resulted in Silber gaining attention from the media. From regular coverage by the Boston Globe, interviews about his character when running for Massachusetts Governor in 1990, to an opinion piece by Nora Ephron in Esquire magazine, the attention on Silber’s personality and demeanor also helped gain attention for BU. However, Silber was more than just controversial, bold, and brash—he was a leader who paved the way for the University’s stability into the 21st century. Silber had achieved what Marsh had sought so desperately to gain: a nationally recognized research university.

This accomplishment led to BU’s next vision and mission: to become a globally recognized university. As the current President, Robert Brown (2011) reflected on how he saw the BU community adapt to such changes after he joined as the 10th President of the institution:

Starting as a regional commuter school only a few decades before, Boston University was emerging to become a major global private research university. In
2005 most members of our community had yet to really comprehend the magnitude of either the changes that had occurred, the opportunities in front of us, or the changes in processes, standards, and external support we would need to put in place in order to achieve and sustain our goal—to be a great globally-connected private research university. (para. 3)

Through its various internationalization efforts, BU expanded to grow its study abroad programs and its international student enrollment. In his Fall 2014 commencement address, President Brown (2014) further discussed the sustainability and expansion of the University’s global commitment:

Since its inception, Boston University has been engaged in the world by welcoming international students to our campus, through educational programs, research, and community service around the globe, and by creating novel opportunities spurred by new cohorts of students from abroad to internationalize our curriculum. We must recommit ourselves to being a truly globally connected University and continue to innovate in our programs both in Boston and around the world. (para. 18)

**Internationalization Organizational Structure**

The current global strategy for Boston University is created by the President and is disseminated throughout the university to his administration. This senior leadership team is responsible for the following areas within BU:

1. Provost (who leads a team of deans who oversee the 17 different schools and colleges at the university)
2. Operations
3. Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer
4. External Affairs
5. Senior Counsel and Secretary to the Board of Trustees
6. Development and Alumni Relations

Generally, global strategies are operationalized and managed under the leadership of BU’s Vice President and Associate Provost for Global Programs, Deputy General Counsel, Willis Wang. His role is in the cabinet of the Provost, who is the second ranking officer reporting to the President. However, the uniqueness of Wang’s role is in the
dotted line to the President and the central location of his unit’s budget operations. In an interview with Wang, he shared that his unit helps facilitate “getting BU out into the world and then bringing the world to BU.” Overall, this unit is charged with providing support for international or study abroad students in areas such as academic programs, crisis management, or financial services. Therefore, the inbound and outbound mobility programs fall under the purview of the Global Programs Office (GPO). This unit includes three areas that manage aspects of mobility: the Study Abroad Office, the International Student and Scholars Office (ISSO), and the Center for English Language Orientation Programs (CELOP).

**Outbound Students**

The BU Study Abroad Office provides academic programs in six continents; many include internship programs. If a student wishes to study outside the Charles River Campus, including at a program within the United States, then the Study Abroad Office manages this process, which includes application dissemination, review, and placement. This office is the University’s largest physical operation around the world, which includes the management of students, faculty, staff, and brick-and-mortar operations. Gareth McFeely manages the Study Abroad Office and is joined by a team of about 20 individuals located in Boston who are responsible for the operational development, including program enrollment management, risk, and marketing. Overall, the mission of the Study Abroad Office is “to offer excellent, innovative, and diverse cross-cultural learning experiences for all students. Our study abroad programs cultivate the intellectual, professional, and personal qualities necessary for success in an increasingly interconnected world” (BU, n.d-a., para. 2).
As Wang recalls, BU’s study abroad programs really started to grow in the 1970s. Wang credits President Silber as a catalyst for this development. Silber also provided support for faculty-led programs and the Washington, DC internship program—a program that is still in existence today. The internship program is important to the institution and the students as two thirds or more of our students are engaged in internship experiences. With such growth in the 1970s, the university turned its focus to expansion in London in the 1980s by acquiring buildings for their study abroad programs, which they still own today. Overall, Wang recalls that Silber believed that one needed to engage with people from different cultures because it benefited students, faculty, and staff and overall made the institution stronger and better.

Inbound Students

Other units in the GPO include the ISSO and the CELOP. As outlined on their website, the central charge of the ISSO is to provide guidance to foreign national students on the U.S. immigration and employment regulations (BU, n.d.-d). This ISSO is led by a managing director who oversees a team of nearly 20 individuals who provide support for students, ranging from student advising to support through immigration processes. On the other hand, the CELOP is an accredited ESL school whose aim is to provide English-language support for students and professionals. The Center is over 42 years old and was also founded under the leadership of President Silber. The GPO was created in 2010 “to create a comprehensive international office where there are multiple stakeholders . . . [it was] an effort to be sensitive and responsive at the same time,” said Wang.

While most of the university’s international initiatives are streamlined through Wang’s area, he believes his role is not one of the Senior International Officer (SIO).
McFeely, the Executive Director for Study Abroad, further added to that point, highlighting that the difference at BU is “there is a greater degree of coherence here than even I can perceive in other institutions.” The SIO role started to emerge in the 1990s when universities were starting to further develop their internationalization strategies (Dessoff, 2010). While the role may be called different things at different universities, the overall position encompasses someone who leads “global initiatives at the campus-wide level and ensures that the institutions meet their strategic mission related to internationalization” (Kratochvil & Karram Stephenson, 2015, para. 8). Wang and McFeely share the view that many people at BU are involved in the execution of internationalization strategies, so it is not purely centralized as the GPO does not “control everything international at the university.” For example, other key units that also work closely with the internationalization efforts related to inbound and outbound mobility include the Undergraduate Admissions Office and the Office for Federal Relations.

In 2004, BU merged its international student admissions office with the Undergraduate Admissions Office under the leadership of the Associate Vice President and Dean of Admissions, Kelly Walter. According to Walter, admissions is often viewed as the “lifeblood of any institution,” as this department coordinates the applications, acceptance, and entry process for the entering class of the institution. Having been at BU for 34 years, Walter recalls that the international admissions strategy has been ever changing at BU: “What we were doing in 2004 as a university and as part of our strategy is very different than where we are today.” At that time, 5% of BU’s enrolled class included international students, which “was a lot when we looked at our peers and we did benchmarking. That was a large percentage.” However, when the Great Recession of
2008 occurred, many universities were looking for ways to sustain financial revenue streams that suddenly had been cut. As Desrochers and Hulbert (2016) highlighted in the 2003-2013 Delta Cost Project, “The financial ramifications of the 2008 recession were vast, affecting students’ ability to pay for college, lawmakers’ prioritization of public resources, and the budgetary environment facing higher education leaders” (p. 1).

Universities looked for different revenue streams, which included the increase of out-of-state or international students who were not eligible for federal financial aid and therefore paying the full cost of attendance. As Walters recalls, the enrollment of international students

became a financial strategy for a lot of institutions. It was not for us because we were by 2008 already enrolling 15% of our class international. We had made that commitment years earlier. It’s something that continues to be a priority for Boston University. We have a target, if you will, that our freshman class can be no more than 25% international. We’ve never been at 25, but we’re very close. The freshman class this past year [2016] was 22% international.

Beyond the freshman class at BU, the undergraduate and graduate classes are made up of 9,038 international students from over 130 different countries. Forty percent of this figure makes up the undergraduate class at 3,606 students. Table 17 is the breakdown of the total international student demographics for the 2016-2017 academic year (BU, n.d.-d).

With the growth in international student enrollment, the operational structure of the International Admissions Office adapted, expanding from a 3-person office in Boston with five international offices to a centralized department for undergraduate international admissions, led by a Director of International Admissions who has nine direct reports. The international offices were located mainly in Asia—in Taiwan, Taipei, Tokyo, and
Table 17

2016-17 Total International Student Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total International Students</th>
<th>9038</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Countries Represented</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 10 Countries</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>45% 4074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>10% 884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>5% 461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4% 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan, R.O.C.</td>
<td>3% 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>3% 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>2% 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>2% 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1% 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1% 109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. From “2016 International Student Data,” by BU, n.d.-d.

Thailand—and there was one office in London. When Walters inherited the international admissions offices, she made the decision to discontinue them. She shared:

Under me, we closed those offices. That was a big shift for lots of reasons mostly that they just were not . . . I mean from a budget perspective, it didn't make a lot of sense to have these remote outposts. They were supposed to do little admissions, a little development, a little alumni relations, but it didn't really happen that way. They weren’t truly admission officers. As our applicant pool grew from international students, they really were not well positioned to advise these students. They weren’t involved in reviewing applications. It made sense to close those operations, expand the admission’s office here.

BU’s Office of Federal Relations is part of the Division of External Relations, which is located in Washington, DC. As the Vice President of External Relations, Jennifer Grodsky and her team are charged with strengthening the university’s relationship with the federal government, its agencies, and policymakers. Grodsky’s reporting line is to the Senior Vice President for External Affairs. She is also a member of the Provost’s Cabinet and President’s Administrative Council. The purpose of her work in DC is twofold: (a) advocating for BU’s priorities, and (b) gathering information
intelligence about what is happening in Washington, DC to ensure the University has the most current information. For example, in January 2017, after President Trump signed Executive Order (EO) 13780, or the “Travel Ban,” Grodsky recalls that BU’s Study Abroad and ISSO offices had reached out asking her office to collaborate on three town hall meetings. According to J. Brown (2017), “The meeting was intended to relieve some of the widespread anxiety among international students, who [had been] stunned and dismayed” (para. 5) by the signing of EO 13780.

**Internationalization Strategies**

Under the leadership of President Brown, a new strategic plan was published to the BU community by the Strategic Planning Coordinating Task Force on December 1, 2006 (BU, 2006). The plan focused on changing the internal culture and philosophy of BU by announcing a new view, reflected in the title: *One BU: A Connected University*. This shift looked to create a more cohesive and interconnected community that enabled constructive intellectual engagement, cooperation throughout departments, transparent decision-making, and accountability (BU, 2006). At that time, a shift in culture was needed. For example, President Brown reflected in an interview with *BU Today* that, upon arriving at BU, the campus was a complex and political place to navigate: “There were dead cats everywhere, and nobody wanted to bury them” (as cited in Jahnke, 2011, para 6). He saw that, to sustain the success already accomplished by the institution, certain key commitments needed to be made throughout the entire university.

The University’s goals that concentrated on the strengthening of BU’s academic reputation paid off in 2012 when BU joined the Association of American Universities (AAU), “an elite organization of 61 leading research universities in the United States and
Canada” (Jahnke, 2012, para. 1). That year, BU became the 62nd member and was one of only four universities invited to join the group since 2000; “in the Boston area, only Harvard, MIT, and Brandeis are also members” (Jahnke, 2012, para. 1).

President Brown’s inaugural goals also focused on strengthening the University’s global initiatives. As outlined in the BU (2006) strategic plan:

*We will refine and strengthen our conception of our global commitments* [emphasis in original]. We must do more to engage with a variety of communities in the city of Boston; to internationalize our students, faculty, and studies; and to carefully and strategically extend the BU presence in select countries around the world. Partnerships with the city, corporate relationships, internships, creative professional development for our staff, and technology and knowledge transfer will secure the global and local future of our University. BU should come to represent the very best of Boston to the world and to bring the world to Boston. (p. 4)

Such commitments were either created or enhanced when Brown became President.

Table 18 outlines some of the current internationalization efforts by BU.

President Brown outlined in his Fall 2014 State of the University address that, to sustain and expand the university’s global commitment, it was important for BU to continue to focus on its internationalization efforts as it strengthens into the 21st century:

Since its inception, Boston University has been engaged in the world by welcoming international students to our campus, through educational programs, research, and community service around the globe, and by creating novel opportunities spurred by new cohorts of students from abroad to internationalize our curriculum. We must recommit ourselves to being a truly globally connected University and continue to innovate in our programs both in Boston and around the world. (section 7.1)

Overall, as BU emerges into the 21st century as a leader in global education, such strategies are led by its President and disseminated throughout the entire institution.
**Table 18**

*Internationalization Strategies/Programs at Boston University*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Internationalization Strategy/Program</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description of Boston University Strategy/Program</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Programs Office</td>
<td>Quasi-centralized function that includes three key internationalization programs: Study Abroad, ISSO, CELOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
<td>An office that manages all operations for students studying outside of the Charles River Campus. The office states that it has 90+ Programs, 30+ cities, 20+ countries, 6 continents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Students Scholars Office (ISSO)</td>
<td>Provides a service to students seeking expertise on immigration and employment, as well as help ensure student, scholar, and institutional compliance with federal regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for English Language &amp; Orientation Programs (CELOP)</td>
<td>A long-standing strategy in existence since 1975. The mission is to “help international students and professionals succeed in their academic and work lives by offering programs that enhance their English language and cultural competence.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International student recruitment</td>
<td>Part of the Undergraduate Enrollment team, this area provides oversight on the admissions strategy, recruitment and enrollment of international students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick S. Pardee School of Global Studies</td>
<td>Founded in 2014, Pardee’s four domains of excellence are: peace, prosperity, policy and place. Undergraduate majors include: international relations, Asian studies, European studies, Latin America studies, and Middle East and North Africa studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Engagement</td>
<td>The alumni association have networks around the globe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Northeastern University**

*We are creating a global university system—a world-wide network of people, programs, and experiences that foster lifelong learning and intellectual growth at every stage of life.*

– President Joseph Aoun (2007)

**Institutional History**

At the time of Northeastern University’s creation in 1898, educators gathered in the basement of the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA) and offered various...
classes to the local community. These educators, who later became the University’s founders, were not attempting to create, nor could they even fathom, a 120-year strategic plan that would consist launching an internationally ranked university with Research 1 status, Division 1 athletics, and comprised of a Board of Trustees, 1,257 faculty, and 24,944 graduate and undergraduate students (NU, 2016). Moreover, those involved in the early days of the University did not conceptualize the magnitude of what NU would become in the global market, and as a result, the University’s early history from 1898 reflects a modest beginning for Northeastern.

The early landscape of Boston in 1898 showcases that “the industrial and commercial growth of Boston was resulting in increased opportunities for young men with general legal knowledge, as well as practicing lawyers” (Marston, 1961, p. 15). Harvard and Boston University were the only schools in the Boston area to offer law programs, and so, under the leadership of Frank Palmer Speare, the Educational Director of the YMCA, who recognized the demand for law education, the Evening Law Institute was created in 1898 (Marston, 1961). Speare later became the first President of NU, officially inaugurated on March 30, 1917 (Churchill, 1927). Table 19 lists NU’s serving presidents. The Evening Law Institute offered two hundred hours of instruction, in one-hour sessions, four evenings a week. The first faculty consisted of five men—three teaching courses in Pleading, Property, Criminal Law, Contracts, and Torts. The tuition was announced as $30 a year, including a five-dollar YMCA membership. (Marston, 1961, p. 15)

However, it was not until 1904 when the Commonwealth of Massachusetts granted the Evening Law School of the Boston YMCA the power to award the LL.B. degree, and with that, in 1904 and 1905, 20 degrees were awarded (Marston, 1961).
Table 19

*Presidents of Northeastern University*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northeastern University President</th>
<th>Years in Office</th>
<th>Total Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Frank Palmer Speare</td>
<td>1898-1940</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Carl Stephens Ell</td>
<td>1940-1959</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Asa Smallidge Knowles</td>
<td>1959-1975</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Kenneth Gilmore Ryder</td>
<td>1975-1989</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  John Anthony Curry</td>
<td>1989-1996</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Richard M. Freeland</td>
<td>1996-2006</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Joseph E. Aoun</td>
<td>2006-present</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* From “Timeline: Northeastern University 1896 and Beyond,” by NU, 2018e. Retrieved from https://library.northeastern.edu/services/archives-special-collections/northeastern-history/timeline

One of the cornerstones of NU’s pedagogical approach to learning is the Cooperative Education Program, or the Co-Op Program. As the University’s website outlines, the term *co-op* refers to a “distinct educational approach [that] integrates rigorous classroom study with real world experience to create a powerful way to learn” (NU, 2013, para. 1). This form of education was first developed at the University of Cincinnati (UC) in 1906 by Herman Schneider. At that time in the United States, the automotive and manufacturing industries were booming, and Schneider saw opportunity for students in the UC’s engineering school to further skills and link “theory to practice” (Cedercrutz & Cates, 2010). The concept was a success, and in 1909, under Speare’s leadership, cooperative courses were launched at the Cooperative Engineering School. Marson (1961) wrote:

Clearly the plan would provide technical training for young men who because of limited financial status were unable to pay the costs of education at the established schools of engineering, and these were the young men to whom the Institute had been interested since its founding. The appeal of “earn while you learn” was a strong one. (p. 28)
The concept that co-op would be a mechanism to pay for tuition resonated with faculty, staff, and students at NU for almost 100 years following its creation. Further, the co-op concept is still a market differential for NU—it attracts thousands of applicants each year who are drawn to the idea that a student will have real-world workplace experience to help them secure post-graduation employment.

In 1916, Northeastern College was officially recognized by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Marston (1961) wrote, “The structure of the college was a Board of Trustees, headed by Arthur S. Johnson, President of the Boston YMCA; and an Executive Council, made up of Frank Palmer Speare as President; Galen D. Light, Secretary; and deans of the schools” (p. 57). Another name change occurred in 1922, when the college officially changed its name to Northeastern University of Boston YMCA, and then in 1935, the “Northeastern University Corporation was established and Northeastern became totally independent from the Boston YMCA” (Feldscher, 2000, p. xiii).

NU, like most universities at the onset of the world wars in the early 1900s, experienced stagnating and often declining growth. Carl Ell, the University’s second President during this time, was determined not to be impacted by external forces again, so he drafted an extensive “plan of operation” for the postwar period (Freeland, 1992). As he was more apprehensive that NU would never exceed the growth of the 1930s, Ell believed that “to meet the needs of the community . . . NU must be a ‘dynamic,’ ‘developing,’ and ‘flexible’ institution, ready to create new programs in response to changing conditions” (Freeland, 1992, p. 237). However, as a result of the G.I. Bill in 1944, NU’s future enrollment did grow, and the university continued to expand. From that time until the early 1960s, NU focused on sustainable expansion. Property was
purchased near the YMCA, buildings were built, schools were created, degrees were awarded, and an alumni base was formed. According to Freeland (1992), “While the challenge for Ell in the 1940s and 1950s had been to establish the campus as a free-standing institution, the job for Knowles (the following NU president) was to put it on the map as a proper university” (p. 260).

To further diversify its offerings, the University established University College and the Center for Continuing Education in the early 1960s. That year also marked the 50th year of the College of Engineering and of cooperative education at NU (Marston, 1961). The creation of University College was a successful attempt to encompass the values of cooperative education, adult education, and community service and to test innovative approaches to higher education. This included changing traditional notions of course delivery through the creation of different time schedules to tailor to the needs of students in the community (Frederick, 1982). The demand for NU was increasing—the total university enrollment grew from 6,000 in the fall of 1959 to 13,500 by the fall of 1967. Further, Frederick (1982) writes that in 1965, due to the high demand of bringing courses to students in the community, NU opened its first satellite campus system and the university rented high school facilities in neighboring towns of Boston. By 1975, “40 percent of all University College students were attending classes in several facilities outside the Boston area” (Frederick, 1982, p. 100). NU quickly gained a reputation as the leader in adult education in Boston, and by 1980, “University College enrollments reached a peak of 14,000” (Feldscher, 2000, p. 114). This increase in enrollment growth was consistent throughout all areas of the University.
Unlike BU that benchmarked and compared itself to MIT and Harvard, Knowles had a different strategy:

[Knowles] stressed the importance of winning a place for Northeastern at “the head table of academic respectability” through a “quest for higher academic statue.” NU’s president was unusual among academic leaders in Massachusetts, however in believing that his university could best enhance its position not by adopting the patterns of elite institutions but by stressing its distinctive qualities. (Freeland, 1992, p. 263)

For years that followed, that distinction focused on NU’s co-op and adult education programs, which were mainly regional and domestic programs.

One of the most comprehensive histories about the President Ryder administration was written by Antoinette Frederick (1995), a freelance writer in the Boston area who was hired to write official histories of Northeastern. As the University’s archives Collection Overview outlines, the University community was involved in the documentation of the history for the book, Coming of Age: The Ryder Years 1975-1989, and “drafts of each chapter were sent to several University officials” (NU, 2018a, para. 1) for review before publishing. Her research showcases the institution’s internationalization developments during this time.

President Ryder was “determine that Northeastern should become internationally recognized and lost no chance to make that happen” (Frederick, 1995, p. 236). Coming into the University in 1975, Ryder felt that there were two external forces that that were pushing the University to increase its internationalization: (a) changing student demographics; and (b) global changes, such as faster communication and the globalization of economies (Frederick, 1995). Specifically, in response to trends that the
number of U.S. students were declining in the higher education market, Ryder (1982) saw an opportunity to “help fill the gap” with enrolling international students:

I am absolutely convinced that given the nature of our institution, its location, and our experience, we can easily replace any decline in American students with students from Japan, Taiwan, China, western Europe, and South America. (as cited in Frederick, 1995, p. 249)

As Frederick (1995) outlines, “Probably no single action more profoundly affected the shape of Northeastern’s international policy than the trip of twenty-five Northeastern delegates to the People’s Republic of China in the Spring of 1980” (p. 237). The Boston Globe reported, “What impressed this group [from Peking] about this urban institution was its cooperative education” (as cited in Frederick, 1995, p. 237). Yet, from this visit, Frederick (1995) further outlined the direct and indirect implications of the visit, which specifically relate to this study: “An increase in the number of students coming to Northeastern from the People’s Republic of China, which jumped from 2 in the fall of 1979 to 237 in the fall of 1988” (p. 241). Yet, this growth sustained at NU, and Frederick (1995) wrote that the overall international student enrollment dramatically increased during the Ryder Administration, allowing the University to be recognized in Open Doors reports as a university with one of the highest enrollments of international students: “In 1975-76 the total international student population was 858. Fourteen years later [1989], it was 2,100” (p. 249). Yet, there was an awareness at NU during this time that student recruitment was impacted by external forces. Frederick (1995) pointed out that, in 1979-1980, there was a correlation between OPEC members and the number of students from those nations and cites. Countries such as Venezuela, Nigeria, and Iran
“needed trained manpower [and] NU’s international student body reflected that need” (Frederick, 1995, p. 250).

