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Abstract
This article presents a qualitative study conducted at a Historically Hispanic Serving Institution (HHSI) to further the understanding of its internationalization decision-making process. The study uses the Internationalization Cube model to review the institution’s internal processes and policies toward internationalization and assess how its international activities align with its internationalization efforts. The Internationalization Cube, an eight-cell model, permits the positioning of Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) based on the analysis of its three dimensions and respective subcategories: policy, support, and implementation. The International Dimension Index (IDI) and the Item Relevancy Index (IRI) were also used to determine the level of alignment between the HHSI position on the Internationalization Cube and its international activities. The study finds that the HHSI is on Position 6 on the Internationalization Cube (priority policy, one-sided support, and systematic/structure implementation), and exhibits all the international activities considered indicators of internationalization but attention is needed to foreign language, international students, study abroad, faculty movement and involvement in international projects. The study concludes that an association exists between the institution’s position on the Internationalization Cube and its international activities, and adjustments in the institution’s policy, support, and implementation dimensions will be required to advance its position on the Internationalization Cube making its internationalization process more sustainable. This study makes a contribution to addressing the need to assess an IHE by presenting a holistic organizational framework instead of a fragmented international activities organizational analysis.
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Introduction
Despite the growing emphasis on international activities, little emphasis has been given to how international activities fit into the current Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) structures and processes (Burriss, 2006). Internationalization is an intricate process, as it encompasses many components, such as policies, students, and curriculum; it requires all of its components to be examined.

Cummings (2001) elaborates on this challenge by stating, “Because international education is not a primary concern of most scholars in the field, research has been somewhat sporadic, non-cumulative, and tends to be carried out by national organizations as part of advocacy projects” (p. 3). Taylor (2004) expands on this concern by stating that despite the growing number of international activities in many universities, IHEs have a less clear articulated methodology or theories guiding their internationalization process.

According to Green (2002), “The little assessment on internationalization that does occur is accomplished through a series of approximate and easily counted measures, such as number of international students on campus, students studying abroad, or foreign language enrollments” (p. 16). In addition, Green (2002) argues that while paying attention to the supply side of internationalization is the starting point for Higher Education Institutions (HEI), those institutions serious in sustaining their internationalization process should promote a holistic organizational analysis of their internationalization efforts from student learning outcomes, curriculum content, and intuitional policies.

The study sought to provide a comprehensive organizational analysis of how a Historically Hispanic Serving Institution (HHSI) is implementing its process of internationalization by presenting a holistic organizational framework instead of a fragmented international activities organizational analysis.
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Purpose of the Study

This study presented a methodology to examine a HHSI process of internationalization by applying the Internationalization Cube theoretical model developed by Van Dijk and Meijer (1997). The study also used the International Dimension Index (IDI) and Item Relevancy Index (IRI) to further explore HHSI’s internationalization process. The study sought to answer the following questions:

**Research Question 1:** What is the HHSI position on the Van Dijk and Meijer’s (1997) Internationalization Cube?

**Research Question 2:** To what extent is the HHSI’s position on the Van Dijk and Meijer’s (1997) Internationalization Cube aligned to the IDI results on internationalization?

Case Study

The current study drew on a case study methodology. As defined by Merriam (2009), “A case study is an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single entity, phenomenon or social unit” (p. x). Briggs and Coleman (2007) also provide a definition for an educational case study as “a critical inquiry aimed at informing educational judgments and decisions to improve educational action” (p. 142).

This case study sought to provide a deeper understanding and a snapshot of the HHSI’s international activities toward internationalization within its particular organizational context and interactions (policy, support, and implementation dimension). As a result, the HHSI’s internationalization process served as the main unit of analysis. This case study design allowed assessing and describing the unit of analysis in depth. Yin (2014) elaborates on this by stating that “each unit of analysis and propositions would call for a different case study, each having its own research design and data collection strategy” (p. 32). Van Dijk and Meijer’s (1997) Internationalization Cube’s three dimensions—policy, support, and implementation dimensions—and the HHSI’s results on international activities served as the units of observation (units on which data were collected and analyzed).

**Case study: HHSI.** The study was conducted at a HHSI. Due to the nature of the case study, a purposeful sampling strategy was used to select the HHSI. According to Patton (2002), a “purposeful sampling focuses on selecting information rich-cases whose study will illuminate the questions under study” (p. 230).

Bogdan and Biklen (2011) elaborate on purposeful sampling, stating that you choose particular subjects to include because they are believed to facilitate the expansion of the developing theory. This is not random sampling; that is, sampling to insure that the characteristics of the subjects in your study appear in the same proportion they appear in the total population. (p. 67) Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2013) add that sampling in qualitative research is guided by the conceptual question of the study and not the need for “representativeness.”

The HHSI ranks as a Research University in the High Research Activity category of the Carnegie Foundation classification system. The HHSI is a large, state-supported urban, multicultural, and multicampus university. The university serves more than 40,000 students, 1,000 full-time faculty, and more than 124,000 alumni. In addition, the HHSI offers nearly 200 bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral programs in 21 colleges and schools.

The HHSI constitutes a rich case to study for the following reasons:

First, this HHSI’s three founding purposes are as follows: provide a valuable education to students, provide service to the local community, and promote international understanding as described by the statute establishing the business of this institution.

Second, one of the