It was during the Ryder years that NU emerged into the global markets of higher education, encompassing internationalization in the forms of inbound and outbound mobility, as well as the internationalization of the curricula and a shift in internal processes, such as creating new departments to help with such growth. Study abroad programs grew, global co-op was founded, and international student recruitment increased. The University responded to the management of these initiatives by creating joint committees to assess the evolving needs of the growing international student population and shared responsibilities that included “international recruitment, coordination of international visitors, and addressing the cultural, legal, and academic needs of foreign students” (NU, 2018d, para. 2). These committees later emerged into a central unit called the Office of International Affairs, founded in 1982 and in existence until 1988 when its functions were either discontinued or absorbed by other units in the university, such as Admissions (NU, 2018d).

Internationalization was impacted by internal transitions at NU under the leadership of Jack Curry, who served as President from 1989-1996, where huge efforts were put in place to control costs and programmatic growth that had become extremely bloated. Freeland (2001) wrote, “The university embarked on a program of systematic downsizing combined with ambitious efforts to increase admissions selectivity and enhance the campus while improving the quality of academic programs” (p. 241). In 1990, external forces hit the university with the “combination of a struggling economy and a dwindling pool of 18-year-olds [as] high school graduates nationwide fell by 19
percent between 1976 and 1989; in New England, the number dropped by more than 25 percent” (Feldscher, 2000, p. 26). NU had an open enrollment process at this time. With the decrease in 18-year-olds in the market, competition increased with other institutions who had “better academic reputations than Northeastern” (Feldscher, 2000, p. 27); they “began to lower their own admissions standards to keep numbers up, thus dipping into Northeastern’s pool” (p. 27). The University was in a financial crisis, and if they did not correct the situation, NU would have faced a “$17 million deficit in its 1991-92 budget” (Feldscher, 2000, p. 32). There were some tough decisions to be made, which included laying off nearly 200 administrators and support staff (Feldscher, 2000).

However, while other areas of the University may have struggled, “University College generated between about $11.5 million and $12.5 million each year to help Northeastern through the most difficult period in its history” (Feldscher, 2000, p. 115). In 2004, as the college continued to grow, key changes occurred: The name of University College changed to the School of Professional and Continuing Studies, the first online and graduate degrees were launched, and over the next 5 years, the school merged with and created other education programs, such as its Doctorate in Education degree program that operates both domestically and globally.

When President Freeland entered the university in 1996, one of his major goals was to strengthen NU’s ranking. This goal was strongly promoted throughout all areas of the University. In 2006, 10 years after Freeland arrived at NU, and upon his retirement from the University, *U.S. News & World Reports* released its yearly Best Colleges report and announced that NU broke the top 100 and was ranked 98; Kunter (2014) observed, “In his decade as President, Freeland had lifted the school up more than 60 spots” (p. 2).
Northeastern’s next President, Joseph Aoun, arrived at NU in 2006, bringing with him a successful academic career and the experience of having been educated on three different continents. He received his Ph.D. in linguistics and philosophy from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and advanced degrees from the University of Paris VIII and Saint Joseph University in Beirut, Lebanon (NU, 2017). He is a product of an international education. Most recently, before coming to NU, Aoun was the Dean of the University of Southern California’s College of Letters, Arts & Sciences (NU, 2017).

Under Aoun’s leadership at NU, new colleges were created, and some were eliminated to help strengthen and streamline focus on academic quality. As an example, the College of Arts and Science (CAS) was split into the College of Arts, Media, and Design (CAMD) and the College of Social Sciences and Humanities (CSSH). The College of Criminal Justice was eliminated, and majors were absorbed by CSSH. In 2008, the School of Professional and Continuing Studies changed its name once more to the College of Professional Studies (CPS). (College of Professional Studies History, n.d.). With such a strong academic focus, NU continued to rise in the rankings. However, according to Kutner (2014), President Aoun

resisted talking about the school’s meteoric rise over 17 years—from 162 to 49 in 2013. “The focus on the ranking is not a strategy, for a simple reason,” he says. “You have thousands of rankings. So, you will lose sleep if you start chasing all of them.” (p. 3)

In February 2016, Indiana University’s Center for Postsecondary Research published the Carnegie Classifications of Institutions of Higher Education, and Northeastern was categorized as a university with the “highest research activity” within the doctoral university category. There are only 115 universities within this classification.
(Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research, n.d, “Basic Classification Defintion”). At the same time, News@Northeastern highlighted that “the classification signals the impact of the university’s strategic vision and investments over past 10 years . . . have elevated Northeastern into a powerhouse on par with the nation’s elite research colleges and universities” (St. Martin, 2016, para. 1).

Other programs that were established to diversify NU’s offerings included the launch of its regional campus network with the creation of the Charlotte, NC campus in 2012. Shortly following came more campuses in Seattle, WA and Silicon Valley, CA. The University is currently working on its first international relational campus in Toronto, Canada. Overall, strategic decisions such as these, have impacted NU’s 120-year growth has resulted in a steady increase in the rankings, prestige, and member of the global university community.

**Internationalization Organization Structure**

Since his arrival in 2006, Aoun has been a leader building the global strategy for NU. This strategy is executed by his Senior Leadership Team, which consists of six Senior Vice Presidents and his Chief of Staff and Senior Strategy Advisor. The Senior Leadership Team is responsible for following areas of the university:

1. Academic Affairs, led by the Provost, which includes the deans of the nine different academic colleges
2. Enrollment Management, Students Affairs and the Professional Advancement Network (PAN), including the deans of the regional campuses
3. External Affairs
4. Treasury
5. General Counsel
6. University Advancement
Each of these units have distinct responsibilities to execute the global strategy for the university, which spans across undergraduate, graduate, and professional academic programs. As this study focuses on the mobility of traditional undergraduate students there are a few key areas that work directly with this population: academic affairs, enrollment management, and external affairs.

**Outbound Students**

Specifically, in regard to undergraduate academic affairs, Susan Ambrose is the Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Experiential Learning. Reporting directly to the Provost, she oversees the “distinctive model of integrative, experiential global education, as well as university-wide assessment of student learning that results from this model” (NU, n.d.-c, para. 1). Two key outbound mobility academic programs are in her area of responsibility: The Global Experience Office (GEO) and Cooperative Education and Career Development Office. These units are managed by Assistant Vice Provosts, who report directly to Ambrose.

GEO is a central unit for the university within the Provost’s Office. It provides global academic mobility programs, mainly on the undergraduate level to all undergraduate colleges at NU. It also provides operational support for other programs throughout the university that may not have its own operational base, such as visa support and contract development. Under the leadership of the Director, GEO has a team that is divided into areas responsible for advising, operations, and program coordination. Three types of programs are offered by GEO to students: (a) traditional semester study abroad

---

6 The data reflected in the Open Doors and IPEDS reports for this study reflect traditional full-time, residential undergraduate students. CPS undergraduate programs are not reflected in these datasets.
programs, (b) Global Co-Op (nonacademic credit program), and (c) faculty-led international programs called Dialogues of Civilizations (DoC). The GEO provides support from finding opportunities to the coordination of visas, housing, and awarding scholarships for items like transportation and housing abroad (NU, 2018b).

The DoC program, as Ambrose recalls, was founded about 15 years ago by a faculty member from the political science department who received support from the Dean of his college to lead a program with students abroad. The program gained attention and popularity from students and other faculty that it has now expanded throughout all colleges at the university. As NU operates with a traditional U.S. semester system (one in the fall months and one in the spring months of the calendar year) and then two 6-week summer sessions, the DoC’s align with the summer session model. As the Director of GEO, Marina Markot, points out, the DoCs are “a sizable piece of our portfolio” and that it is a “very productive model because a summer session and a co-op cycle mesh very well and students actually can use financial aid for summer study, which is unusual among different institutions.” Further, she comments that the Global Co-Op program has grown substantially, which was driven by two forces: (a) international students have difficulty finding co-ops in the United States due to work visas, and (b) it provides another avenue for giving NU students an international experience, but at a very independent level.

Additionally, Ambrose is the Co-Chair of the International Safety and Security Assessment Committee (ISSAC) at NU, which is described as being charged with providing advice, guidance, and recommendations to the Provost and Senior Vice Presidents in response to circumstances that present a safety concern where students are, or will be, participating in a University-approved
activity. The ISSAC also proactively makes recommendations in response to changing world conditions regarding programs still in the planning stages. (NU, 2018c, para. 1)

This committee was created by the Provost and other members of the President’s Senior Leadership Team. Ambrose co-chairs this committee with the University’s International Safety Specialist, a relatively new position within the University that is charged with constantly assessing the international landscape outside of the University. ISSAC is comprised of about 12 members throughout the University from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, General Counsel, Risk Services, and NU Global.

Further, as Ambrose is charged with undergraduate education, she views the support that is given to international students as an area within her domain of responsibility. As Ambrose notes, the Office of Global Services (OGS) is charged with incoming international students whereas her unit focuses on the outbound mobility of students. Overall, while Ambrose believes that both her office and OGS work well together, structurally OGS should fall under the Provost.

However, OGS reports directly to the Vice President of Enrollment, who reports to the Senior Vice President of Enrollment and Student Life and CEO of the Professional Advancement Network (PAN), Philomena (Philly) Mantella. Within Mantella’s responsibilities include student affairs, undergraduate enrollment management, and athletics. Additionally, she is responsible for leading strategic planning, global market expansion, marketing, new business development, digital platforms, learner experience, and academic programs for serving 18,000 adult learners worldwide. This also includes the oversight and development of NU’s global and regional campuses and the College of Professional Studies (with a shared reporting line to the Provost).
Mantella admits her role is unique when compared to traditional higher education structures as her function has evolved in which international enrollment building, retention and support on a macro institutional level are a part. Mantella arrived at NU in 2000 as the Vice President of Enrollment Management, and then became the Senior Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs. In 2008-2009, her role expanded and now further encompasses three distinct areas: (a) international student markets, (b) adult learners, and (c) the global university system. Specifically, related to the undergraduate market, OGS is within her purview as it provides visa and transitional support for international students entering the institution.

**Inbound Students**

Luchen Li has been the Dean of OGS since 2016. The office has also evolved from the former International Student Scholar Institute (ISSI) into OGS to bring awareness to students the level of services provided by the office. As Li outlines, there are four pillars of support: (a) pre-arrival; (b) compliance; (c) employment; and (d) student support, programming, and operations. All direct reports and operations take place on the Boston campus with the exception of an Assistant Director who is located on NU’s Seattle campus to provide support on the West Coast.

While CPS programs are not a main focus of this study, it is worth noting its internationalization components due to the volume of students it manages. The college is divided into four areas: (a) the Graduate School of Education, which was founded in 2009; (b) NU’s Lowell Institute—a STEM-focused bachelor’s completion program; (c) doctoral, master, and certificate programs for “nontraditional” learners; and (c) NU Global, which includes the following type of programs: (a) pathway bachelor completion;
(b) English language preparation; (c) English language tutoring, language, cultural, and reading workshops; (d) off-shore graduation programs in Australia, Vietnam, and Hong Kong that partner with Swinburne University of Technology, International University, and Kaplan International Colleges, respectively; and (d) the N.U.in Program, a first-year international program (NU, n.d.-a, n.d.-b). Overall, CPS programs are either separate entities or programs that serve as pipelines into to the entire undergraduate university.

Finally, another area of the University to note that is constantly scanning the external environment is the division of External Affairs, which is divided into two departments: the Office of Marketing and Communications and the Office of Government Relations. With his home base in Boston, Tim Leshan is the Vice President for Government Relations and reports directly to the Senior Vice President. His role focuses mainly on federal relations but also does work with the state government. According to Leshan, when he started at NU, his work “didn’t have much of an international piece to it, but it has certainly grown over time to include international government relations as well.”

**Internationalization Strategies**

As Ryder is noted as introducing internationalization to NU and later Freeland is noted as transforming the institution to become a nationally known university, Aoun’s current focus is on expanding these strategies to make NU a more globally recognized, research-focus institution. When Aoun entered NU, one of his major goals was to elevate the internal and external perspective of the University. His strategy was communicated from the start of his career. On March 26, 2007, in his Inauguration Address, Aoun (2007) spoke to members of the University and Boston communities:
Globalization is breaking down the barriers of time and distance. Our students should be as comfortable in Shanghai, Johannesburg or Mexico City as they are here in Boston. By September of 2007, we will double the number of international co-op opportunities. Going forward, we will continue to expand the reach and scope of international co-op until our students can be found in all corners of the world. (paras. 36-37)

When reflecting upon why the University decided to increase its international initiatives, Aoun shared, “We had to make internationalization real to every component of the organization.” Within the first year, the University created its first strategic plan under Aoun that outlined five strategies and initiatives: (a) Enhance Student Outcomes Through Experiential Learning, (b) Address Global and Societal Challenges Through Interdisciplinary and Translational Research, (c) Enrich Intellectual Life and Creative Expression, (d) Strengthen Urban Engagement, and (e) Embrace Global Opportunities (NU, 2007). Within the last strategic initiative, Aoun’s global agenda was outlined:

The world and the world of higher education are undergoing enormous change. The global university, characterized by campuses in several countries and a strong presence in cyberspace, is rapidly becoming commonplace. U.S. dominance in higher education is threatened by expanding systems in Asia and the European Union. The knowledge economy, driven by globalization, is becoming a defining feature of the world. During their careers, our students will need to be equally at ease in Shanghai and Chicago. Our research partnerships will need to span the globe in order to capitalize on the knowledge now being developed elsewhere. (NU, 2007, pp. 9-10)

This plan further outlined that, to enhance the global presence of the University, it must be enhanced internally and externally. Ten years after Aoun’s arrival to the University, these global strategies and initiatives continue to be a focal point for all areas of the institution as reflected in the new Academic Plan: Northeastern 2025. While Global is not a word leading the plan, it is implied through the plan’s three pillars specifically focused on networks: (a) Build Diverse, Inclusive Networks of Endless Possibilities; (b)
Learning Any Time, From Anywhere, With Anyone; and (c) Accelerate Discovery Exponentially Through the Power of Networks (NU, 2016)

Overall, as NU’s global strategies fall under each Senior Vice President’s responsibility, each are charged by the President to move the needle a bit further to internationalize their programs and initiatives. Table 20 highlights some of the global strategies that fall under the different SLT members.

All of these strategies are connected through an overall initiative called the Global University System. Ambrose describes this as “moving from [a] hub and spoke model” where “Boston is at the center.” She believes that one cannot “think about it as this is the mother ship and these are the colonies out there, but rather to think about it as a complex system. It’s a global university network, and not everything has to be centralized here in Boston.” Strategically, the University is thinking of ways where students can seamlessly move through a global network. Aoun officially signaled to the community this initiative during his State of the University Address in Fall 2017 where he announced from London that “we are building a global university system and it will position us for preeminence. We are leading with our differentiation, which is experiential” (St. Martin, 2017, para. 4).

University of Southern California

*When our founder Robert Maclay Widney nurtured our university into being in 1880, USC was not in position to be an exclusive, insular institution. By necessity, in this American frontier of expectation, we were open to all—enrolling women and drawing students from across the Pacific in our earliest years. We were global before it became the fashion or the new reality.*

– President C. L. Max Nikias (2017)
Table 20

Examples of Northeastern University Global Strategies per Senior Leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Vice President Area, Enrollment Management, Students Affairs and the Professional Advancement Network, External Affairs, Treasury, General Counsel, University Advancement</th>
<th>Global Responsibility of Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Academic Affairs | • Global Co-op  
• Study Abroad  
• Dialogues of Civilization  
• Core curriculum |
| External Affairs | • Office of Global Services (OGS)  
• The N.U.in Program  
• NU Global  
• Global University System |
| Treasury | • Funding of global programs  
• Operations overseas  
• Procurement activities |
| General Counsel | • Visa regulations  
• International contracts  
• International compliance |
| University Advancement | • International alumni engagement and relations |

Institutional History

At the time of the founding of USC in 1880, California was a new state. Only 32 years prior, in 1848, Mexico and the United States had ended the Mexican War, signing a treaty that gave the United States land in the current Southwest of the United States (National Archives, 2018). However, with the discovery of gold in this region, there was a large “rush” of migrants to the area. The State of California outlines that, when gold was initially discovered in early 1848, “the state’s non-Indian population numbered about 14,000. By the end of 1849, it had risen to nearly 100,000, and it continued to swell to some 250,000 by 1852” (California Department of Parks and Recreation [CDPR], n.d.-b, para. 2). With this substantial increase in the population, there was a “pressing need for
civil government” (CDPR, n.d.-a, para. 1), and so, on September 9, 1850, California became the 31st state of the United States (CDPR, n.d.-a).

Thirty years after California officially joined the United States, in 1880, USC would enroll its first 53 students. As former president, Steven Sample (2005) reflected at the 125th anniversary of the founding of the University:

When USC was founded on September 4, 1880, Los Angeles was a dusty little village of 10,000 souls with a pretentious name: El Pueblo de la Reina de Los Angeles, the Town of the Queen of the Angels . . . USC’s founders had the audacity to call a two-story frame building a “university.” And not just a university for the village of Los Angeles. This building in a mustard field on the edge of Los Angeles was a university for all of Southern California. (pp. 11, 20)

The surrounding LA population was very diverse as “about one-fourth of the city was foreign-born, and the populace reflected a wide-variety of ethnicities, religions, and social classes” (Sample, 2005, p. 12), which included “Spaniards, Mexicans, Indians, Europeans, Easterners, and Midwesterners” (p. 14). Further, USC’s “establishment helped settle a new geographic territory, Los Angeles, which was nothing more than a frontier town in 1870” (Trani & Hosworth, 2010, p. 55). This location is the differential to the other cases in this study as its climate, community and political/social landscape at this time in the United States was very different from the northeast. More importantly, USC’s access to the world, specifically the Pacific Rim, was (and still is) different from the east coast institutions.

Similar to the creation of BU, USC was the product of Methodist missionaries looking to further higher education. As Thelin (2011) outlined:

In Los Angeles, a deliberately ecumenical group of civic leaders that included Jews and Catholics accepted the invitation of Methodists to found the University of Southern California—a private university that served the metropolitan area that had been neglected by the governor and by the University of California. (p. 123)
As there was no state-run higher education system in this part of the state, Sample (2005) reflects:

From 1880 to the 1950s, [USC] served primarily a local clientele and played a quasi-land-grant role. Of course, we were not a land-grant university, but we were serving public needs in the way that traditional land-grant universities do—by training the doctors, lawyers, pharmacists, dentists, engineers, nurses, teachers, and other professionals the region desperately needed. Why? Because there wasn’t anyone else in Southern California to do it. Indeed, it wasn’t until the 1930s that the University of California, Los Angeles, established its first professional schools. (p. 13)

The student population was drawn from the entire local population and was not exclusive to a specific elite social class. In fact, USC touts that its first graduating class in 1884 had three students, and a woman was the valedictorian (USC, n.d.-e)

Yet, when looking at the evolution of USC, Sample (2005) points out that the University’s growth was in tandem with the region: “a university whose mission grew and grew up in concert with the eponymous region of which it is a part” (p. 10). In depicting this point, Sample brings attention to how long USC has been a university compared to well-known east coast institutions such as Harvard and Yale, who were already established universities when USC was trying to come into existence. In the late 1800s, “L.A. still lacked paved streets, electric lights and a reliable fire alarm system” (Trani & Hosworth, 2010, p. 55). The intense growth the University faced when emerging into the 1900s, foreshadows the success led by its presidents. As USC’s Presidents have been key catalysts for such ambitions for USC, Table 21 outlines all USC presidents from its inception.
Table 21

Presidents of University of Southern California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Years in Office</th>
<th>Total Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Marion M. Bovard</td>
<td>1880-1891</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Joseph P. Widney</td>
<td>1892-1895</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 George W. White</td>
<td>1895-1899</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 George F. Bovard</td>
<td>1903-1921</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Rufus B. von KleinSmid</td>
<td>1920-1947</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Fred D. Fagg, Jr.</td>
<td>1947-1957</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Norma H. Topping</td>
<td>1958-1970</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 John R. Hubbard</td>
<td>1970-1980</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Steven B. Sample</td>
<td>1991-2010</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 C.L. Max Nikias</td>
<td>2010-present</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


USC experiences in the early 19th century were similar to East Coast institutions with the experience of an increase in students, infrastructure, and resources that was eventually impacted due to the onset of the United States entering World War I. At USC:

Enrollment plummeted as students left to enter the armed forces, and campus life changed profoundly as military training was introduced in physical education classes, a course in international conciliation was added to the curriculum and a senior division of the Reserve Officers Training Corps was established, by order of the Department of War, making USC an official training school for army officers. (USC, n.d.-c, para. 6)

With the return of solders to the region, enrollment increased “by 1,000 students annually beginning with the 1920-1921 academic year” (USC, n.d.-c, para. 7). Von KleinSmid sustained and scaled this growth with the introduction of new schools, degree programs, buildings, and aggressive financial contribution campaigns. “His ambitious developments and construction program earned him a reputation as the University’s ‘building president’” (USC, n.d.-j, para. 2). Specifically, regarding internationalization developments, Von KleinSmid established the country’s first School of International
Relations (SIR). As the school’s website outlines, “SIR was founded as an offshoot of the 1922 Pan-American Conference on Education that brought together chancellors and university presidents from 22 countries to discuss the importance of education and to foster international understanding” (USC, n.d.-k, para. 1).

Some of the schools most significant “firsts” occurred during the Von KleinSmid presidency, which included participating and winning the first Rose Bowl football game in 1923, conferring the first Ph.D. in the School of Education, and creating the country’s first filmmaking program founded by Cecil B. DeMille (USC, n.d.-j).

This same enrollment pattern that occurred under Bovard was also experienced under the Von KleinSmid presidency as enrollment declined when students went to Europe to fight in World War II. However, with the return of soldiers to the region, coupled with the G.I. Bill, enrollment dramatically increased. During the war, “USC had enrolled an average of 6,000 full-time day students,” and after the war, enrollment continued to grow where it “peaked in 1947-48, when USC’s combined daytime and evening enrollment reached 24,000, mostly former servicemen” (USC, n.d.-j, para. 8). Due to this massive expansion, the next president, Fred D. Fagg, focused on increasing the physical infrastructure of the campus to keep up with the increasing demands brought on the enrollment increase (USC, n.d.-a). However, it was President Norman Topping that took USC to another level financially. According to Trani and Hosworth (2010), “USC’s 1961 Master Plan for Enterprise and Excellence in Education included the ambitious goal of doubling the university’s endowment” (p. 56). The “fundraising goal of $106,675,000” was “to be raised in 20 years”; however, USC surpassed this goal in just over 5 years (USC, n.d.-g). Due to these significant financial gains, USC continued to
expand and strengthen during the Topping administration, including its academic infrastructure. One of the university’s “crowning achievements” occurred in 1969 when USC was elected membership in the Association of American Universities (USC, n.d.-g).

In the recent contemporary history of the university, President Steven Sample was in office for nearly 20 years and had an impact on the university propelling the institution into greater recognition and prestige. Upon Sample’s death in 2016, the current USC President, C.L. Max Nikias, reflected upon the work Sample did for the university:

Generations from now, those studying the history of our university will quickly find themselves learning the remarkable story of Steven Sample. So many of USC’s successes, so much of our university’s current stature can be traced back to Dr. Sample’s dynamic leadership, keen foresight, and extraordinary prudence. (Vogl & Lipinski, 2016, para. 3)

The list of Sample’s accomplishments is quite long, but overall showcases massive contributions to the institution due to his leadership. This includes record breaking fundraising campaigns, the opening of key facilities such as the university hospital and elevating the institution’s global research reputation. Goffard and Hamilton (2016) wrote, “During 19 years as president, Sample catapulted USC from being a school often mocked as the University of Second Choice or the University of Spoiled Children into a top educational institution and fundraising powerhouse” (para. 3).

While global initiatives continued to be a focus for the university, one of the most significant was in 1997, when USC collaborated with other California universities such as UCLA and UC Berkeley to create the Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU). “From its modest beginnings, the group has grown into a consortium of 36 leading universities from 16 economies around the Pacific Rim, contributing to the economic, scientific and cultural advancement of Pacific Rim economies” (USC, 2018a, para. 24).
Nikias has been at USC since 1991, but prior to that he was educated in Cyprus, Greece, and the State University of New York at Buffalo, where he received his Ph.D. He was a member of the NU engineering faculty from 1985 until 1991, then joined the USC faculty in 1991, then served as Dean of the Viterbi School of Engineering from 2001 to 2005, the University’s Provost until 2010, and then was voted by the Board of Trustees to become the University’s 11th President in 2010 (USC, 2010).

**Internationalization Organizational Structure**

USC’s senior administration team is led by Nikias and is comprised of 10 Senior Vice Presidents who are responsible for the following areas:

- Provost and Academic Affairs—this area includes a team of 19 deans who oversee the different USC colleges/schools
- University Advancement
- Administration
- Chief Executive Officer for Keck Medicine
- Chief Investment Officer
- University Relations
- Finance and Chief Financial Officer
- Athletic Director
- Chief of Staff

Within the institution, there are a few key units that work directly with inbound and outbound undergraduate mobility, which include the academic affairs, admissions, and international student services.

**Outbound Students**

USC’s outbound mobility structure is unique in the sense that each of the academic colleges are responsible for overseeing outbound study exchanges. However, agreements for those exchanges or anything that is policy related to the university as a whole is funneled through the Provost’s office under the Vice President for Strategic and
Global Initiatives, Anthony Bailey. He describes the structure as decentralized, which is enabled by USC’s Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) budget system. In the RCM system:

academic units referred to as “responsibility centers” are given the revenue that they generate for the institution, and they must use it to cover their unit’s expenses. Typically, schools and colleges within an institution are defined as the responsibility centers; however, academic departments could also be used for this purpose. If the expenses exceed revenues for a responsibility center, then it must make cuts in its spending or generate additional revenue to achieve a balance. (Toutkoushian & Paulsen, 2016, “Extensions,” para. 7)

USC’s (1998) report on the 1994 Strategic Plan highlights that the RCM model has been in existence at the university since the early 1980s. While it notes at that time that it has been instrumental for balancing budgets, there were concerns with the RCM model at USC had “created behaviors and incentives that often benefit individual schools to the detriment of broader university interests” and as a result, the plan encouraged the community to look for ways to better “facilitate inter- and multi-disciplinary research and teaching, and to better enable university-wide long-range planning and implementation” (USC, 1998, p. 9).

Bailey’s role is similar to a chief international officer as his unit reviews specific international agreements that the different colleges and schools create, whether it is with other institutions, governments, or organizations. Those agreements are reviewed and signed by him on behalf of the university. At USC, there is not a centralized study-abroad office as each college and school creates their own individualized programs and relationships. By reviewing such agreements, the Office for Strategic and Global Initiatives supports the university by ensuring initiatives align with the global vision of
the institution. This office also supports centralized units such as Admissions and University Advancement.

Two of the largest schools and colleges at USC are the Marshall School of Business and the Dornsife College of Arts, Letters, and Sciences. In the fall 2016, the Marshall School reported an enrollment of 4,064 students and Dornsife College reported 6,665 students were enrolled. Each have created their own internationalization initiatives that align with their academic offerings. For example, the Marshall School offers a World Bachelor in Business (WBB) where students study in Los Angeles, Hong Kong, and Milan in conjunction with the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology and Università Commerciale Luigi Bocconi (USC, n.d.-h).

Steven Lamy came to USC in the early 1980s and became a full-time faculty member in 1985. He is a professor of International Relations and served as the Vice Dean for Academic Programs in Dornsife College from 2007 until 2017. He is now acting as the “inaugural Director of the Dornsife Task Force on Global and Political Studies” (USC, 2018c, para. 1). Lamy explains that this is a charge the dean has asked him to lead to create two master’s degrees where one will focus on global governance and the other will focus on several global policy issues and initiatives. With over 30 years at the university, Lamy has been involved in the creation and sustainability of many different international initiatives including a program called Problems Without Passports (PWP). This 4-week program is a problem-based learning course led by USC faculty in the summer terms. While it is not a “traditional” study abroad program, the goal is to encourage students to “consider going abroad in a traditional way” who may be apprehensive to go at all.
Within the Marshall School, Sean O’Connell is the Director of International Business Programs. He describes his unit’s function as overseeing programs such as short-term (1-week in a country) to longer semester programs. Specifically, he outlines, “We don’t utilize third party providers with our semester long programming. We do bilateral exchanges only.” This stems from the perspective that by sending American students to another country to sit in a classroom with only American students “was something that we did not want to replicate. That was already happening on campus, so we wanted to do something a little bit different, so we looked at the Erasmus plan and we then started engaging with universities that were engaged in bilateral exchanges.” Operationally, O’Connell describes that his unit does not have many university-wide memorandums of understanding (MOU) to which the Office for Strategic and Global Initiatives would then be involved.

Inbound Students

Specific to USC’s inbound mobility, the office of Admissions is charged with shaping the student body of the university. Timothy Brunold is the Dean of Admissions, which is the University’s Chief Admissions Officer, and “oversee everything that relates to undergraduate admissions, graduate admissions, campus visitors and also new student orientation programming.” Brunold has been at USC for his entire professional career, over 25 years. During that time, he has seen a strong dichotomy of the USC’s world of admissions from “seeing what it’s like to work in an institution that can barely fill its classes to going all the way to an institution that’s this year probably going to have 65,000 freshman applications.” Such changes impacted USC’s profile, where Brunold reflects that USC went from being a regional institution about 30 years ago that had about
an “80% admission rate” where the “typical student profile had test scores maybe in the 
50th percentile” to a more elite and selective institution where the 2018 admission rate 
will land close to 13%. Overall, the admissions operations at USC is very large as 
Brunold has about 130 people who report up to him including directors of undergraduate 
admission, graduate admission, and orientation.

USC has admitted international students since its inception as the first graduating 
class included a woman from Japan. As Brunold reflects about the international 
recruitment plan at USC:

We weren’t late to the game, we didn’t say wake up in 2005 or 6, or 7 and say, 
“Hey, there’s this international market out there, let’s go tap it.” We had hundreds 
of international students in the 40s and 50s.

USC has consistently enrolled international students, and in its most recent 
history, has been a leader among higher education institutions due to the volume of 
students enrolled. Table 22 displays the international student enrollment, by country at 
USC for the 2017-2018 academic year.

As over 25% of USC’s undergraduate population is made of international 
students, significant support is provided by a centralized office at the university, the 
Office of International Services (OIS). This office falls within the Division of Student 
Affairs, which at USC falls under the purview of the Provost. Tony Tambasica is the 
Executive Director of OIS who outlines that the mission of the office is to “provide 
service, support and advocacy for USC’s international students and scholars, incoming 
international students and scholars.” Further, the students that come through this office 
are generally F-visa and J-visa holders. As Tambasica points out about USC, “There are 
other departments on campus separate from us that handle employment-based
Table 22

2017-2018 USC International Student Enrollment, by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>USC Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>5,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>1,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,374</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


immigration, so USC faculty and staff immigration cases is another area completely.

With over 10,000 students receiving support from OIS, the workload for this office is constant and includes supporting students by providing visa compliance support and immigration assistance, (such as setting up bank accounts) to providing what Tambasica describes as “non-immigration related types of support” such as “advising, programming, event planning and things like that to help support the population.”

Internationalization Strategies

While USC has a long history with a commitment to internationalization, most recently, its 2011 Strategic Vision outlined how the university will continue to execute these strategies. The motivation for strengthening its internationalization efforts stems from the notion that USC believes it must continue to be a leader in the Pacific Rim due to its unique positioning: “The university’s breadth, size, diversity, location, international character and global research have positioned it as the intellectual, creative and cultural wellspring for the Pacific Rim and emerging societies in Asia and Latin America” (USC,
Strategic planning subcommittees were then charged with addressing themes outlined throughout the Strategic Vision.

Specifically, the subcommittee entitled “Global Connections” was charged with answering the following question to ensure the university’s alignment with the strategic plan: “What does it mean to be a global university? What institutional attributes will be necessary to achieve this status?” (USC, 2011, p. 8). The committee outlined that, to address the charge, they sought guidance from key reports created by the university within the past 5 years. The subcommittee then found four key themes of focus that they recommended to be used when continuing to expand USC’s internationalization strategy: (a) research, (b) student experience, (c) learning environment, and (d) service and global citizenship. Particularly of interest, the subcommittee report outlines a vision, philosophy and core principles that the university should use toward their actions of (what they call) globalization. These core principles are:

1. USC does not have wholly-owned brick and mortar campuses in foreign locations.
2. USC only partners with the highest quality institutions wherever we offer teaching, research and service collaborations.
3. USC fosters initiative and entrepreneurship in our globalization efforts through a highly decentralized approach. (USC, 2011, p. 9)

The subcommittee further recommended that these core principles should continue to be used as a guide when crafting the next global strategy for the university. On November 6, 2015, the Provost, Michael Quick (2015), announced to the USC community that work will commence toward a new strategic planning process.

Most of USC’s strategies are led and executed within the Office of the Provost. The office outlines that one of their key initiatives is Global Engagement, which is
implemented through a variety of different programs. Table 23 outlines the key outbound and inbound internationalization initiatives within the Office of the Provost.

In regard to study abroad programs, which fall under the Provost’s Office, Quick outlined the following perspective toward study abroad:

At USC we want to go from study abroad to doing abroad. What that means is that it is not enough that students are taking a semester to study Spanish in Spain. We want our students to be fully engaged in the world; understanding problems from different perspectives, thinking about how to make a difference across the globe, and doing that both locally here in Los Angeles and taking that experience out into the world. (USC, 2017, 0:01-0:39)

This perspective deviates from the traditional viewpoint of study abroad programs in the early 1900s (and still today) where students were led by faculty to study language in another country.

Overall, USC’s vision stems from the president who has outlined throughout his speeches and publications the university’s commitment to preparing students for a globalized world. As an example, Nikias, Chan, and Sironi (2015) published the article, “Building a New Global Higher Education Model,” in the Huffington Post where he discussed why the WBB program was created at USC:

The goal is to prepare confident executives who are socially and professionally fluent in international settings. We do this by facilitating real-world experiences and face-to-face meetings with leaders so students can understand foreign workplace cultures and business climates. Students are regularly exposed to leading international executives, including most recently, the chairman of Disney International, and the chief technical officer at Nestlé USA. (para. 7)

As USC continues to try to be a leader in international higher education efforts, its mission, vision and strategic planning serves as a guide to the university in how to implement its internationalization strategies.
Table 23

Examples of USC Global Strategies Under the Office of the Provost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Global Responsibility of Administration under the Provost</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Study Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Core Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Office for Strategic and Global Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• USC Marshall School of Business: World Bachelor in Business (WBB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• USC Viterbi School of Engineering: iPodia Classrooms without Borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• USC International Artists Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Office of International Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• USC Dornsife College of Letters, Arts and Sciences Overseas Study Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• USC International Academy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAPTER 5 – FINDINGS

This chapter is divided into three sections and describes the findings from this study as guided by the following research questions:

1. What external forces affect universities’ internationalization strategies?
2. In what ways do external forces affect universities’ internationalization strategies?
3. How do universities adapt to external forces that have affected or may affect their internationalization strategies?

In this study, internationalization strategies applied to the outbound mobility of academic programs (e.g., study abroad programs) and the inbound academic mobility of students (e.g., enrollment of international students) at U.S. higher education institutions (HEIs). In addition to the interviews conducted for this study, other main data sources included documentation, archival records, and observations. The first part of the chapter discusses the findings that focused on external forces, the second section discusses the findings as related to the effects of external forces, and the final section discusses the findings that addresses how universities adapt their internationalization strategies to external forces.

**External Forces Shaping Internationalization Strategies**

When examining the responses from this study on the external forces shaping internationalization strategies, a thematic analysis was conducted, which is the process of noting “relationships, similarities and differences in the data” (Ravitch & Carl, 2016, p. 222). As described in Chapter 3, there were overall 267 different answers provided to this research question. These responses were assessed and coded, from which seven themes emerged, including subthemes within each major theme. Table 24 outlines the seven themes and their subthemes that emerged from the research.
Table 24

*Findings: External Internationalization Forces: Themes and Subthemes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>• Competition With Other HEIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Global Economic Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>• Location of the HEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Location of Study Abroad Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>• Shifts in Job Market, Technology, and Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Usage of Globalization Terminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political &amp; Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>• U.S. Political Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• International Political Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• United States and International Cultural Landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>• Perception of Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Study Abroad Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• International Student Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Power</td>
<td>• United States Soft Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Canada Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal University Forces</td>
<td>• University Presidents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To further describe these findings, a thick descriptive examination of the seven different themes is provided in this section. As Ravitch and Carl (2016) highlighted, “It is the role of the researcher to provide thick description so that thick interpretation can be made and then presented to readers” (p. 201). Thus, providing a thick description of the different themes—which ultimately make up seven external forces—allows for “thick interpretation and ultimately thick meaning of the study’s findings for researchers, participants, and research audiences” (p. 201).

**Economics**

Theories of economics emerged in this study, which included perceptions of the U.S. and world economies, supply and demand of global education, shifting populations, human capital theory, and the awareness of the return on the investment in education, particularly driven by financial costs. The Economics theme emerged across all cases,
applying to inbound and outbound mobility, as participants discussed choices to internationalize based on resources either gained or used for such initiatives. According to Toutkoushian and Paulsen (2016), “Economics is the study of choice. It is a social science that focuses on how decision makers use their resources (such as money and time) in pursuit of their goals” (“Introduction,” para. 1). Toutkoushian and Paulsen (2016) examined the economics of higher education to understand the behavior of higher education stakeholders, such as students, administrators, and faculty. This behavior is examined to delineate how decision makers allocate resources to pursue goals, which, when applied to this study, refers to internationalization strategies.

Three major subthemes surfaced under this theme in this study: (a) Competition With Other HEIs, (b) Cost of Education, and (c) Global Economic Stability. Each of these subthemes emerged in regard to the enrollment of international students and students studying abroad.

**Competition With Other HEIs.** The research conveyed that participants from the three institutions in this study understood that they are competing for the best students, the strongest reputation, and/or to be the best institution. They discussed a general observation that inbound and outbound mobility programs are created as a part of a strategy to compete for best students. Often, the inbound and outbound mobility strategies are aligned, as they are used to attracting the best students to come into the university—in other words, an enrollment management strategy. The inbound mobility strategy is centered around enrolling the best international students, whereas the outbound mobility strategy is sometimes an element of an enrollment management strategy to enroll the best students [international and domestic] as such students are
seeking institutions with such outbound international experiences. Overall, it was observed that, by seeking to enroll the best students, universities are competing with other HEIs. For example, Tambascia reflected that such competition is a “good thing” for the institution and the higher education sector:

I think such a large proportion of institutions are making [inbound/outbound mobility programs] a key part of their identity and their strategy that there’s more competition, there’s more interest, and it’s a more challenging time to maintain a level of leadership and attainment in this area. When you think about it, it’s probably a win-win for all institutions because those that were perceived to be highly rated when it comes to international initiatives have to work harder to keep that perception.

In this study, participants articulated internal metrics to measure success. For example, Mantella noted that, within NU, senior leadership and the Board of Trustees identify a series of metrics that are “emblematic of driving the agenda” of the university. Mantella continued to outline elements such as measuring the “level of research, level of philanthropy, profile of the entering class, graduation rates, number of students completing in four years, loan debt, and the international [mobility of] outgoing and incoming [students].” Most participants in each case study also indicated an overall awareness of what other peer institutions are achieving. For example, Walter from BU reflected:

If you’re not benchmarking against what other institutions are doing, you could conceivably lose out. Again, I don’t worry so much about BU. I really don’t, because we’re in a strong market position, but it doesn’t mean we don’t have to be smart.

In another example, Brunold from USC discussed that while his work is not to “chase rankings,” he does know that senior leadership and the Board of Trustees are aware of the rankings.
Across the three universities, participants noted that competition with other HEIs had emerged over time as a newer phenomenon, especially in regard to competition for international students. For example, Tambascia noted how competition has evolved throughout his time at USC:

Many more institutions have gotten involved in competing for the best international students. And, I think USC, like most other places, is much more intentional now about recruitment and outreach and marketing globally than it was certainly when I got here 24 years ago.

Participants from all three universities discussed an intentional approach on how and to whom they are recruiting for their entering class. For example, Walter mentioned:

[Boston University] could fill [its] class with students from China 10 times over. Of course, that’s not what we want to do because it’s not just about hitting a percentage of international students, but it’s really about a geographic diversity, cultural diversity, and nationality diversity.

Such recruitment for the best students was noted by Markot, which she observed had resulted in “fierce” and “tremendous competition” with other institutions “for the best brains” resulting in “everybody coming up with different tricks” to attract and retain the best students. These “tricks” include different types of study abroad programs or internationalization programs, which can also be a factor that attracts students.

Differential factors were discussed, meaning that the universities focused on and used factors to separate themselves from other HEIs when competing for students. The participants from the three institutions indicated their “differential” factor gave them an edge or advantage within the higher education market. For most, the factor that made their institutions distinct was the institution’s internationalization efforts—inbound and outbound mobility. However, there was an awareness throughout the interviews that the U.S. higher education landscape is rapidly expanding internationally, and many are
seeking ways to further strengthen that differential factor to continue to stand out against competitors. McFeely discussed how BU and other institutions are reacting to such competition:

If other institutions see the potential for them to be different by moving into our space, then that will provoke the need for us to react as well. We’re hardly the only institution that has tried to define itself by its international frame of mind. And so, we have to be reactive to that, as well as to try to stay out in front of the pack.

In looking to bolster their differential factors, participants from the three cases noted efforts to strengthen their research reputation or existing experiential education programs, such as NU’s co-op program or the internship program at BU.

Ledford also observed such actions among his university clients, sharing, “Universities know they can’t wait for students to come to them; they have to meet the students where they are.” By doing that, institutions have to offer “alternative modalities for education” as the international learner may not reflect the traditional U.S. learner, which Ledford described as an “18-year-old man or woman who is ready for a 4-year educational experience with no family, or burdens, or job [as an example].” Ledford added that the traditional student is not the same in different parts of the world; thus, institutions are feeling pressure to “meet those students where they are” within their lives and their educational needs.

This concept of “meeting a student where they are” becomes more complex as U.S. HEIs have recently found themselves competing with non-U.S. HEIs. Participants noted that, previously, recruitment efforts focused on the U.S. HEI market, yet the strength of non-U.S. HEIs has increased competition. For example, institutions within Canada, Australia, and the United Kingdom were noted as having recruitment strategies...
and schemes that would differentiate them against the U.S. HEI market. This included the creation or strengthening of sophisticated work visa programs for students or offering degree programs at lower tuition rates than U.S. HEIs.

**Cost of Education.** Two cost areas were discussed in this study: (a) the cost to study abroad, and (b) the financial impact from the enrollment of international students. First, the perceived cost to study abroad for a traditional semester was discussed as a deterrent for students, but it was noted that there are other factors students take into consideration beyond financial cost. For example, Ambrose discussed how NU has evolved to where they can now offer financial support to students who study abroad—an initiative in which the university was not engaging about 10 years ago. However, she noticed that, although students may receive financial assistance, the university had to take into consideration other factors, such as the “developmental level” of the student, specifically their “self-efficacy skills” and “level of confidence.” Students also examine the overall benefit to spend a period of time outside the United States by studying at another institution, especially if the experience may be perceived as restraining their academic and social progress at the home campus. Ambrose further noted that a student may make a decision either to participate or not in a study abroad program simply based on social elements, such as a boyfriend or girlfriend at the home campus, thus not wanting to leave them for a semester or 6 months.

The cost of studying abroad for Americans was also a finding, as there is a perception that international institutions identify U.S. students as being “wealthy.” As Markot noted, there is “an appetite [from international institutions] for getting American students [to enroll in their study abroad program] for revenue.” She added, “Not everyone
is made of easy money [and] we can’t put it all on the shoulders of our students,” even though there is a perception that U.S. students have a lot of wealth or easier access to money than students from other countries. This, ultimately, is interpreted as U.S. students having the means to afford to study abroad.

Generally, U.S. HEIs use three different cost models for charging their students for study abroad programs: (a) home tuition model, (b) cost-plus model, and (c) market price model (see Table 25). The research portrayed the cost models for study abroad programs offered by each university in this study is very similar; thus, it is not a “one cost model fits all” type of model. For example, the BU Study Abroad website outlines the costs for studying abroad compared to a regular semester in Boston:

> Generally, the cost of study abroad is the same or less than a semester at Boston University, but study abroad fees sometimes include extras like air fare and great excursions. Most forms of Boston University financial assistance travel with students; however, some forms of financial aid (such as work/study arrangements) may not transfer. (BU, n.d.-c, para. 7)

NU outlines that the costs of its study abroad programs vary by program:

> Northeastern tuition covers all academic costs for most study abroad programs. Housing and all other non-academic costs are the responsibility of the student and will be paid directly to the relevant vendor, host institution, or program provider. Below is a more comprehensive breakdown of the study abroad costs for which students are responsible and those for which Northeastern University is responsible. (NU, 2018b, para. 2)

The USC’s Dornsife College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences website mentions two types of cost models for its study abroad programs:

**USC home school tuition:** Regular USC home school tuition ($25,721 semester in 2016-17) is charged for the following programs: USC Madrid Center, USC Paris Center, UK Programs (except BADA), Sciences Po Exchange, Trinity College Dublin Exchange & CUHK Exchange.
Table 25

Cost Models for Study Abroad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Models for Study Abroad</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Tuition Model</td>
<td>Students going on a campus-sponsored study abroad program are charged full home tuition and sometimes required fees. The funds are used to pay tuition and fees and/or courses organized by program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-Plus Model</td>
<td>Where the home institution’s tuition revenue is not sufficient to pay the basic direct program costs, the institution will add an extra fee “or a study abroad administrative fee” to cover estimated overhead costs. As a result, fees differ by program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Price Model</td>
<td>A multistep approach that includes an analysis of the different programs, their various components, and the costs for their services. Then, after analyzing the overall price range, place the program accordingly within that market price. For example, if the desire from the home institution is to be about one-third from the top and the range is $8,000 to $12,00, the program price is set at $10,600.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Program provider tuition + USC administrative fee: The program provider tuition is lower than USC home school tuition for the vast majority of programs. However, it is higher than USC home school tuition for the BADA London Theater Program and ICCS Rome. USC does charge an administrative fee for these programs: $2800 for semester programs and $5000 for academic year programs. (USC, 2018b., paras. 4-5)

In regard to the cost of education for international students, there was an awareness that since this group is not eligible for U.S. federal financial aid, they often are charged the full tuition cost. The attraction of students from outside the United States who could pay the full fee was viewed as a motivating factor to recruit international students by the entire higher education industry, as it helped increased the institution’s revenue stream. If the participants in this study did not directly discuss how international students who are paying full tuition benefited their institution, they discussed on a macro
level an understanding of how the revenue benefits their institutions—either financially or by increasing the diversity of the student body. Yet, for some institutions, the revenue is not the driving factor to increase international student enrollment. For example, Brunold from USC commented:

I always quip to people internally that we can find plenty of full-pay students in the United States if that’s our concern. I will tell you quite honestly that we’re not really going after international students because they tend to be full pay. Maybe you can say that’s an added bonus, but that isn’t certainly our driving factor for wanting them.

Further, just as U.S. students are perceived by international institutions as having access to money to pay for their study abroad experience, the same perception was noted for international students studying in the United States—that they are wealthy. Yet, as Wang from BU highlighted, that is not always the situation:

Not all international students are wealthy individuals . . . I do wonder if people, and I think they do still have a bias, in the sense that they make assumptions about our international students as if they’re all driving Ferrari’s and Maserati’s and can afford a fancy town home. . . . And actually, a large majority cannot . . . I worry a little bit about certain biases that people have towards our international student population and vice versa [and] how that could impact future enrollment.

Overall, the findings uncovered that the cost to study abroad and the revenue obtained from an enrollment pipeline of students who can pay the full tuition fee was understood as a key external force.

**Global Economic Stability.** The final subtheme that emerged from the Economics theme stemmed from discussions about various global economic situations and how they impact a university’s internationalization strategy. Global recessions and economic markets were mentioned as forces that affected the educational mobility of a student who was either studying in the United States or studying in another country.
During the interviews, the 2008 Great Recession was the most common economic situation mentioned by participants in this study. Described by participants as either the 2007 or 2008 “global downturn,” “market crash,” or the “financial crisis,” this time period was seen as an external force that impacted internationalization initiatives. During that time period, individual and university spending usually decreased as each looked for mechanisms to sustain revenue streams (Desrochers & Hulburt, 2016). As reported by Fisher (2010) in The Chronicle of Higher Education after the IIE released its 2008-2009 study abroad data:

The number of American students traveling abroad to study fell slightly in the 2008-9 academic year, the first drop in the 25 years that such figures have been tracked. . . . Study-abroad officials blame a confluence of factors, including the global financial crisis, rising fuel costs, the depreciating U.S. dollar, and even a swine-flu outbreak in Mexico, a destination that had been growing in popularity because of its low cost and proximity. (paras. 1, 3)

However, while the participants from all three universities in this study did not discuss how their study abroad programs were specifically impacted during the Great Recession, it was either noted because they were not working at the university or did not remember.

Regarding international enrollment, general economic situations—whether in the United States or other countries—were noted as an external force that affects the enrollment strategies of international students. As Tambascia observed:

Since the recession of the late 2000s, 2008, and beyond, I’ve sensed a real difference in sort of the mentality among our international students in that things are more challenging in the U.S. when it comes to long-term employment or employment after graduation. Many of our students go on to stay and work for some period of time in the U.S., but there seems to be less of an assumption that it’s going to just happen and more angst and more effort and more anxiety around it because things are just not quite as available today as they might have been on a relative basis even 10 years ago. But the economy affects everybody, so certainly international education is not immune to that.
Further, specific economic crises were mentioned, such as the 1997 South Korean market crash impacting South Korean student enrollment at BU and USC, and the strength of certain markets, such as the Chinese, Iranian, and Saudi Arabian economic markets. Overall, the economic theme was a dominate theme across this study.

Geography

As real estate agents often tell their clients, the most important factor is “location, location, location,” and this notion can be applied to the second external force found in this study: Geography. When asked what external forces affect their internationalization strategies, two subthemes emerged: (a) Location of the HEI, and (b) Location of the Study Abroad Program.

Location of the HEI. For BU and NU, the Boston region and its location on the East Coast of the United States was most often referred to as an attractive factor to international students. Further, it was also noted that Boston’s close proximity to certain global regions, such as Europe and central Asia, helps to enhance the inbound and outbound mobility of its students. The participants perceived that being located in another part of the United States would be a deterrent to internationalization efforts.

As Li from NU pointed out, Boston is a “great location” with “hundreds of thousands of students” in the city; it is an area that is dynamic in “intellectual pursuit.” Ledford noted that Boston is very attractive as it is “rich in university history,” as top-tier institutions such as Harvard and MIT attract the best and brightest from all over the world who want to be in Boston. When attracting international students to BU, Walter said the location of BU (in Boston, Massachusetts) helps defend the institution against many forces that may impact their strategies:
We’re in a major metropolitan area. We’re in a blue state. We’re on a coast, which international students want East or West Coast. We’re a high-ranked well-known prestigious university. I just don’t know to what extent we may be impacted in the same way as public flagship in [the Midwest].

While Boston is known for being a hub for universities, it has also been ranked as one of the top cities for students in the United States by Times Higher Education (THE) World University Rankings and Quacquarelli Symonds Limited (QS) Top Universities. As an example, Boston was announced as the number one city in the United States for students by QS in 2015 (QS Top Universities, 2015).

Although USC is located in the city of Los Angeles on the complete opposite coast from Boston, USC participants continuously outlined the importance of its location as an external force. The location of Los Angeles was continuously mentioned as an attractive factor for international students to attend USC. However, the notion of the Pacific Rim, which is the land that surrounds the Pacific Ocean, was mentioned throughout all USC interviews as a force that helps attract international students to this region.

Yet, the surrounding neighborhoods and diversity within Los Angeles is also an attractive factor. As Lamy noted about the location of USC within Los Angeles:

We live in probably the most diverse city in America, and all the places we go abroad, there’s a population here in USC. We are really committed to LA and the community. If you’ve ever been to LA, if you’ve ever been to USC, we’re downtown. We’re not on the west side in the wealthy section of town like UCLA is. That was not an anti-UCLA thing, it’s just that we are right in the heart of the city.

Further to that point, Brunold noted that there is an emerging multigenerational legacy at USC, which he does not think would exist if USC was “located in another part of the country.”
Location of the Study Abroad Program. Finally, participants mentioned the location of a study abroad program as an external force. Most noted that students are attracted to European destinations for a study abroad experience, whereas non-European destinations created an opportunity to diversify the university’s portfolio of offerings for students. Within Europe, western European cities, such as London, Brussels, and Paris, were often noted as popular study abroad destinations. The finding that European destinations are preferred aligns the data from Open Doors that reported the 2015-2016 leading study abroad destinations for students. Table 26 reflects this data, which demonstrates that six out of the top 10 destinations are European. It was also noted that, in these popular “traditional” study abroad locations, programs might reflect academic tourism more than a rigorous academic experience.

Yet, while students’ interest in a location may be a driver, the faculty could also be a driver for why a certain location is pursued. As Ledford reflected:

I think what you saw is an explosion of places that were both accessible because of the way travel changed. The changing faces of your faculty also opened up partnerships with countries from which they came. That is a big driver of that.

Markot reflected:

At some point in the 1990s . . . faculty led programs started to show up. That was an interesting trend that also continues [as] study abroad became less of a business of an office on the margins, but actually more a business of the educators and the universities.

In other words, universities shifted toward increasing programs where the destination was encouraged by the faculty, as demonstrated by each university in this study that has a faculty-led international program, such as NU’s Dialogues of Civilizations (DoC) and USC’s Passports Without Problems (PWP).
Table 26

U.S. Student Leading Study Abroad Destinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>2015-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>39,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>34,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>29,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>17,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>11,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>11,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>11,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>9,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>9,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>7,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Globalization

The theme Globalization emerged throughout the discussion, either when participants directly mentioned globalization as a concept, or when they indirectly discussed factors of globalization. As discussed in Chapter 3, globalization is defined as a phenomenon pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 290). The participants in this study discussed globalization as a force that affects internationalization initiatives, such as enrolling international students or creating study abroad programs. Two subthemes developed throughout the interviews: (a) Shifts in Job Markets, Technology, and Access; and (b) Use of Globalization Terminology.

Shifts in Job Markets, Technology, and Access. Throughout all of the interviews, participants described shifts in the global job market as forces that are “changing the world” and are increasing the pressure on students to be nimble in an interconnected global world. As Donovan White observed, students’ international
interests have increased, and institutions are realizing that “this globalization force” is at work, and it would “behoove students to have some exposure to that.” She further reflected that both the students’ interest and the institution’s interest have “worked in tandem,” which has resulted in a “greater number of programs to be offered.”

On workforce development due to globalization, Ambrose reflected, the “future world of work” is an external force with which HEIs are trying to align. This stems from the idea that the workforce will be more globally intertwined, and that the development of this workforce starts within higher education. She observed:

I think we are going to continue to see companies of all sorts looking at markets outside of the United States because, some of the fast and growing markets are not in the United States. And so, whether you are selling a physical thing or whether you are selling a service, chances are, you are going be making more money when you look toward Asia than you were when you look within the United States, toward Latin America.

Further, she observed that board members of the university, many of whom are CEOs of companies, have highlighted that they value a “global mindset” and “cultural agility” in those who work in their industries. She links this with the university’s strategy to increase access to more outbound opportunities for students. This notion also aligns with observations from Lamy who noted that former USC President Sample was known for telling students, “Throughout your life, you are not going to have one job, you are going to have many jobs, and they are going to be around the world.” Thus, the job market is believed to be moving in a direction that demands students be exposed to global experiences.

Participants noted technological shifts, such as an increase in automation and artificial intelligence (AI) and connectedness through the media and the Internet, as
impacting internationalization initiatives. In his book, *Robot Proof: Higher Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*, NU President Aoun (2017) discussed the changes in the workplace: “A generation ago, a person could spend four years of her life earning a bachelor’s degree and confidently expect entry into a lifetime of steady middle-class employment. This is no longer the case” (p. 17). Thus, there is pressure on institutions to update their approaches to learning. For example, Li noted there is pressure to be innovative “in order to survive” and that the institution must be “on the leading edge, on the frontier, and find the best technology.” He further mentioned the example of how online education “flipped the classroom” and was at first criticized for not being sustainable, and was even seen as “a joke,” as it was different from the traditional classroom.

In regard to inbound and outbound programs, participants noted how globalization has created opportunities to think differently about approaches to these programs. For example, Wang reflected on inbound and outbound programs, “Does the field of AI and robotics provide an opportunity for what programming we might develop for not just study abroad, for even ESL? I can’t even imagine what it would be like with robotics and AI and virtual reality and all the other technical things that clearly are way beyond my ability to understand it.”

Participants also discussed social media, which has increased awareness of global issues and overall connectedness with others from around the world. For example, in discussing how social media has impacted homesickness for students who study abroad, O’Connell commented, “I’ve never seen more homesickness from students before, and I think social media has a lot to do with that.” In other words, students can see the events
they are missing at home, in real time, through various social media outlets, such as Facebook, Twitter, and Snapchat. Further, participants discussed how students are more aware of situations in other countries due to the ability to access the Internet from almost anywhere in the world. For example, Ledford commented that due to increased media coverage, “people are acutely aware of challenges that are happening abroad.” Lamy adds:

I think the depth and the impact of the processes of globalization have increased dramatically and they increase every day. It’s a little thing. You go from a larger sample to a small sample. It’s the mom who’s on social media and is reading news of what’s going on in X and says, “You're not going there [or] I don’t want your roommate to be somebody from there.”

Additionally, participants noted increases in travel accessibility, especially at a low cost. These changes aligned with globalization as an external force impacting internationalization efforts. For example, Wang highlighted that “the ability to travel in the 70s and the early 80s has changed and opened up a lot of opportunities” for international education due to changes in the air travel industry.

**Use of Globalization Terminology.** As already discussed within the literature, there is often confusion surrounding the term globalization; in this study, it was important during the interviews to listen and assess how the participants used the word. Overall, the term globalization was mentioned 48 times throughout all of the interviews. Many participants used phrases to indicate their university has a “commitment to globalization,” a “strategy of globalization,” or that the strategy was to “globalize” the university. Thus, the terminology was not often clear and seemed to be used in different ways and for different reasons. This aligns with the confusion noted in the literature on the term
globalization and the current evolution of the terminology within the field of international higher education.

**Political and Cultural Landscape**

The theme Political and Cultural Landscape can be divided into three subthemes: (a) U.S. Political Landscape, (b) International Political Landscape, (c) U.S. and International Cultural Landscape. In this study, *landscape* refers to the current state of either politics or cultural trends within a certain region.

**U.S. Political Landscape.** Throughout the interviews, participants mentioned the U.S. political landscape with particular emphasis on President Trump’s Administration. At the time of the interviews, Trump had been in office between 8 to 9 months. When asked about the key external forces shaping international education today, participants overwhelmingly responded with an acknowledgement of the current state of U.S. politics, specifically U.S. immigration policies. Walter from BU reflected:

> This past year has been one of some ups and downs with the new administration elected last November—that probably many of us in Massachusetts didn’t see coming. With the very early announcements about the travel bans and the stricter visa vetting requirements, we immediately got to work on strategies to ensure that we would enroll a strong international class.

This tone resonated across all participants who discussed the series of executive orders that Trump signed in 2017. At the time of the interviews for this study (September through November 2017), Trump issued a proclamation putting restrictions on new countries (Chad, North Korea, and Venezuela) and removing restrictions from Sudan (The White House, 2017c). This gained national media attention, and universities worked to determine whether and how this action would impact their students and their institution.
In addition to interviewing university administrators, representatives from the university’s federal relations office or their Washington, DC lobbyist representative were interviewed to understand their perspective on external forces as it was important to get a sense of their perspectives on issues in the current political landscape. They also echoed that the Trump Administration’s policies, specifically the executive orders known as the “travel bans,” were key external forces impacting the internationalization efforts of universities.

Some participants also discussed state politics, such as legislative bills that affect study abroad. For example, Grodsky from BU noted that, in November of 2017, Representative Sean Maloney introduced H.R.4410—the Ravi Thackurdeen Safe Students Study Abroad Act—at the congressional level (U.S. Congress, 2017). The bill seeks to “amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional reporting on crime and harm that occurs during student participation in programs of study abroad, and for other purposes” (U.S. Congress, 2017, para. 1). The stimulus for this bill stemmed from an unfortunate accident involving Swarthmore student, Ravi Thackurdeen, who drowned off the coast of Costa Rica while participating in a Duke University-sponsored study abroad program (“Parents of Student who Died on Study Abroad Program,” 2017). If the bill passes, universities may have to alter their study abroad policies and operations.

Another U.S. law mentioned during some interviews that impacts study abroad and international students is Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments, 20 U.S.C. A§ 1681 et. seq. as described by the U.S. Department of Justice (n.d.):

Title IX is a comprehensive federal law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in any federally funded education program or activity. The principal objective of Title IX is to avoid the use of federal money to support sex
discrimination in education programs and to provide individual citizens effective protection against those practices. (para. 1)

This law also protects students from sexual harassment, and while this law is only 37 words long, it is the regulations and “Dear Colleague” letters issued by the U.S. Department of Education (2011) that have helped clarify the law’s role in higher education. In the April 4, 2011 Dear Colleague letter, the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights under the U.S. Department of Education, Russlynn Ali, issued a letter that further outlined sexual harassment and sexual violence. The letter required universities to provide students with accommodations if they are a victim of a sexual violence act. For U.S. and non-U.S. students who are enrolled at a U.S. institution and who study abroad through the university anywhere in the world, the U.S. university is still obligated to ensure that their Title IX rights are protected and upheld. For non-U.S. host institutions that do not fall under U.S. law but that instead fall under their own country’s laws and regulations, the situation can become complicated regarding who needs to know about the situation, what accommodations can and must be provided for the student, and how to respond to the safety of the student in the international environment. For example, a student from a U.S. university who is sexually assaulted in Europe during a faculty-led academic program may tell a U.S. faculty member leading the program about the situation. That faculty member may not know what resources are available in the host country, and they might also want to protect the student’s privacy and contact only individuals who need to know about the situation. This notion can be interpreted different ways, especially culturally.
**International Political Landscape.** The political landscape of countries outside the United States was also a major finding. Often, participants would mention situations in other countries that impacted the inbound or outbound mobility of students. For example, Lamy noted how USC is impacted by the international political landscape:

> Where we really are affected by the outside world is when there’s massive changes in international politics. [For example] we have a number of Korean students. They’re very concerned about what’s going on in North Korea. We have the Korean Studies Institute here on campus, which is very large and very influential, and they’re doing a lot of programs, but some of our South Korean students that are here are concerned what might happen over there.

Other examples included the demographic shifts within China, specifically related to its population and increased demand for higher education. Some participants suggested that they were starting to see national shifts in Chinese enrollment as China starts to build new universities within its country. However, Brunold mentioned that, while USC had not experienced such as shift in enrollment, he felt there was a sense that institutions are getting ready for changes in the market: “I know a lot of people who thought China was an endless ATM for student tuition dollars. We [at USC] haven’t really seen a slowdown yet in China, but it’s coming.”

Throughout all of the interviews, participants mentioned certain countries, cities, or regions more frequently than others, often in relation to the political landscape impacting their internationalization strategies. The frequency of certain countries and cities is noted in Table 27. The words “China,” “Asia,” and “Chinese” we frequently mentioned throughout interviews. In regard to sending students abroad, Markot reflected that the international landscape is something the NU Study Abroad Office is constantly monitoring. On her experience in international education in the past 20 years, she said:
Table 27

*Frequency of Countries, Cities, or Regions Mentioned in Interviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, City, Region</th>
<th>Frequency Mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Rim</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Everything in the diplomatic world is reciprocal. If you tighten the screws on your visa, somebody else is going to start tightening them on yours. What we are experiencing for the past 10 years has been the tightening of various [student] visa regulations in other countries . . . to the point of me having two people on my staff that do nothing but advising students on visas, particularly global co-op students because that [also includes knowledge of] . . . labor regulations.

Thus, study abroad offices often find themselves in a position to support the logistics on how to access their international program through visas, costs, and travel.

**United States and the International Cultural Landscape.** Shifts in populations within countries were mentioned as cultural phenomena that affected the internationalization initiatives of universities. Specifically, this impacted the enrollment of international students. For example, Walter mentioned that, in the 1990s, BU was starting to see a “plateau in the number of 18-year-olds graduating from high schools in the United States” and that, to meet enrollment targets created by the university, certain enrollment management decisions were to be made. This included either “sacrifice
quality and compromise standards [by admitting] students who are not as strong and well qualified or . . . looking for other pipelines for students.” For BU at that time, as Walter noted, “overseas students were a natural pipeline.”

Another cultural phenomenon that was noted was the assimilation of international students into U.S. culture once arriving into the United States. It was noted that with the increase in Chinese students within the United States, some institutions are struggling to diversify their university’s international student population and are trying to create meaningful ways to integrate their student populations. Participants from all three universities noted that Chinese students are often viewed as not integrating with other non-Chinese populations and are often a tightly knit and isolated group. Yet, some participants noted that, for some Asian students, it may not always be easy to make American friends, which results in the students leaning on each other. Participants noted that Chinese students appear to create their own peer advising structures and provide advice to other Chinese students on how to transition to U.S. culture, from where to live to how to succeed academically.

Lamy further discussed the concept of “Parachute Kids,” which is a term used to describe a population of Chinese students who come to the United States:

In the last decade, the number of Chinese students in U.S. high schools and middle schools has jumped from 1,200 to 52,000. More than a quarter of these students—called “parachute kids” if they come without their family—land in California. (Shyong, 2016, para. 10)

This group seeks to further their odds to get into a U.S. higher education institution by making family sacrifices. As Gao (2017) wrote, “Globalization and rapid wealth creation have put two Chinese traditional values at odds: family and education. Now,
more parents are willing to split their families apart and send their children here alone” (para. 11). In an added dimension to this phenomenon, Lamy indicated that USC’s reporting of how many international students are studying at USC would actually be higher, but international students who have lived in the United States for a period of time are not counted in that data.

Safety

The theme Safety emerged when interviews discussed external forces in the form of events that put their students at risk in inbound or outbound mobility programs. Three subthemes emerged: (a) Perception of Safety, (b) Study Abroad Safety, and (c) International Student Safety.

Perception of Safety. Safety was often referred to as a perception—that is, how students identify if a situation or place is protected from harm. The participants shared that, when students (and their parents) determine when and if they should participate in internationalization programs, they are making the decision based on their perceived safety. For example, O’Connell recalled that in the fall of 2014 during the Umbrella Revolution in Hong Kong, USC had 20 students slated to go in January 2015. He reflected:

I got so many phone calls from parents. “Oh, is my child going to be safe?” Then a few months later in January . . . the horrific shootings at Charlie Hebdo in Paris [happened], and the people who perpetrated that went to a kosher grocery store and shot people there . . . I had 20 students going to Paris as well in a couple of weeks . . . not one parent called me.

He mentioned that this response was aligned with a “feeling” of being safe and what students perceived as being in a safe environment. McFeely from BU also saw similar responses from their students, indicating that “the specter of international terrorism
doesn’t play out in the ways that we always expect,” meaning that sometimes a student’s perception of safety is not logical or rational. In other words, the rational thought is that, if an event occurs that is perceived as dangerous, then students and parents will contact the university to question if they should still attend a program in that area. For example, McFeely reflected that he had seen students seek out study abroad opportunities in Australia “because there’s a sense that that’s been preserved from some of the worst of the ravages of international terrorism.” Yet, students are still seeking opportunities in cities that have more recently been impacted by terrorism: “Paris or Brussels also remain strong [as destinations], despite the fact that those locations have been deeply impacted by terrorism in the last couple of years.” Overall, the perception of safety was a major external force mentioned in every interview.

**Study Abroad Safety.** Participants discussed safety as an external force, specifically how it affects study abroad in terms of health issues and international terrorism and violence. Examples of health issues that participants mentioned included large-scale global infectious diseases that have occurred in the past 10 years (e.g., Zika, SARS, and H1N1). The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, n.d.) defines SARS as

a viral respiratory illness caused by a coronavirus, called SARS-associated coronavirus (SARS-CoV). SARS was first reported in Asia in February 2003. The illness spread to more than two dozen countries in North America, South America, Europe, and Asia before the SARS global outbreak of 2003 was contained. (para. 1)

Walter mentioned that when the SARS outbreak occurred in Asia, BU was in a position to decrease enrollment from students from that region: “SARS definitely impacted us. It impacted every institution because the U.S. State Department wouldn’t allow anyone
who’ve been in a SARS-infected region into the country for all the right reasons. That definitely impacted enrollment.” Study abroad programs were also impacted as many returned home or did not send students at all. Other options were created, where students who were scheduled to study with CET Academic Programs in China moved and operated from BU’s Washington D.C. Center in the fall of 2003. Noted in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, “Approximately 50 of the 98 students originally set to go to China with CET Academic Programs will sign a ‘language pledge’ to speak only Chinese with one another in the streets of Washington” (“SARS Fears in China Prompt U.S. Study-Abroad Programs to Remain at Home,” 2003, para. 2). Additionally, as reported by *Daily Free Press*, the independent student newspaper at Boston University, in Fall 2003:

SARS has instilled fear in people around the globe, and that fear hit home for the only BU student studying abroad in Beijing last Thursday, when program coordinators on her study abroad program told her she would be flying back to America because of the illness. (“SARS Reaction Frustrates BU Student,” 2003, para. 4)

Ledford observed that such illnesses create a “chilling effect, given people’s concern about going [abroad] and catching something overseas.”

Terrorism, on the other hand, also can create a chilling effect and can have serious implications, such as physical harm and fatalities. As Lamy reflected, terrorism and extremism abroad has prevented USC from either continuing certain programs in certain regions of the world or has resulted in new locations being created: “We halted sending students to Turkey, [and] we closed a couple of our Middle East programs. We still have Jordan and Morocco, [but] we are very careful [about those programs].” Another example noted was the November 13, 2015 attacks in Paris that killed 130 people. NU had
multiple programs and communities in Paris. Northeastern News reported this the day after the attacks:

In the wake of yesterday’s tragedy, Northeastern University has been working around the clock to ensure the safety and well-being of university community members currently in the Paris region for work, study, or personal travel. The university is doing all it can to offer resources and assistance as needed to those abroad, as well as to those on the Boston and regional campuses with personal ties to France. (“Northeastern Students and Faculty in Paris are Safe, 2015, para. 1)

Grodsky also commented that parents also consider where their students are going for a study abroad and take into consideration if there have been terrorist activities, specifically citing the recent terrorist activities in Europe “that might impact parent’s willingness to allow their child to study abroad.” In recent years, Europe has seen a steady number of terrorist activities in places that have hosted study abroad students.

While not an entire list and while not all were discussed in the interviews, the timeline in Appendix D demonstrates terrorist activities in (mainly) Western Europe since 1988. In some incidents, students were directly impacted, such as the Lockerbie bombings in 1988; in other incidents, students were not physically injured, but experienced other effects due to the proximity of where they were studying within the city, such as the Paris attacks mentioned earlier. Overall, the safety of study abroad students was consistently mentioned as an external force throughout the interviews.

**International Student Safety.** Participants at all three institutions mentioned incidents where international students were at risk in the United States. This included incidents such as domestic violence and terrorist activities. For example, Lamy reflected on an incident where Chinese students died due to violence outside of the university’s campus in Southern California. As Lamy noted, the incident was “beyond the university’s
control” as the incidents were “off our property,” but the incident deeply impacted the student community.

Another example was the fatality of BU students and Chinese nationals, Lingzi Lu and Zhou Danling, who were victims in the Boston Marathon bombing in 2013. As reported in *The Chronicle in Higher Education* at that time:

Boston University’s campus is in shock as it mourns the death of Lingzi Lu, a Chinese graduate student in the mathematics and statistics department who was killed on Monday in the twin bombings near the finish line at the Boston Marathon. The university is also grappling with the serious injuries of Zhou Danling, a Chinese graduate student in actuarial science, who was with Ms. Lu when the first bomb ripped through the sidewalk near a set of bleachers. (Patton, 2013, paras. 1-2)

Lu and Dangling were watching the marathon together near the finish line when the explosions took place.

**Soft Power**

Soft power is the “ability to shape the preferences of others. If I can get you to want to do what I want, then I do not have to force you to do what you do not want” (Nye, 2008, p. 95). As outlined earlier by Altbach and Peterson (2008), the soft power of the United States is tested when it appears to be less open and more dismissive of the rights of others, making it less attractive. In the research, two subthemes emerged under the Soft Power theme: (a) U.S. Soft Power, and (b) the Canada Effect.

**U.S. Soft Power.** The theme Soft Power expanded to include the soft power of the United States as participants discussed reflections on how the United States is perceived internationally. As the three institutions in this study are U.S. HEIs, the soft power of the United States was referred to as a force effecting study abroad and international student enrollment. For many, this was often related to how certain
decisions made by the United States were impacting the perception of the United States outside of its border. For example, Markot reflected on this concept by highlighting how the foundation for the creation of the Fulbright Program, J-Visas, the Peace Corps, and government-sponsored cultural exchanges were built on the notion of increasing the United States’ soft power. She mentioned former Senator Paul Simon “who was a great friend of international education” and a catalyst for pushing and supporting programs in the Senate that would increase the positive perception of the United States abroad. For example, the mission of the Peace Corps outlines what Markot discussed:

Peace Corps Mission:
To promote world peace and friendship by fulfilling three goals:
1. To help the people of interested countries in meeting their need for trained men and women.
2. To help promote a better understanding of Americans on the part of the peoples served.
3. To help promote a better understanding of other peoples on the part of Americans. (Peace Corps, n.d., para. 2)

On the other hand, soft power was noted to effect international student enrollment. Specifically, with changes out of Washington, DC due to decisions by the Trump Administration, Bailey noted that there was an increased feeling of anxiety among students and prospective students about coming to the United States and to USC. The fear and uncertainty was related to whether a student would be able to get a job in the United States after graduation. According to Bailey, students’ perception was based on the fear that it might be more difficult to get a H1B1 visa or participate in the OPT program if the U.S. government removed such programs. Tambascia also observed that international educators found themselves responding to government actions that were “revolutionizing
the landscape” and “changing the perception of welcomeness” when coming to the United States.

**The Canada Effect.** Participants at all three institutions mentioned a perception of Canada’s increased positive soft power, which was described as The Canada Effect. Participants noted how Canada had used its soft power to increase its international student enrollment. As the current soft power of the United States was perceived as decreasing, Canada was noted as strengthening its soft power by creating the perception that Canada is a welcoming nation. For example, Walter commented that the United States “looks completely unwelcoming compared to Canada,” and that, because of this, there was a sense it will affect enrollments as more students consider going to Canada over the United States. Aoun also mentioned awareness of this phenomena, reflecting that other countries are competing with the United States for international student enrollments, but specifically mentioned that Canada is taking advantage of the restrictions to enter the United States by creating visa incentives for students who want to study in Canada. Further, Brunold discussed Canada but mentioned Australia and the United Kingdom also competing with the United States:

Institutions in Canada, institutions in Australia, and perhaps less so, institutions in the UK, are adding to their international student pitches lots of ideas and elements that are directly reflecting what’s going on in the U.S. now. Oh look, it’s easy to get student visas here, or you can work here for several years after you graduate. So, we know that our competitors for international students are absolutely cashing in on what we’re seeing right now in Washington.

There was an overall sense that other countries are looking to increase their soft power by trying to be perceived as a welcoming place that is open to all. Yet, if the United States is perceived as being a place that is “unwelcoming,” then the participants believed such a
perception would negatively impact the soft power of the United States, and thus negatively affect their university’s internationalization efforts.

Walter pointed out that the Canadian Prime Minster, Justin Trudeau, seems to be sending a clear message that all are welcome in Canada. For example, after Trump signed Executive Order 13769 (the “Travel Ban”) in 2017, Canada’s Prime Minster, Justin Trudeau, posted on Twitter: “To those fleeing persecution, terror & war, Canadians will welcome you, regardless of your faith. Diversity is our strength. #WelcomeToCanada” (as cited in Austen, 2017, para. 2). Participants in this study believed that Canada’s actions may have a serious impact on how students perceive the United States as a destination for their higher education experience.

Overall, the participants in this study reflected on how the external force, Soft Power, is out of their control, especially as countries and governments create actions in a vacuum that can ultimately impact another country’s soft power.

**Internal University Forces**

While not an external force per se, participants continuously mentioned internal forces throughout all interviews. Internal forces are anything within the structure of HEIs that is a stimulus for change. When participants mentioned such internal forces in earlier interviews, I reminded them that the study is focused on external forces. Often, they would correct themselves; however, on many occasions, participants mentioned internal forces again. Key internal stakeholders who were often cited included the university president, the board of trustees, alumni, and the faculty. For example, Brunold from USC reflected:
I think a lot of things at an institutional level will have to be the institutional will for [creating internationalization strategies] . . . and a lot of it came from the faculty, a lot of it came from the administration, a lot of it came from the Board of Trustees. These different groups of people have always been at USC filled with individuals who see the value of internationalization, see the value of globalization.

Additionally, University Presidents emerged as a key subtheme as participants mentioned this group as being a key force impacting internationalization efforts.

**University Presidents.** In all three cases, participants credited presidents for the start of the development of an international program. Their drive was associated with carrying out the mission of university. For example, Wang shared that BU’s CELOP program was founded because “President Silber had that vision,” and while he is an internal force, Wang reflected, “I think Dr. Silber understood that potential for growing. I think it was a way to differentiate.”

As Bailey reflected, the push to internationalize and for all USC schools to have study abroad programs “started with the prior president, Sample.” Lamy added to this, reflecting on when Sample came to USC:

> He began the process of trying to raise the profile of USC and enhance its quality in all areas. One thing he wanted to do was to make sure we were seen as a global institution and not just a Southern California institution.

USC Participants also mentioned Sample as being a key internationalization driver through his work in creating the Association of Pacific Rim Universities (APRU).

Additionally, participants mentioned a president’s ethnic background and personal experiences as a reason why they were a driving force. Brunold shared how USC President Hubbard was also the former Ambassador to India and that the current President, Nikias, is a Greek Cypriot who came to the United States as an international
student. The notion of the president’s personal background aligned with how Mantella described Northeastern’s expansion of their internationalization strategies:

The first thing that comes to mind is less external, but I think relevant, which is the orientation of [Northeastern’s] leadership . . . I would think that part of what you’d see, and institutions that take this on with sort of a vigor, is [that] they’re passionate in their leadership. I think [Aoun’s] personal passion [and] his own personal journey of being educated on three continents made this very central to the agenda [at Northeastern].

In all three cases, participants seemed to perceive presidents as the conduit to the external world or a force that is external to their own day-to-day work in international education. As this internal force is the decision maker for internationalization strategies, they are perceived to be the most important or major internal force.

External Forces Affecting Internationalization Strategies

The second interview question was: In what ways do external forces affect university’s internationalization strategies? Participants were asked about their understanding of how external forces (that they identified) are affecting their institution’s strategies. The major theme that came from these questions was that participants described the effects of the forces as “negative” or “positive.” Participants described a positive perception of the effects of an external force as being good, of value, or helpful to multiple communities, and they described a negative perception as bad, harmful, or detrimental to communities. As indicated throughout the interviews, participants described positive and negative external forces as creating positive and negative effects.

Positive Effects From External Forces

Positive effects are when perceived external forces result in effects that create, sustain, or stimulate the implementation of the internationalization strategy. For example,
regarding inbound and outbound programs, participants viewed the location of USC within the Pacific Rim as an external force that has multiple positive effects on the institution. Participants also viewed USC President Sample’s creation of the APRU as strengthening the USC reputation and brand internationally by being a member of this network. Further, the positive effects of the APRU for USC is the increase in academic partnerships, exchanges, and joint research efforts. As Tabascia reflects on inbound mobility, USC’s membership in the APRU network has also impacted their international enrollment as there is more awareness of the institution:

That network, that USC has worked to establish, has paid dividends in multiple ways, including continued strong recruitment of really good students, but also opportunities for faculty to get involved, opportunities for domestic students to go to different places, for internships, for study.

Another positive effect that participants discussed was the increase in tuition revenue from internationalization initiatives, such as international student enrollment. For example, participants perceived the political changes in China in 2007 as an external force that increased opportunities for Chinese students to enroll in U.S. HEIs. As Brunold reflected:

With the Chinese government changes that took place in 2007 [and] with the legalization of foreign curricula in public institutions [in China], a flood gate was really opened. I think that that act alone, the growing middle class, the emerging wealth in China, the inability of the Chinese higher educational system to serve all of the people who were looking for higher ed. That can’t be ignored, we certainly, USC certainly benefited from that surge.

As a result, since 2007, international enrollment increased in all three cases in this study, which participants perceived as a positive effect.

Participants noted positive effects for universities that offer study abroad programs; these programs are an attractive factor for students who are considering
whether to enroll at certain institutions. However, Lamy noted that, even if the university seeks out such a strategy, some students may be deterred from studying abroad due to cost. Seeking solutions to optimize options for students, Lamy discussed how he worked to create a program at USC—Passports Without Problems (PWP)—to encourage students to study abroad. Thus, PWP was a positive effect of the external force of economics as it created an alternative from a semester-long and often expensive study abroad experience.

Examining the effects that forces have on inbound and outbound mobility programs, Ledford observed that many institutions “recruit more international students because it helps with the tuition base [and] the business sense on study abroad [side] is it helps you recruit students because they are seeking that as a key component of any school they accept.”

As another example of a positive effect of external forces, Markot recalled how policies and procedures were created in response to the tragic events on September 11, 2001. Markot reflected on how the events affected her work back then: “I started a new job on September 4th, 2001. I inherited a new office. There were 65 students slated to study abroad that fall.” She further reflected on how the office kept paper files on where students were going, but it was not very organized:

In a week’s time [from starting her new job], September 11th happened. Of course, everybody wanted to know where the students are. There was no mechanism for me to, in an instant, to say, “That’s where they are.” We had to close the office [and] three of us combed through these files and discovered who was where. There were some students stranded along the way. No student was [harmed].

As a result, her office created an in-house database to easily access where students were. Overall, the research demonstrated that external forces can result in positive effects, such
as an increase in revenue, access to international education, and strengthening of internal systems.

**Negative Effects From External Forces**

Participants viewed negative effects of external forces as either hindering, stalling, or ending the implementation of the internationalization strategy, such as the elimination of certain study abroad programs. With the increases in enrollment, revenue, and recognition, as discussed earlier, participants discussed how there is an increased demand to better serve students and be better prepared to address issues that arise, such as low retention rates of international students. Participants discussed the negative effects as an increase in their daily work load, which resulted in stress or a demand for more resources.

As Li noted, when he entered Northeastern, the graduation rate of international students was not low, but was also not as high as the domestic graduation and retention rate. He was invited to join a subcommittee that focused on the retention and graduation rates of international students. This subcommittee was led by the Provost’s Office and asked members to conduct an assessment of student data and create a report for the Provost. As Li shared, “We [at Northeastern] are not only interested in . . . marketing, recruiting and bringing [the students] here, but [we are also interested in] how we can sustain their good experiences so that they stay and graduate.” He discussed ways his team is tasked to work with students academically and socially to ensure students are retained and graduate. Another example is from Walter who commented that, with BU’s expansion in international enrollments, there was a need to expand resources in the Admissions Office to focus on international recruitment:
My director of International Admissions has nine people on her staff. We’ve gone all in making sure that we have the expertise in the admission’s department about international education systems around the globe, immigration policies, visa processes, obviously recruitment. We do all the credit evaluations for transfer students that are coming into the university from universities overseas. It is a unit that is quite strong, very robust but . . . has expertise that no one else at the university has.

In regard to outbound study abroad programs, a negative effect from external forces that participants observed is when the increase in demand for study abroad programs, locations, and participants results in an increased demand for certain services for the students. For example, study abroad administrators need to understand international laws and visa restrictions of other countries to ensure students can actually enter the home country to study abroad. If administrators are unable to assist, it can be a deterrent for students, as noted by Markot from NU:

You have to jump over hoops [that] weren’t there before. 20 years ago, we excited the students about going abroad. Now it’s not just excite the students going abroad, but also carry them through this obstacle course, saying, “You can do it. We can help. We know how. We can help you here.”

Additionally, as students are studying across the globe, time zones can impact a traditional work day, as work can happen during off hours. For study abroad, there was an overwhelming tone that global programs require that student resources at the home campus be available and that students can expect an immediate response 24 hour a day, 7 days a week. However, due to time zones and elements that are out of the control of the institution, such as international politics, the resources may not always be in place. As Wang reflected:

I worry about our team burning out. It’s basically 24/7 now, because we do have a responsibility. We enroll so many students overseas, there is bound to be something just based on the volume and the number of places . . . and it often happens . . . on a weekend . . . when we’re ready to try to decompress.
Another example is when the cultural landscape has a negative effect. For example, Redden (2017a) reported, “Three Chinese students have agreed to plead guilty to cheating on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and will likely be deported” (para. 1). Student Yue Wang was paid to take the TOEFL by other Chinese students who gained admission to Arizona State University and Northeastern University. After gaining admission, “the students then obtained visas from the U.S. State Department based on their admission offers” (Redden, 2017a, para. 2). The pressure to pass and be admitted resulted in a negative effect where the students being arrested, in their trial, pleaded guilty and were ultimately deported from the United States.

Participants provided other examples of external forces throughout the interviews that created negative effects, such as U.S. political policies having a negative effect on universities. Specifically, participants continuously mentioned Trump’s executive orders as a negative force that negatively affected their institution’s strategies. Participants perceived this force as being negative as it increased the stress and workload for the universities. For example, at NU, Leshan outlined how a task force at the university was called together by President Aoun:

The president and the senior leadership team put together a taskforce for responding to the Executive Orders and tried to really make sure that we were helping students at the grassroots level on the ground. But also thinking about what he could do in terms of pushing back on these Executive Orders, and . . . about how we needed to work with our congressional leaders to help. . . . Then that taskforce also has recommended, in partnership with the senior leadership team, that we sign an amicus brief opposing the executive order. There was a ton of work around that, and [those that] ran that taskforce and continued to work on those issues . . . we had daily emails about those issues.
Overall, a major theme that emerged from the research is that participants understood external forces to have either positive or negative effects on the university’s inbound and outbound internationalization initiatives.

**Adapting to External Forces**

The survival of the institution in today’s global age is dependent on how well that institution can adapt during times of change (Cameron, 1984). The findings from the three case studies demonstrate that BU, NU, and USC have extensive internationalization strategies specific to students’ outbound and inbound mobility. As Cameron’s (1983) adaptation framework outlines:

> By thinking about strategies in terms of their emphasis on domain defense, offense, and creation, administrators are able to determine appropriate responses to conditions of decline that are more consistent with theoretical prescriptions and have a long-term potential for success. (p. 375)

Further, the three different domains, as defined by Cameron (1984), include: (a) domain defense, which is designed to enhance the legitimacy of the organization and buffer it from environmental encroachment; (b) domain offense, which is designed to expand in current areas of expertise and exploit weaknesses in the environment; and (c) domain creation, which is designed to minimize risk by diversifying into safer or less turbulent areas of the environment. Questions 7 to 9 in the interview protocol in the study (see Appendix C) were designed to align with Cameron’s framework. Answers reflected various types of inbound and outbound international initiatives that demonstrated how the universities sustained, expanded, or created new internationalization programs.

Participants from all three universities mentioned that their university had a history of enrolling international students and sending students to study abroad, an
initiative that initially was created to enhance the university’s place within the market. When I asked participants how they understood their institution’s ability to sustain such programs, responses often noted groups from within the university, such as presidents and faculty. For example, Brunold suggested that USC sustained such initiatives because of the “institutional will for [sustainability]” and because of the drive of the faculty at USC. Walter reflected a similar tone, citing BU’s internal collaboration efforts across departments such as enrollment management and the Office of Global Programs. Because of this, participants discussed each university’s infrastructure throughout the interviews. The findings indicate that the management of these initiatives varies. For example, at BU and NU, study abroad is centralized within the university, falling under the leadership of the Provost. Whereas, at USC, study abroad is decentralized and falls under the management of different colleges. International enrollment management units are centralized across each institution in the study. Additionally, once the international students are enrolled in the university (or its programs), the management of their success also fell under a centralized office at each institution.

When asking BU, NU, and USC participants how they have expanded within this framework, they often provided examples that reflected programs that shifted the paradigm of outbound semester-long study abroad programs to shorter and often faculty-led international programs. As an example, Lamy at USC refers to Dornsife’s attempt to expand within the framework by creating “boutique programs,” such as PWP, Maymester, and faculty-led spring break programs. Another example is NU’s Dialogues of Civilization programs.
Finally, participants in this study gave similar responses when they discussed how their university has expanded beyond their current internationalization models. For example, participants at Northeastern discussed how the co-op program expanded their model to include co-op experiences outside of the United States. As Leshan discussed, the strategy to expand co-op globally involved a huge effort throughout the university, which he highlighted: “It was not easy to do, so I wouldn't underestimate [the process included to expand].”

On the recruitment of international students, Brunold discussed how USC expanded beyond their campus recruitment efforts by opening “Global Offices” in different cities around the world. As he described them:

> These are simply embassies for the USC. They often have a director, a couple of staff members, and, basically, they exist to help with academic partnerships, alumni relations, government interactions, they help us a little bit with recruiting, although they don’t come up and report through me.

Today, the offices are in Hong Kong, Shanghai, Beijing, Mumbai, Mexico City, Seoul, San Paolo, and London. Brunold shared that the main purpose of these offices is “to get the USC brand out there.” He continued, “If we want USC to be considered a global institution, [then] we know one of the best ways we can do this is to have a presence.”

Overall, the participants in this study shared the diverse types of international programs offered at their institutions. Table 28 demonstrates some of the international programs mentioned throughout the interviews.

**Summary**

The findings revealed that participants in this study from BU, NU, and USC perceived seven internationalization forces that are affecting their outbound and inbound
Table 28

**Examples of Inbound and Outbound Student Mobility Programs at BU, NU, & USC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Examples of Inbound Mobility Programs</th>
<th>Examples of Outbound Mobility Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boston University</strong></td>
<td>• International Student Enrollment</td>
<td>• Undergraduate and graduate study abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• International Students and Scholars Office (ISSO)</td>
<td>• First-year study abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Center for English Language and Orientation Programs (CELOP)</td>
<td>• Faculty led programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research collaborations and partnerships</td>
<td>• Study Abroad BU Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northeastern University</strong></td>
<td>• International Student Enrollment</td>
<td>• Full year international programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• International Global Offices</td>
<td>• International Study Centers (London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Office of Global Services for domestic and international students, within the division of Enrollment Management Student Affairs</td>
<td>• Research collaborations and partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pathway programs within the College of Professional Studies</td>
<td>• International Branch Campus developments in Toronto, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Southern California</strong></td>
<td>• International student enrollment</td>
<td>• Undergraduate and graduate study abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research collaboration such as Pekin University and the Rossier School of Education</td>
<td>• First-year study abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Office of International Services, within the Division of Student Affairs</td>
<td>• Faculty exchanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty exchanges</td>
<td>• International volunteer service opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Master’s program in collaboration with international universities, such as University of Edinburgh on global governance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

international mobility programs. Participants perceived these forces as having positive and negative effects on internationalization strategies. Finally, participants at all three institutions demonstrated that they have adapted to these forces by creating programs to sustain their initiatives, expand within the framework of their initiatives, or expand beyond the framework of their strategies.
CHAPTER 6 – ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The conceptual framework from this study was used to provide a deeper context for the research and to guide the analysis and discussion of the findings. To make meaning of the findings, this chapter examines the seven external forces and their effects, discusses loosely coupled organizations, and provides an analysis of the different domains from Cameron’s (1983, 1984) framework as applied to the outbound and inbound mobility internationalization programs of Boston University (BU), Northeastern University (NU), and the University of Southern California (USC).

Internationalization Forces

As outlined in Chapter 5, seven external forces, or Internationalization Forces, were identified in the research as affecting inbound and outbound internationalization efforts. The major themes that surfaced throughout the interviews with participants at BU, NU, and USC included these seven forces. As demonstrated in the research, external forces have historically affected international education, whether it has been from wars, such as the European World Wars in the 20th century, or the rising costs of education as demonstrated in the early 21st century. Because of this, it is important for higher education institutions to understand the external world outside of the campus border to sustain, expand, and further create internationalization initiatives.

Original Framework Versus Findings

In the original framework of this study, five external forces were acknowledged and used to guide the research. However, as the findings outlined, seven different forces were identified. While some of the final forces were similar to those outlined in the original framework, some were very different. The original framework was based on
concepts discussed in the literature, whereas the final Internationalization Forces were based on the findings in this study (see Table 29). To further demonstrate how the seven final forces differ from the original framework, an analysis was conducted (see Table 30).

In examining how the seven forces emerged, for example, the Soft Power theme was originally framed as the soft power of just the HEI and emerged into a theme about the soft power of the United States. In the conceptual framework for this study, the reputation and the external perceptions of the university were considered to be an external force. However, after assessing the data from the interviews, the Soft Power theme emerged to include the soft power of the United States as participants shared reflections on how the United States is perceived internationally and how these perceptions affect study abroad and international student enrollment.

To further demonstrate the Internationalization Forces and how they affect internationalization strategies, Figure 6 reveals a conceptual model of the findings from this study. The arrows from the external forces pointing at the HEI International Strategies box denotes that these forces are affecting internationalization strategies. Within the External Forces circle, arrows are pointing from one external force to another external force as each force can affect another force. For example, the political and cultural landscape of a country could result in an increase in terrorism effecting safety. Finally, as internal forces were a key finding, Figure 6 also demonstrates the intersection of internal forces with external forces affecting internationalization strategies. Overall, multidimensional forces affect international education.
The findings in this study revealed that participants understood two external forces—economics and globalization—as dominate forces impacting internationalization strategies. Many times, throughout the interviews, these forces would overlap in discussion, with participants either citing that globalization was driving economic situations, or vice versa. In this section, the two forces will be discussed and assessed further in depth.

**Economics.** Discussion about the economics of higher education revealed how competitive international higher education is and how competition has grown beyond the borders of the United States. What determines the best? A contemporary exercise is to use the world ranking systems as a market guide. Rankings of HEIs and programs is not just U.S.-centric, but actually a global phenomenon (Marginson & Van der Wende, 2007) and tend to be more generous toward highly selective institutions, such as the institutions in this study (Kulkarni & Rothwell, 2015). Ranking systems tend to be valued as students often use them as one of the many factors that help them to determine the best return on their higher education investment. Yet, as Hakelkorn (2015) highlighted, “While many
### External Forces: Original Framework and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Forces: Original Framework</th>
<th>External Forces: Research Findings</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>Globalization remained a theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deglobalization</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Deglobalization was referenced only as a phenomenon as it relates Globalization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Power of the institution</td>
<td>Soft Power</td>
<td>In the original framework, this was a narrow theme applied only toward the university’s soft power. The findings led to a broader connotation to include soft power of the United States, other countries, and the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the U.S.’s hegemonic role</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>This was not mentioned directly during interviews but discussed in relation to the Soft Power of the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnational events (political and economic)</td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>The original framework resulted into three new themes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political &amp; Cultural Landscape</td>
<td>(a) Economics: emerged as a dominate theme throughout interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>(b) Political &amp; culture landscape: discussed as an amalgamation of political policy, culture, and structures within countries such as U.S. Executive Orders, international immigration laws, and population shifts. Therefore, politics was not discussed as an event, per se but rather as a description of the overall state of affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>(c) Safety: Terrorism was discussed a result of transnational events; however, this was re-framed as “Safety” when other themes emerged such as health and domestic and international violence consistently emerged within the research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Internal University Forces</td>
<td>Geography was not mentioned in the original framework but became a theme as the location of the institution or its internationalization inbound/outbound activities was discussed throughout interviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While not considered an external force, *per se*, internal forces were discussed in every interview as either the interviewee considered the internal force to be physically external to their department or unit, or the force was such a strong conduit to the external world.
[higher education] leaders claim they do not overemphasize the rankings, few [higher education] leaders or senior administrators are either unaware of their own rank or that of their national or international peers” (p. 91). Thus, in this study, although participants did not articulate using the ranking systems to achieve a competitive edge, it was clear from the interviews that their institutions were aware of the value of them and spoke of the metrics used to achieve institutional goals, which actually align with achieving high rankings. For example, student selectivity was discussed, which was a variable used in the methodology of the U.S. News & World Report rankings (Morse, Brooks, & Mason, 2017). Thus, the rankings have emerged into a tool often used by students and institutions to participate in the global economy (Hakelkorn, 2015).
Additionally, the U.S. HEIs in this study acknowledged that the competitive playing field has expanded to include non-U.S. HEIs, as demonstrated by the subtheme, The Canada Effect. U.S. HEIs are finding that they are not only competing with the similar institution down the street (such as NU and BU), but now a similar institution in another country, thus, a space where globalization and economics intersect for U.S. higher education.

The economics literature noted that “land, labor, and capital” have historically been the three resources “used in the production of goods and services” (Toutkoushian & Paulsen, 2016, “Background,” para. 5). As noted earlier, education is an international tradable commodity, as recognized by the U.S. Department of Commerce under the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) and by other nations in their international political economic policies. Further, organizations, such as NAFSA, have also highlighted the economic benefits to society, citing that, in 2016-2017, international students studying at U.S. colleges and universities contributed $36.9 billion to the U.S. economy (NAFSA, 2017).

However, the work of Becker (1993, 2008) has been influential in shifting the economics paradigm to think about the impact of human capital. In Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis With Special Reference to Education, Becker’s study of human capital expanded beyond the traditional economic framework and looked at how the investment into human resources impacts economics. Adapted from his earlier works, Becker (2008) later noted:

To most people capital means a bank account, a hundred shares of IBM stock, assembly lines, or steel plants in the Chicago area. These are all forms of capital in the sense that they are assets that yield income and other useful outputs over
long periods of time. But these tangible forms of capital are not the only ones. Schooling, a computer training course, expenditures of medical care, and lectures on the virtues of punctuality and honesty also are capital. That is because they raise earnings, improve health, or add to a person's good habits over much of his lifetime. Therefore, economists regard expenditures on education, training, medical care, and so on as investments in human capital. They are called human capital because people cannot be separated from their knowledge, skills, health, or values in the way they can be separated from their financial and physical assets. (paras. 1-2)

For a university, the focus on internationalization showcases an institution’s choice in investment of human capital beyond the traditional classroom. Thus, across all three cases in this study, participants saw the value in expanding a student’s human capital globally. The concept that the economy is important is not a new phenomenon. In more contemporary times, the phrase, “It’s the economy, stupid,” which was the battle cry of the Bill Clinton presidential campaign when advisor, James Carville, outlined this phrase to remind the campaign team of the importance of the issue when trying to win the election. Similarly, in higher education today, it is clear that economics is a major force impacting internationalization strategies.

Globalization. While competition is an economics force, competition can also be driven by globalization. As noted earlier by Scott (2000), “Globalization reflects discourse and competition, resulting in a phenomenon where order and alliances are redrawn and shifted” (p. 6). Thus, while economics is a force that impacts internationalization strategies, it is also affected by and affecting globalization, thus the intersection of these two dominate forces.

While often not clear about what was meant or how participants were using globalization terminology, after analyzing the transcripts from the interviews to further
understand such comments and other references to globalization, there are a few interpretations of how the participants were using the term globalization:

1. **Misuse of term**: The use of the term globalization was an actual misuse of the terminology. The word “globalization” was used when the word “internationalization” should have been used to describe the phenomena that participants were referencing.

2. **New use of term**: The participants used the term to describe education as a globalization force. That is, education is pushing for a greater global interconnectedness and interdependence. Therefore, there is emerging a new use of the term globalization.

Based on this, there may be a new use of the term globalization related to higher education. As the findings revealed, participants used the word “globalization” to describe education as a globalization force. That is, education is pushing for a greater global interconnectedness and interdependence. Thus, there is a new use of the term globalization emerging. This tends to break away from Altbach and Knight’s (2007) definition of globalization, which was used in this study: “the economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement” (p. 290). Based on the findings, the definition of globalization may be shifting toward the following definition: the economic, political, societal, and educational forces pushing the world toward greater international involvement.

This notion aligns Bovens and Wille’s (2017) research. In their article, “Globalisation Has Made Education the New Political Cleavage in Europe,” they discussed how a new social divide is being created: those who are educated and those who are not. Political cleavages are associated with the research by political scientists, Lipset and Rokkan (1967), who discussed how different groupings, blocs, or cleavages within society are indicators of political party alignment. They found that four major
social divisions within society impact how the political parties align: (a) center-periphery (ethnicity), (b) state-church (religion), (c) rural-urban (economic), and (d) owner-worker (occupation; Lipset & Rokkan, 1967). However, Bovens and Wille discussed that a new political party cleavage has emerged that is based on education attainment. Thus, education may be emerging as a globalization force, which would align with how participants referred to the notion of globalization. Additionally, the subtheme of de-globalization is salient when thinking of education as a force of globalization, as it describes the retraction of globalization. Specifically, participants referred to the U.S. political foreign policy under President Trump, known as “America First,” to demonstrate this notion. America First is the idea of anti-globalization or American nationalism. For example, as Lamy from USC noted, there is a fear of globalization that was demonstrated in recent elections in the United States and the United Kingdom.

Further, he highlighted USC’s work regarding the increases in globalization:

> We need to teach about [globalization] and understand the process, because it’s not going to go away, and we need to create institutions to manage it. Our whole theme in terms of the preparation of students here [at USC] is we’re preparing you for a job that may change 10 or 20 times, and one where you’re not necessarily going to work in the United States.

Lamy outlined how USC is serving as a force of globalization: by teaching and preparing students to go into a world after graduation that demands their ability to work in interconnected markets. Thus, the concept of education as a force of globalization can be interpreted as education causing and requiring greater international involvement. This flips the paradigm of education being seen as a passive player on the sidelines reacting to globalization efforts to now a driver of globalization. The emergence of higher education as a force is still evolving. As Aoun noted, “We, in higher education, are still
approaching it as internationalization rather than globalization of higher education, and that’s the opportunity.” This view may also indicate that there are institutions that see higher education as a globalization force.

If education is considered a globalization force rather than an entity *reacting to* globalization, then the role of universities is shifting. Bovens and Wille (2017) discussed how political cleavages around education are emerging:

> We argue that at a deeper level it is not just globalisation or the EU that drives this contestation. The new political divide is also rooted in demographic changes, it is a manifestation of the rise of a more structural, educational cleavage. It’s no longer just the economy, stupid, it’s education. (para. 1)

Overall, there is a steady drumbeat demanding universities to be key drivers in global workforce development, thus shifting the university’s role in globalization. As a driver, education is impacting globalization, and as this study outlined earlier, education may be emerging as the new globalization force creating political and societal cleavages. Institutions are both the drivers and are responding to the demand. Thus, the role of higher education to effect change through its internationalization initiatives is evolving and changing.

**Scanning the Political Landscape**

For U.S. HEIs, internationalization requires the understanding of politics beyond the traditional U.S. university campus. External affairs or federal affairs divisions within the university have generally been charged with scanning the U.S. political landscape. As participants from this study demonstrated, each of the three universities have advanced efforts to put boots on the ground in Washington, DC and work closely with a public affairs office to maintain a constant life line to the political developments on Capitol Hill.
Yet, as institutions continue to increase their international presence, the demand for international information increases. This includes an understanding of visa entry requirements, political affairs in other countries (e.g., election results and legislative actions), how to access resources in other regions (e.g., medical, safety), and how to assess the evolving language and cultural norms (e.g., public and religious holidays, gender rights). Overall, the universities in this study have enormous pressure placed on them to ensure they are constantly scanning the political landscape.

**Perception of Internal University Forces**

Participants from the three universities in this study perceived forces from within the university as a driving external force for internationalization initiatives. While an internal force is anything within the structure of the HEI that is stimulating change, the interpretation of why internal forces was mentioned in a study on external forces is simply based on how the participants perceived such forces. Either they thought internal forces were external because they were physically external to their department or unit, or because the internal force was such a strong force serving as an outlet to the external world. As there was an overwhelming number of responses that indicated internal forces are a key external force driving internationalization strategies, stricter attention was given to the analysis of their response.

Generally, in all three cases, participants named the president as one of the most powerful forces affecting internationalization strategies. As swiftly as they can create the strategy for the institution, they can swiftly remove it. The effects of their actions are large and can be positive or negative. A president’s actions may be perceived as a
negative or positive external force, and the response of the internationalization unit can result in positive or negative effects.

Environment Analysis Tools

When the external forces in this study were first identified, they resembled elements from Michael Porter’s (2008) five forces and elements of strategic management acronyms, such as PESTEL. Porter’s five forces include the examination of the following five areas: (a) threat of new entrants, (b) threat of substitutes, (c) bargaining power of customers, (d) bargaining power of suppliers, and (e) industry rivalry, whereas a PESTEL analysis encompasses the examination of the following factors: (a) political, (b) economic, (c) social, (d) technological, (e) environmental, and (f) legal (Kaplan & Norton, 2008). Both are often used as environmental analysis tools, especially when it comes to external forces.

However, the internationalization forces identified in this study are specific to the work of international higher education and the strategies universities create and implement. While PESTEL is a tool to help identify factors in the external environment, it differs from the Internationalization Forces in its focus on geography, globalization, soft power, and safety.

Effects of External Forces on Internationalization Strategies

The first research question of this dissertation asked what the external forces are, and the second research question sought to uncover how these forces affect internationalization strategies. The major theme that came from these questions was that participants perceived forces as “negative” or “positive” and used such terms to describe the effects of the force. Participants described a positive perception of the effects of an
external force as being good, of value, or helpful to multiple communities, and they described a negative perception as bad, harmful, or detrimental to communities. As indicated throughout the interviews, positive and negative external forces created positive and negative effects. Positive effects created, sustained, or stimulated growth of the implementation of the strategy, whereas negative effects either hindered, stalled, or ended the implementation of the internationalization strategy. Overall, four different type of circumstances could result from positive/negative forces and positive/negative effects.

To help demonstrate this concept, the coordinate plane in Figure 7 further exhibits how external forces affect internationalization strategies. The x-axis represents the effects of external forces and the y-axis represents the external forces. The coordinate plane includes four quadrants, and the placement of each force and effect is based on whether each is positive or negative. For example, if the external forces are positive and the effects are positive, this was plotted in Quadrant I, the upper right quadrant. Each quadrant is described by a theme that emerged after the forces and their effects were plotted. These themes are:

- Quadrant I: Beneficial
- Quadrant II: Stressful
- Quadrant III: Harmful
- Quadrant IV: Creative

The following sections discuss the findings from the research and how they align with each of these quadrants.

**Quadrant I: Beneficial**

The Beneficial quadrant demonstrates the results when perceived external forces are positive and the effects of the external forces are something that helped or was of
Figure 7. How external forces affect internationalization strategies.

value to the university’s internationalization strategies. The product of positive external forces and positive effects is beneficial to the institution.

For example, a positive force was USC President Sample’s creation of the APRU (Internal University Force). Participants viewed the APRU as strengthening the USC reputation and brand internationally by being a member of this network. Participants noted that academic partnerships, exchanges, and joint research efforts were created as a
result. As Tabascia reflects, USC’s membership in the APRU network has impacted their international enrollment as there is more awareness of the institution:

That network, that USC has worked to establish, has paid dividends in multiple ways, including continued strong recruitment of really good students, but also opportunities for faculty to get involved, opportunities for domestic students to go to different places, for internships, for study.

The APRU is an international consortium that fosters “collaboration among faculty, students, and university leaders” (USC, n.d.-l, para. 6). Overall, the APRU elevated the importance of the global academic community in this region.

Another example of a positive force-positive effect relationship was Ledford’s observation that many institutions “recruit more international students because it helps with the tuition base.” Ledford continued, “The business sense on study abroad is it helps you recruit students because they are seeking that as a key component of any school they accept.” In other words, when the external forces are positive, study abroad participation and international enrollment increases, which, as a result, can increase revenue for the university.

Brunold from USC noted that there was a general perception that, today, the “global market is strong,” and as a result, there is a fair amount of openness, a fair amount of free trade, and I think a general willingness to cross borders both in education and in business. We are benefiting from the fact that there is emerging wealth in several developing countries.

Overall, the label Beneficial is applied to positive external forces and positive effects, as the effects are beneficial for all those who are involved, including the students and the institution. The benefits vary and can include increased tuition, enrollment, and brand recognition of the institution.
Quadrant II: Stressful

The Stressful Quadrant comes into play when the external forces are perceived as positive and their effects are negative or perceived as something that hinders internationalization strategies. For example, participants perceived the political changes in China in 2007 as a positive force since these changes increased opportunities for Chinese students to enroll in U.S. HEIs. As Brunold reflected:

With the Chinese government changes that took place in 2007 [and] with the legalization of foreign curricula in public institutions [in China], a flood gate was really opened. I think that that act alone, the growing middle class, the emerging wealth in China, the inability of the Chinese higher educational system to serve all of the people who were looking for higher ed. That can’t be ignored, we certainly, USC certainly benefited from that surge.

With the increase in international students, there was an added pressure to serve a population that culturally may have been different to the institution. As outlined earlier through examples from the findings, the institutions attempt to increase enrollment of students from certain regions resulted in an increase in pressure on various units: retention rates were being revaluated, there was a demand for more staff within certain areas (e.g., enrollment management), and the knowledge requirements increased. All factors can cause tension throughout the institution, especially if there is a high demand for units to be agile in response to such changes.

Overall, while positive external forces can help to create and sustain the university’s internationalization strategies, their effects can also create pressures and stress on existing infrastructures within the university. Thus, the label “Stressful” is applied to positive external forces and negative effects.
Quadrant III: Harmful

The Harmful quadrant represents external forces that are perceived as negative and their effects are perceived as something that hinders a university’s internationalization strategy. Unlike the Stressful quadrant where universities could still respond to the external force, thus limiting its effect, this quadrant is the most dangerous of all quadrants as universities are unable to control any of the effects from the negative forces.

Most participants referred to the external force, Safety, as a negative force and provided examples of negative effects that included fatalities or physical harm. Donovan White noted further negative effects, such as international educators being pulled away from focusing on student learning objectives in study abroad programs to instead focus on discussions around security. There is a lot of attention being given to student safety and threats. She commented:

You can try to sit down and have a more cerebral, theoretical, conversation about student learning with a group of international educators, and [usually] within 20 minutes, [the conversation] will turn to security . . . security related safety . . . like responding to emergencies, sexual assault, Title IX.

Participants sometimes noted certain U.S. political policies as external forces that might have a negative effect. Participants described the negative effects as an increase in the workload and or internal pressures to quickly rectify the situation or change it completely. Overwhelmingly, participants admitted that the changes related to immigration coming out of Washington, DC had increased their workload, either due to longer workdays, planning of town halls, or participating in internal task forces to assess the possible impact of the changes on the institution. Overall, the negative effects from
negative external forces create situations that are harmful to internationalization strategies. Thus, the label “Harmful” is applied to this quadrant.

**Quadrant IV: Creative**

The Creative quadrant demonstrates when external forces are perceived as negative and the effects of the external forces are perceived as something that helped or was of value to internationalization strategies.

For example, in response to the negative economic external forces, such as the cost to study abroad, Lamy created PWP. He recognized that some students were deterred from study abroad due to cost, so he thought of ways to navigate around the academic calendar and tuition payment schedule to create a short-term faculty-led program. He noticed that, even if you provided a study abroad scholarship, students may need further financial assistance as the cost to study abroad can be very expensive when taking into consideration the flight and housing and meals abroad. PWP is a short-term, faculty-led program that takes students to global and domestic areas to conduct problem-based learning. As the USC website describes the program:

> Most, if not all, of the societal problems or challenges we face are transnational or global in nature. These problems like global climate change, pandemics or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction are global challenges that do not belong to a single country. These are “problems without passports.”

PWP was created in response to negative external forces, and, as a result, an innovative program was created, which, as Lamy notes, “increased the number of students going abroad.”
Finally, another example is how the negative perception and changes in the political landscape resulted in the USC community thinking of new ways to serve their international student population. As Tambascia reflected:

In a period of disruption and a period of change what we try to do to navigate is to be a source of stability. We can’t take ownership and predict everything the federal government’s going to do, the President, Congress, anybody else, different agencies. But we can try even harder to be seen within our own community as a credible source of information so that there’s a trust that is maintained despite the uncertainty and the sort of apprehension that exists within the community.

Overall, this quadrant demonstrates how negative external forces can result in creative, innovative programs, and strategies for the institution.

Organizational Structure and Strategies

“Colleges and universities are extremely vulnerable to outside pressures” (Julius, Baldridge, & Pfeffer, 1999, p. 115); as such, it is imperative that the organizational structure of the university can function with these pressures. As noted, the institutions selected for this study are large, loosely coupled, private universities that have a large population of international students enrolled at their institutions and a large population of students who study abroad. The findings from the research revealed that key administrators from BU, NU, and USC identified seven Internationalization Forces that affect their inbound and outbound internationalization strategies. These forces have either a positive or a negative impact on their strategies; this study demonstrated that there are four different ways to categorize the effects of these forces resulting in positive or negative effects. The key component of what contributes to the outcome becoming negative or positive is the level of control the internationalization unit has within the organizational system (and perhaps in the external environment). The cases in this study
were identified as being a part of loosely coupled internationalization systems; thus, their level of control is stronger than perhaps a unit in a more tightly coupled system.

**Internationalization Strategies**

Internationalization strategies are generally not easy to initiate. It involves focus on and an understanding of the complexity of the cultures and groups involved. The complexities intensify when considering the different motivating factors for why internationalization occurs. As this study demonstrated through the examination of the literature, there are three primary groups within higher education that are motivated to participate in internationalization initiatives: students, governments, and universities. Each group comes to the table with their own needs and agendas. This study focused on universities.

Once they are implemented, internationalization strategies are usually collaborative, multicultural, and multilayered. In other words, internationalization strategies do not occur in a vacuum. As noted, this study was guided by Mintzberg’s (2007) work on strategies, specifically deliberate and emergent strategies: a “deliberate” plan is about controlling the environment with a plan for how to implement it, while an “emergent” plan is one that develops as a reaction to the environment or from something that has been learned. Internationalization strategies that focus on the inbound and outbound international mobility of students can be developed as either a deliberate or emergent plan (Mintzberg, 2007).

In this study, universities demonstrated more emergent internationalization strategies than deliberate strategies. For example, participants at the three universities indicated target enrollment percentages for their international enrollment, but they did not
maintain control of certain environments outside of their institutions, such as the economic or population shifts in other countries. Thus, their universities afforded these units a high level of autonomy to accomplish their internationalization goals. The university’s leadership often provided indicators or signals to units as to what the university’s strategies are. These signals are similar to “moon shot” strategies. As discussed earlier, the term moon shot refers to a “difficult or expensive task, the outcome of which is expected to have great significance” (Anthony & Johnson, 2013, para. 1). In the case of internationalization strategies, universities have created internal signals, moon shot statements, or indicators. The universities in this study presented these strategies in a variety of ways, which included: (a) strategic plans, such as formalized strategic plans that generally utilized language to reflect emergent strategies or tactics; (b) speeches, such as commencement or State of the University addresses that signaled future internationalization efforts; and (c) mission and vision statements that often use the word “global” or “international” as an adjective to describe the enhancement of a key function within the institution.

The ability for strategies to adapt to external forces can depend on the organizational structure of the university. As outlined in Chapter 4, the universities in this study have unique and different internationalization structures. Each case demonstrated that all internationalization efforts are not centralized through one department or unit. Instead, individual areas are charged with oversight for various aspects of the internationalization strategies. For example, the management of the enrollment of international students was found to be in a different division of the university than the study abroad office or the offices that provide services for international students. These
units are not always working directly with one another, and if they did, it would reflect a more tightly coupled system. The three universities in this study have loosely coupled internationalization systems related to the outbound and inbound mobility of students.

**Loosely Coupled Systems and Internationalization**

The conceptual framework used to guide this dissertation showed that BU, NU, and USC have large, loosely coupled systems. Such organizational structures can maintain substantial control of its environment, hence allowing a greater ability to adapt to external forces. As Weick (1976) outlined, “Loose coupling [is meant to convey] that coupled events are responsive, but that each event also preserves its own identity and some evidence of its physical or logical separateness” (p. 3). Specifically, this notion is revealed when applying this framework to units that are focused on the implementation of internationalization strategies within loosely coupled systems. The findings from the cases in this study aligned with this concept.

Weick (1976) further outlined “seven potential functions that could be associated with loose coupling” (p. 6), and when examining these seven functions alongside the cases in this study, the analysis further conveys that loosely coupled systems are indeed adaptable. For example, in Table 31, an analysis of Weick’s seven functions is applied specifically to loosely coupled systems with particular focus on the implementation of internationalization strategies. Weick discussed elements of response, knowledge, adjustment, isolation, autonomy, and resources that systems must take into consideration when adapting. Overall, and most compelling from this study, is that internationalization units within loosely coupled systems have the ability to maintain some level of control when effected by external forces.
Table 31

Analysis of Weick’s Functions and Dysfunctions of Loose Coupling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Functions and Dysfunctions of Loose Coupling</th>
<th>Analysis Applied to Internationalization Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Loose coupling lowers the probability that the organization will have to or be able to respond to each little change in the environment that occurs.</td>
<td>The entire university does not have to respond to the external forces. Instead, the level of response or adaptation will and can vary by unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Loosely coupled systems preserve many independent sensing elements and therefore “know” their environments better than is true for more tightly coupled systems, which have fewer externally constrained, independent elements.</td>
<td>Internationalization units are more capable of understanding how to adapt to external forces that impact internationalization strategies then perhaps other units within the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Loosely coupled systems may be a good system for localized adaptation. If all of the elements in a large system are loosely coupled to one another, then any one element can adjust to and modify a local unique contingency without affecting the whole system.</td>
<td>If an external force effects one unit within the university, then the entire university may not be affected when that one unit adapts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A loosely coupled system could preserve more &quot;cultural insurance&quot; to be drawn upon in times of radical change than in the case for more tightly coupled systems. Loosely coupled systems preserve more diversity in responding than do tightly coupled systems, and therefore can adapt to a considerably wider range of changes in the environment than would be true for tightly coupled system.</td>
<td>The bandwidth to what a university responds and adapts to is quite large. It is able to adapt to many different external forces ranging from those that specifically impact internationalization strategies to those that impact other non-internationalization departments or units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If there is a breakdown in one portion of a loosely coupled system, then this breakdown is sealed off and does not affect other portions of the organization.</td>
<td>If “breakdown” is interpreted as negative external forces, then how an internationalization strategy can adapt to negative forces impacts the effect within the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In a loosely coupled system, there is more room available for self-determination by the actors.</td>
<td>That is, actors within units can manage and operate with more autonomy. More research is needed to examine this function.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A loosely coupled system should be relatively inexpensive to run because it takes time and money to coordinate people.</td>
<td>In this study, more research is needed to examine this function.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, point five of Weick’s (1976) framework can be applied to internationalization strategies: “If there is a breakdown in one portion of a loosely coupled system, then this breakdown is sealed off and does not affect another portion of the organization” (p. 7). If “breakdown” is interpreted as negative external forces, then this claims the loosely coupled system can isolate the effects from the negative force (or the situation) from spreading to other areas within the university. For instance, negative effects from the external force (e.g., international political landscape) should not be able to spread into non-internationalization departments (e.g., residence life or dining services) if the internationalization unit can adapt, thus creating very limited, if any, consequences within the university. Overall, understanding the internal structure allows a deeper appreciation for how a university and its strategies can adapt to external forces.

Expanding on the examples of the loosely coupled functions in Table 31, negative or positive effects can emerge. Using point five again to demonstrate how negative external forces impact control of the environment, let us apply the external force, Safety, to the coordinate plane. The effects of a negative external force (Safety) could result in either positive or negative effects. When plotting these effects in the coordinate plane, the effects can be plotted in the creative quadrant (positive effects) or harmful quadrant (negative effects). The ability for the internationalization unit to isolate an incident from other areas of the university will determine into which quadrant the effect falls.

For example, if students participating in a study abroad program were in danger and needed to be evacuated from the country in which they are studying, the response by the university could be to evacuate or not evaluate the students. This could result in positive or negative effects. The negative effects, for example, could result in situations
that are dangerous to the students or harmful to a university’s reputation, whereas the positive effects could result in the students being evacuated to a new location not used by the university before or the creation of new safety protocols for the university. This example is demonstrated and is plotted in Figure 8. Within this example, the effects of the negative external force can be plotted on a continuum of the line “effects.” The level of resources and the ability to respond and adapt within the institution can thus determine which quadrant the effect can be plotted.

**Adaptation**

This study employed Cameron’s (1983, 1984) framework to guide the research and further understand how universities adapt to external forces. In focusing on conditions of decline in higher education, Cameron (1983) discussed how HEIs are generally ill-prepared to “cope with or manage effectively conditions of decline” (p. 359). Generally, HEIs are focused on managing growth, not decline. However, as this study demonstrated, conditions of decline can occur as an effect of external forces that are either understood to be negative or positive. Additionally, conditions of growth can also result from external forces that are either negative or positive.

Cameron (1983) further outlines that there are three reasons why HEIs are not equipped to deal with conditions of decline: (a) generally, most HEI administrators or managers have been responding to conditions of growth; (b) the values and ideology of HEI culture has shifted to emphasize growth, as it is generally viewed that bigger is better; and (c) most organizational theories are focused on responding to growth, not decline. Thus, for the institution to adapt to external forces, both decline and growth must be taken into consideration.
Figure 8. An example of how universities can adapt to negative external forces.

As portrayed in the findings, BU, NU, and USC have extensive internationalization strategies, specifically related to the enrollment of international students and sending students to study outside the United States. An analysis was conducted by applying the findings of this study to Cameron’s (1983, 1984) three domains—defense, offense, and creation—to assess what strategies institutions create to adapt to external forces.
Domain Defense

The research examined how BU, NU, and USC sustained their internationalization efforts. All three universities have a history of enrolling international students and sending students to study abroad, and the institutions have benefited by such initiatives. Thus, all three universities in this study have achieved domain defense through the “traditional” initiatives. Labeling study abroad programs as traditional reflects a university’s long-standing internationalization program that sends students to another country for a semester where they earn academic credit. Labeling the enrollment of international students as traditional reflects the university’s initiative where there is an effort to enroll students who are from outside the United States.

Internationalization initiatives were created as a defense to the external forces that were present at various times for each institution. Participants from all three cases discussed that their institutions have adapted to one of the dominate external forces—Economics. For example, international student enrollment was a result of the competition within the market, and, as such, BU, NU, and USC continue to enroll international student within their institutions. This action allowed the three universities to each defend themselves against “environmental encroachment” (Cameron, 1984, p. 128) due to external competition. As a result, their work was enhanced as demonstrated by their expanded execution of study abroad programs and formalized international enrollment strategies.

Domain Offense

Each university in this study accomplished domain offense as each university demonstrated that they expanded their offerings beyond “traditional” study abroad and
“traditional” international student enrollment. The expansion of these traditional programs, or domain offense, as Cameron (1983) outlined, “may include the expansion of current markets, or student groups, using current resources to engage in extra non-traditional activities” (p. 374). In this study, all cases demonstrated domain offense activities that aligned with this framework.

For example, at NU, the increase of pathway programs housed in the College of Professional Studies has been an opportunity for the university to expand admissions opportunities to international students. Through programs such as its Pathway bachelor completion program and English language preparation program, NU accepts qualified students by creating alternative entry points. Other examples include how BU, NU, and USC expanded their study abroad programs through the implementation of faculty-led programs. Such programs allowed their institutions to continue providing international experiences, but at lower costs for students.

Cameron (1983) outlined that domain offense is also a mechanism to “cultivate alternative revenue sources” (p. 374), which creative international recruitment strategies and programs that increase study abroad participation allow. Further, domain offense strategies “provide ways for the institution to remain effective and efficient using current capacities. The institution simply does more—more aggressively—of what it now does well” (Cameron, 1983, p. 374).

**Domain Creation**

According to Cameron (1983), “Domain creation strategies might include completely new program offerings in high demand areas, acquiring subsidiaries, capital investment, or public-service ventures in previously unexplored areas” (p. 375). Based on
the interviews with participants, each university demonstrated domain creation strategies in a variety of ways.

For example, NU announced in November 2016 that it signed an agreement with the Fundación Antonio Núñez Jiménez, or FANJ, to increase environmental research by expanding into Cuba (St. Martin, 2016). In February 2017, President Aoun signed the most far-reaching agreement between an American university and the University of Havana, a collaboration that includes co-op and other educational opportunities, as well as research partnerships in areas such as coastal sustainability, rare tropical diseases, and the social sciences. (St. Martin, 2017, para. 2)

In this study, Leshan discussed how the university was “working with the State Department on various issues, [for this partnership] especially around [the] effort to expand and have co-op and research in Cuba.” Incidents such as President Trump’s June 2017 announcement to cancel the Obama Administration’s deal to open up Cuba and the horrific Category 5 Hurricane (Irma) that hit the island were viewed as challenges for growing the initiatives. As Leshan commented, as a result of these events, the Cuba initiative is “not completely shutting down by any means, because it’s an educational activity, but just making it more challenging.” NU’s expansion of internationalization programs into Cuba aligns with Cameron’s domain creation.

At BU, domain creation was reflected in its expansion in London through the creation of its London Study Center. However, Walter noted a new pilot program at BU that started in 2017. While BU generally has not worked with pathway programs, Walter mentioned a program of about 40 students who “were not competitive for admission, not for academic reasons but language proficiency reasons.” She reflected that BU created a
semester-long program where they would work with students to improve their English language skills and that if they achieve the bar that we set for them, they will be able to enroll at Boston University in January. It is the first time we’ve done that, but our fall enrollment is not at all reliant on any pathway programs. That reflects how robust and strong our pool is. We are just shy of 61,000 undergraduate freshman applications last year, 13,200 of them were from international students.

Another example of domain creation is USC’s establishment of the APRU, a venture that was not established at that time in the Pacific Rim. Additionally, new academic programs, specifically Lamy’s current venture to create a master’s program in collaboration with the University of Edinburgh on global governance, are another example.

Table 32 demonstrates just some of the initiatives portrayed in the research by participants from BU, NU, and USC and outlines each university’s adaptation through the three domains—domain defense, domain offense, and domain creation. The adaptation of these three universities also seems to have emerged in sequential order. For example, NU had study abroad programs (domain defense) in place before launching niche programs such as the N.U.in Program in 2007 for first-year students (domain offense), which was in place before the university sought to develop an international branch campus in Toronto Campus in 2016 (domain creation). However, as these three institutions have been operating within international higher education for a long time, adaptation within these domains is not always sequential. For example, USC’s creation of first semester programs (domain offense) may have come after research collaboration and faculty exchange agreements were created (domain creation).

The adaptation by each institution is multidimensional. First, these institutions are responding to multiple external forces, such as Economics and Safety. Second, their
Table 32

*Adaptation by BU, NU, and USC*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Boston University</th>
<th>Northeastern University</th>
<th>University of Southern California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain Defense</strong> (sustainability)</td>
<td>• Undergraduate and graduate study abroad</td>
<td>• Undergraduate and graduate study abroad</td>
<td>• Undergraduate and graduate study abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• International Student enrollment initiatives and programs</td>
<td>• International Student enrollment initiatives and programs</td>
<td>• International Student enrollment initiatives and programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• International Co-op programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain Offense</strong> (expansion within framework)</td>
<td>• First-year study abroad</td>
<td>• First-year study abroad</td>
<td>• First-year study abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty led programs</td>
<td>• Faculty-led programs</td>
<td>• International Volunteer and Service opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Study Abroad BU Law</td>
<td>• International co-op programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Graduate programs and dual degree</td>
<td>• Graduate programs and dual degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pathway programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain Creation</strong> (expansion beyond framework)</td>
<td>• International Study Centers (e.g., London)</td>
<td>• International Branch Campus development in Toronto, Canada</td>
<td>• Faculty exchanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Research collaborations and partnerships</td>
<td>• Cuba partnership</td>
<td>• Research collaborations such as Peking University and the Rossier School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Semester-long enrollment program</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Master’s program in collaboration with the University of Edinburgh on global governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• for students to improve their English language skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

adaptation may not be in response to all external forces, just one force at one time, such as Economics, which is a dominate force.

The response by institutions in times of decline are often effective rather than efficient (Cameron 1983). Cameron (1983) defines these two terms as:

- **Efficiency**:
  - Measured quite easily by computing the ratio of some output to some input (e.g., cost per student, cost per institutional unit).
  - Doing the same things with fewer resources.

- **Effectiveness**:
  - Not easily measured. A construct with no precise or agreed-upon indicators.
• Doing the right things is more important than doing things right (pp. 362-363).

Cameron (1983) found in his study linked to the tobacco industry that the most effective firms were “those that acted proactively rather than reactively to conditions of decline and those that concentrated almost entirely on enhancing organizational effectiveness rather than organizational efficiency” (p. 371). In this study, all three universities demonstrated a proactive approach to a commitment of internationalization strategies. However, most strategies were a mix of being both efficient and effective. For example, enrollment targets were created, measured, and achieved as an efficiency indicator, whereas an effective indicator was the creation of town halls that were used to discuss the impact of U.S. government policies. Overall, the university’s sophisticated efforts are a response to the external forces identified in this study.

Summary

When discussing and analyzing the level of success for implementing an internationalization strategy, certain factors must be taken into consideration. This study focused on external forces outside of a university, the effects of external forces, organizational structures and strategies, and finally, how these organizations adapt their strategies. The research from this study indicated that the impact of an organization’s international strategy and structure are important. Loosely coupled systems provide the most opportunities for internationalization units to maintain control, and if the HEI is able to maintain control of its environment, then the HEI can impact (or control) the effect of an external force. Overall, the onus is on the HEI and the internationalization unit to determine what resources they have in place to determine such outcomes. Tools such as
the Coordinate Plane in Figure 7 can be used to further assist the HEI in navigating how to adapt to external forces.
CHAPTER 7 – IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Implications and Recommendations for Future Research

When considering how this study further impacts the practice of international higher education, four themes emerged. Three of these themes focus on how roles of key stakeholders are shifting within international education: (a) the role of the External Affairs office, (b) the role of the U.S. government, and (c) the role of the international education administrator. The last theme focuses on why adaptation is important for international higher education. The second part of this chapter provides recommendations for future research.

Implications for Practice and Research

Universities that are looking to create or expand upon their comprehensive internationalization efforts can look to this study to reflect on what external forces may affect their strategies and how they can adapt. Showcasing Boston University, Northeastern University, and the University of Southern California allows these and other universities to understand what has occurred and what is occurring within the international higher education community. For universities that are considering how to increase or more fully participate in internationalization initiatives, the results from this study provide a deeper understanding of how the world beyond the traditional campus affects U.S. colleges and universities. This study sought to identify what the global external forces are, how they are affecting internationalization strategies, and how universities adapt their strategies in response to these forces. Overall, the research from this study confirms that universities cannot be blind to the actions and perspectives of the external world when further internationalizing the institution.
The first part of the research identified what forces are perceived as being the most salient in effecting internationalization strategies. The second part of this study examined how the Internationalization Forces (Economics, Geography, Globalization, Political and Cultural Landscape, Safety, Soft Power, and Internal University Forces) can have positive and negative implications on the university. The research in this study revealed that the implications of these forces boil down to the control the university has on their environment and these internationalization forces can make universities feel like they have or not have control. Adaptation theory, particularly identified through Cameron’s (1983, 1984) theoretical framework outlining domain defense, domain offense, and domain creation, further demonstrates how universities can increase their agility and outcomes due to such external forces. Understanding what the forces are can strategically assist universities on all internationalization levels, ranging from their institution’s leadership and academic affairs units to the operational implementation units within universities. Yet, this study found that the role of three key stakeholders is evolving due to the increases and pressures of internationalization initiatives in higher education.

**Role of the External Affairs Office**

It is crucial that universities are able to identify what external forces are affecting their international activities. However, as universities expand their internationalization efforts, universities need sufficient resources to recognize the external internationalization forces in a timely manner. Generally, in higher education, one of the offices that examines the external landscape (sometimes called the External Affairs Office) has focused on local or U.S. issues that directly impact the university. However,
when issues in other countries occur, the office is forced to quickly become a subject expert on areas regarding that regions policies and cultures. While some universities are using outsourced resources to assist with the occasional incident outside the United States (such as lobbyists, outside legal counsels, insurance companies, and evacuation firms), others may find that the occasional incident is no longer sporadic and actually a frequent occurrence. Thus, universities may look to hire full-time staff within the university to assist. Within this study, participants mentioned how this work was often conducted by various units ranging from the university’s police department for safety responses to the university’s legal team used to examine expanded economic developments.

This addition to the university infrastructure could support universities by continuously scanning the external landscape to identify external forces, their anticipated effects as either positive/negative, and how the university can adapt to such forces. This may mean that universities will need to either alter their office or change the structure to include a unit that focuses on internationalization forces. As a result, we may see the traditional office of external affairs expand or transform into an international or global external affairs office. If a name change was to occur, then the office would need to be cognizant of what it calls itself as many universities already use “Global Affairs” to describe other units in the university such as academic units focused on global politics or study abroad offices.

**Role of the United States Government**

The works of Franz Kafka often reflects surreal situations where the main character is often stuck in a highly bureaucratic situation. When situations reflect such frustrations, they are often referred to as “Kafkaesque.” As mentioned earlier within the
study, there are four major U.S. federal departments whose work intersects with international higher education: Department of Commerce, Department of Education, Department of Homeland Security, the Department of State. As there is not a centralized area within the federal government focusing on international education, the work conducted by universities could at times be perceived as Kafkaesque. In other words, international educators must navigate the bureaucracy of the U.S. federal government to enhance the internationalization goals created by the student, government, and the institution.

As more U.S. HEIs increase their outbound and inbound mobility efforts, more U.S. HEIs will turn to the U.S. federal government to help guide them through the complicated red-tape so that they can expand their international goals. The different operational agendas throughout the U.S. federal departments has often resulted in confusion to where the U.S. government stands on internationalization of higher education. For example, the U.S. Department of State has clearly identified that there is a need to increase international education. However, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security may view an increase of international students studying in the United States as an increase of risk to safeguard the U.S. people.

A call for a centralized strategy is not a new phenomenon and this study would be remiss if it did not acknowledge the work of organizations such as the American Council on Education (ACE), NAFSA: Association of International Educators, the Council on International Education Exchange, the Forum on Education Abroad, and the Institute of International Education (IIE). These groups have a long history of advocating on behalf
of the student with the U.S. government and have worked hard to request or even create comprehensive internationalization strategies for the United States.

Whether the government’s motivation to internationalize is a response to external forces such as economics, globalization, or soft power, the directive may need to be outlined clearer from the executive branch instead of a “moon shot” strategy that seems to be currently coming from the legislative branches of the federal and state governments.

Overall, if the United States is to continue on a trajectory of strengthening its higher education systems, especially on a global scale, the role of the U.S. government may need to evolve to prevent stagnation of growth, or Kafkaesque circumstances for HEIs.

Role of the International Education Administrator

The field of international higher education is expanding rapidly. Indicators such as the number of NAFSA members from 1990 until today demonstrate the steady growth in the profession:

By 1990, as the number of foreign students in the United States approached the 400,000 mark, there were 6,400 NAFSA members on 1,800 campuses and increasing numbers of U.S. students were studying abroad. (NAFSA, 2018a, para. 6)

Today, NAFSA outlines that its membership demographics include:

NAFSA has nearly 10,000 members at 3,500 institutions worldwide, representing over 150 countries. A majority of NAFSA’s members can be found on college and university campuses working as foreign student advisers and admissions officers, study abroad advisers, directors of international programs, teachers of English as a second language, administrators of intensive English programs, overseas educational advisers, community volunteers, and administrators of sponsored exchange programs. (NAFSA, 2018b, para. 1)

As more professionals enter the field of international higher education, there will be more opportunities to diversify and strengthen the work of international educators. As this
niche of higher education professionalizes, more are entering the work they do with an educational foundation from pursuing either master’s or doctoral degrees focusing on international higher education.

Additionally, international higher education has become an amalgamation of major internal units within the institution such as academic affairs, external affairs, student affairs, health and safety, and enrollment management. As a result, the job is very demanding for those that work within this space as they are required to take on many different roles at all times. For some, their work is misunderstood as if they get to “travel a lot,” which can be perceived as easy or fun work. While it certainly can be enjoyable, there may also be a lack of understanding of the physical and mental requirements involved to travel long distances for work where once arriving to that destination, intense requirements are put on the individual to become culturally agile in order to effectively represent the mission and vision of their university. Those stereotypes within the university can hinder the support needed from key units for internationalization efforts.

Additionally, the complexity, intensity, and increased connectedness of the world has had an impact on the fate of international higher education. As a tradable and lucrative commodity amongst institutions, this area of higher education can often feel more like a competitive business rather than an extended international arm of a university. As such, the traditional student-centric work is replaced with business focused outcomes such as increased revenue. Those in the field who seek to be conduits for learning outcomes in international education may instead find they are conduits to the economic goals of the institution. Thus, the overall role of administrators working in international higher education requires an increased elasticity then perhaps the traditional
higher education position. Universities should continue to examine the work required for this area of higher education to decrease tensions among internal units, as well as employee burnout and turnover.

Why Adaptation is Important

This study demonstrated that the ability of the university to adapt is a powerful tool. This study sought to understand how universities adapt their internationalization programs through sustaining, expanding, and creating various initiatives in response to external forces. The external landscape is constantly changing, and it is important for universities to understand that evolving landscape.

In 2015, to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the NAFSA *International Educator* magazine, NAFSA asked educators what the biggest trends in the past 25 years had been. They highlighted five trends: (a) the rise of the middle class; (b) the market and competition for international students has expanded and diversified; (c) countries compete for economic advantages, not diplomatic end; (d) the dominance of English as a language; and (e) technological revolution (Connell, 2015). The educators surveyed further provided four predictions based on these trends: (a) global talent wars will intensify, (b) the road may get rockier for branch campuses, (c) the definition and parameters for international student mobility are being stretched, and (d) universities will face increased pressures to internationalize and prove the worth of the education they deliver (Connell, 2015). If the study’s crystal ball predictions come true, then universities will find themselves in a position where they will need to adapt their internationalization efforts. By leaning on the theoretical framework outlined in this study, internationalization strategies can be developed that look to sustain, expand, and create
new initiatives. However, universities should be honest with themselves as to what the real mission and outcomes are for such initiatives.

As Cameron (1984) outlined, the survival of the institution in today’s global age is dependent on how well that institution can adapt during times of change. As this study portrayed, change is constant due to continuous external forces that effect strategies.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

**Quantitative Study**

Understanding the complexities of the world outside of a university is a large task. Seeking to understand it from the perspectives of international education practitioners is no small feat. As Yin (2014) notes, “The distinctive need for case study research arises out of the desire to understand complex social phenomena” (p. 4). For this dissertation, a qualitative study was selected so the researcher could understand the perspectives of individuals involved in the operationalization of internationalization initiatives at select universities. Seven key internationalization forces emerged from the findings, as well as the notion that these forces are positive and negative and result in positive and negative effects.

However, through a quantitative survey, these forces could be developed into a more comprehensive survey to where the findings could be plotted on the coordinate plane demonstrated in Figure 7. Such results could showcase indicators to how universities perceive the effects of internationalization. For example, are the effects continuously causing stress on the institution? Are inbound mobility programs more vulnerable than outbound mobility programs, or vice versa? Are certain forces more salient within certain types of institutions than others? Do certain forces impact different
types of universities differently? A quantitative study would then allow a deeper dive into what resources are needed to control the effects of internationalization forces and would further confirm how international education is multidimensional requiring universities to not be myopic.

**Focus on Individual External Forces**

This study sought to uncover what was perceived by international educators as external forces that effect their work. Seven forces and subthemes were revealed. While examples were given of positive and negative effects of these forces, a deep investigation of each force on international higher education warrants further reflection and research. For example, the Economics external force could be further researched to understand the impact on inbound and outbound higher education programs.

**Internal Forces**

Another area of study could be the examination of key internal forces that effect internationalization strategies. While this study focused on external forces, the findings from this study revealed that internal forces were continuously noted as a key force impacting internationalization strategies. Forces were identified as either university presidents, the board of trustees, faculty, or alumni. A future area of study would be to examine internal forces that effect internationalization strategies, first by identifying what these forces are understood to be by participants, then examining how units adapt, and finally examining if there is similarity in how these units adapt to external and internal forces.
Other Geographical Areas

The geographical locations of Boston, Los Angeles, and Europe were identified as being positive external forces for internationalization strategies. While some participants discussed how other regions may not affect their internationalization strategies as positively as these three areas, more research should be conducted. Thus, an area of future study would be to look at U.S. universities that are in non-coastal or in rural regions of the United States and examine what they perceive as external forces and how they understand the effects of these forces.

Land Grant and Small Colleges

This study selected cases that were very similar attempting to compare “apples to apples” by looking at large, private universities. Future studies could examine land grant or flagship institutions, which would bring into consideration the external force political and cultural landscape as public institutions lean heavily on state and federal government for budget allocations. Additionally, this study could look at how small colleges perceive external forces (i.e., colleges with a total enrollment of less that 2,500 students). Overall, there may be new external forces that emerge as the internationalization engagement by land grant and small colleges may be different from large private institutions.

Conclusion

This study expanded the literature on international higher education strategies by examining the external forces affecting universities’ inbound and outbound mobility programs. It introduced the seven Internationalization Forces and then plotted how these forces affect internationalization strategies. Finally, it demonstrated through the use of Cameron’s (1984; 1985) theoretical framework how universities adapt their strategies.
The internationalization of higher education can result in the overall strengthening of the student’s higher education experience. However, as this study showed, there are powerful external forces, both positive and negative, outside of the university that can extremely impact the student, the university, and the government. These forces can be rewarding and yet also dangerous. Internationalization strategies are high risk initiatives that should not be taken for granted or handled nonchalantly. Conceptualizing the volatility of the world outside the traditional university campus border can assist universities in their strategies, which hopefully will further contribute to the student’s ultimate learning experience.
APPENDICES

Appendix A

Site Selection Distillation Process – Step 1

Table A1

Site Selection Distillation Process Step 1 (Study Abroad)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Top 40 Study Abroad</th>
<th>Open Doors 2016 Data</th>
<th>2014/15 Total Enrollment (IPEDS)</th>
<th>% of Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin Madison</td>
<td>2152</td>
<td>14045</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>American University</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>13061</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Miami University - Oxford</td>
<td>2046</td>
<td>18620</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
<td>2149</td>
<td>19798</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>17858</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>4310</td>
<td>49274</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>23732</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>24806</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>21679</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>George Washington University</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>25613</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>2068</td>
<td>29135</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>2891</td>
<td>42453</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>23109</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>2049</td>
<td>32112</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>2237</td>
<td>35197</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Michigan Ann Arbor</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>43625</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Texas Austin</td>
<td>2948</td>
<td>51313</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Brigham Young University</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>30484</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>28617</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>41226</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>2668</td>
<td>50081</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Minnesota Twin Cities</td>
<td>2705</td>
<td>51147</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>University of California Los Angeles</td>
<td>2204</td>
<td>41845</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University College Station</td>
<td>3219</td>
<td>61642</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Indiana University - Bloomington</td>
<td>2395</td>
<td>46416</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>32971</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>University of Maryland College Park</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>37610</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>University of Colorado Boulder</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>32432</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>University of Illinois Urbana- Champaign</td>
<td>2193</td>
<td>45140</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>39752</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>2286</td>
<td>49459</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>2056</td>
<td>44784</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>University of California Berkeley</td>
<td>1688</td>
<td>37565</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>2603</td>
<td>58322</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>35313</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>University of California Davis</td>
<td>1454</td>
<td>34508</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>1449</td>
<td>34435</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Arizona State University Tempe</td>
<td>2102</td>
<td>50320</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>47040</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A2

**Site Selection Distillation Process Step 1 (International Students)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Top 40 Universities Hosting International Students</th>
<th>2015/16 Open Doors</th>
<th>2015/16 Total Enrollment (IPEDS)</th>
<th>% of Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Illinois Institute of Technology</td>
<td>5362</td>
<td>7792</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SUNY University at Buffalo</td>
<td>7026</td>
<td>10330</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
<td>11702</td>
<td>19940</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>7051</td>
<td>12963</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>SUNY Stony Brook University</td>
<td>5609</td>
<td>10330</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin - Madison</td>
<td>6440</td>
<td>13454</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>12740</td>
<td>28086</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Academy of Art University</td>
<td>5542</td>
<td>13800</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>15543</td>
<td>50027</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>13340</td>
<td>43401</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of California - Los Angeles</td>
<td>11513</td>
<td>41908</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>6008</td>
<td>21904</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Illinois - Urbana Champaign</td>
<td>12085</td>
<td>45842</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>8445</td>
<td>32158</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Purdue University - West Lafayette</td>
<td>10563</td>
<td>40472</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>6221</td>
<td>24876</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arizona State University - Tempe</td>
<td>12751</td>
<td>51984</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>5259</td>
<td>21789</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>5979</td>
<td>25034</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>University of California - San Diego</td>
<td>7556</td>
<td>32906</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>University of California - Berkeley</td>
<td>7313</td>
<td>38189</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>5647</td>
<td>29652</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>University of California Irvine</td>
<td>5647</td>
<td>30836</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>8259</td>
<td>45408</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>University of Michigan - Ann Arbor</td>
<td>7630</td>
<td>43651</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University - University Park</td>
<td>8084</td>
<td>47307</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>8256</td>
<td>50538</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>University of Texas - Dallas</td>
<td>8145</td>
<td>50950</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>5266</td>
<td>34015</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>University of California Davis</td>
<td>5381</td>
<td>35186</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>University of Maryland - College Park</td>
<td>5802</td>
<td>38140</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Indiana University - Bloomington</td>
<td>7159</td>
<td>48514</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>University of Texas - Arlington</td>
<td>6169</td>
<td>41988</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>University of Minnesota - Twin Cities</td>
<td>7037</td>
<td>50678</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>6751</td>
<td>50645</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>5552</td>
<td>42704</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Rutgers University - New Brunswick</td>
<td>6040</td>
<td>49428</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ohio State University - Columbus</td>
<td>7117</td>
<td>58663</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>University of Texas Austin</td>
<td>6069</td>
<td>50950</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University - College Station</td>
<td>6940</td>
<td>63813</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B

Data Distillation Process – Step 2 and 3

Table B1

*Site Selection Distillation Process Step 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank: Top 40 Universities Hosting International Students</th>
<th>Rank: Top 40 Study Abroad</th>
<th>Institutions that appear on both <em>Open Doors</em> Lists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Arizona State University - Tempe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Boston University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Indiana University - Bloomington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ohio State University - Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University - University Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Purdue University - West Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University - College Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>University of California - Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>University of California - Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>University of California Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>University of Illinois - Urbana Champaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>University of Maryland - College Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Michigan - Ann Arbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Minnesota - Twin Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Texas Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin - Madison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B2

*Site Selection Distillation Process Step 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Top 40 Universities Hosting International Students</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Top 40 Doctorate-granting Institutions: Study Abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Arizona State University - Tempe</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>Boston University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>New York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Purdue University - West Lafayette</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>University of Michigan Ann Arbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>University of California - Los Angeles</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>University of Texas Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin - Madison</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin Madison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Interview Protocol

Working Title
How Internationalization Strategies of Three U.S. Universities Are Adapted to Respond to External Global Forces

Abstract of Proposal
When major transnational events occur, such as the 2015 economic crisis within Greece, the 2016 violent conflicts within Turkey, and the creation of political policies such as the 2017 President Trump Executive Order on visa and immigration, the effects ripple throughout the field of international higher education. How higher education institutions take these external factors, which are out of their control, into consideration can affect the extent of their overall internationalization efforts and strategies. This qualitative study will employ a multicase study approach to examine the phenomenon of what large, private, universities define as external forces and how they then adapt or not adapt their internationalization strategies to the external forces.

Research Questions
- What external forces affect a university’s internationalization, cross-border and transnational strategies?
- In what ways do external forces affect a university’s internationalization, cross-border, and transnational strategies?
- How does a university adapt to external forces that have affected or may affect their internationalization, cross-border, and transnational strategies?

Framework for Study
External Forces Affecting University Internationalization Efforts:
- Globalization
- Deglobalization
- Soft Power of the institution
- The perception of the hegemonic role of the United States
- Transnational events (political and economic)

Internationalization:
“The process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education”
Protocol Questions (Note: This will be a semi-structured interview):

Background of the Interviewee
- How long have you been at your institution?
- How long have you been working in the field of International Education?

Organizational Structure
- How is your office structured?
- How does it relate to other offices, departments, or divisions that work with international initiatives within your institution?

The Past
- How and why did your institution develop a study abroad program and enroll international students?
- What were the external forces during that time that may have caused why these initiatives were created?
- What steps have been taken to ensure the sustainability of those programs/initiatives?
- Why do you think this happened?
- How has your institution expanded and done more *within* the framework of study abroad and the enrollment of international students?
- Why do you think this happened?
- How and why has your institution expanded and diversified its offerings *beyond* the framework of study abroad and the enrollment of international students?
- Why do you think this happened?

The Present
- What do you see as the key external forces shaping international education today?
- How are these external forces affecting your institution’s internationalization strategies?
- What criteria does your institution use to determine if external forces pose a threat to student safety abroad and their ability to learn on your domestic campus?
- How was that criteria determined? When? By Whom?
- What are your thoughts about managing international programs at this point in time?
Appendix D
Examples of Terrorist Activities in Western Europe Since 1988

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 21, 1988</td>
<td>Lockerbie, UK</td>
<td>Pan Am Flight 103 is bombed, killing all 243 passengers, including 35 Syracuse students studying abroad in London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11, 2004</td>
<td>Madrid, Spain</td>
<td>Known as “11-M” in Spain, a series of bombs are detonated killing 191 people and injuring 1,800.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 7, 2005</td>
<td>London, UK</td>
<td>Known as “7-7” in the United Kingdom, a London bus was bombed killing 52 people and injuring over 700.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2, 2011</td>
<td>Paris, France</td>
<td>Charlie Hebdo magazine was firebombed after featuring a caricature of the Islamic prophet Muhammad. No one was injured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 22, 2011</td>
<td>Oslo, Norway</td>
<td>Series of attacks led by Anders Behring Breivik kills 77, and injuring 110 mainly teenagers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 24, 2014</td>
<td>Brussels, Belgium</td>
<td>Four people were killed at the Jewish Museum by an intruder with a rifle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7-9, 2015</td>
<td>Paris, France</td>
<td>Charlie Hebdo magazine office is attacked. More attacks followed around Paris followed. At least 12 are killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21, 2015</td>
<td>Train from Amsterdam to Paris</td>
<td>Train from Amsterdam to Paris: 3 Americans help prevent a mass shooting by a gunman with a Kalashnikov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 10, 2015</td>
<td>Ankara, Turkey</td>
<td>103 killed when two bombs are detonated at the Ankara train station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 13, 2015</td>
<td>Paris, France</td>
<td>A series of coordinated terrorist attacks in Paris killed 130 people and injured hundreds more. The attacks consisted of mass shootings and suicide bombings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 11, 2016</td>
<td>Marseille, France</td>
<td>A teenager attacked a Jewish teacher in Marseille with a machete. He told police that he carried out the attack in the name of ISIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 22, 2016</td>
<td>Belgium, Brussels</td>
<td>Two suicide bombings on March 22, 2016—one at Brussels Airport and the other in the city’s subway system. Combined, the attacks killed 32 people, over 300 injured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 2016</td>
<td>Istanbul, Turkey</td>
<td>Mass shooting and suicide bombing in airport killed over 40 people and injuring more than 230.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 13, 2016</td>
<td>Nice, France</td>
<td>Seventy-seven people were killed in Nice, France, when a truck drove through a crowd on Bastille Day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 26, 2016</td>
<td>Normandy, France</td>
<td>Two men took five people hostage during a Mass at a church in Normandy and murdered an elderly priest by stabbing him in the chest and slitting his throat. The hostages were freed later, and the two men were arrested. Then-President Francois Hollande said that the men carried out the attack in the name of ISIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 19, 2016</td>
<td>Berlin, Germany</td>
<td>Truck rams into crowds at a Christmas market; 12 are killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 22, 2017</td>
<td>London, UK</td>
<td>Truck rams into crowds on the Westminster Bridge in London. 5 are killed, including a London police officer who was stabbed and the perpetrator, were killed in a terror attack. More than 40 people were injured outside the Parliament building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7, 2017</td>
<td>Stockholm, Sweden</td>
<td>Truck rams into crowd; 5 killed, 14 injured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20, 2017</td>
<td>Paris, France</td>
<td>Gunman fires automatic weapon along the Champs Elysees at a parked police van, killing the officer inside, and others standing on the nearby sidewalk, injuring two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22, 2017</td>
<td>Manchester, UK</td>
<td>Suicide bomb is detonated at the Ariana Grande concert. 22 are killed and 119 are injured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3, 2017</td>
<td>London, UK</td>
<td>Van rams into crowds near London Bridge. 8 killed, 48 injured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 17, 2017</td>
<td>Barcelona, Spain</td>
<td>Van rams into crowds in the Las Ramblas area of Barcelona. 13 are killed, 130 are injured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 15, 2017</td>
<td>London, UK</td>
<td>Bucket bomb detonated on the Tube near Parsons Green, 30 are injured.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Adapted from “Timeline of Recent Terror Attacks Against the West,” by B. Singman, 2017 and from “Terrorism Timeline,” by Since 9/11, n.d.
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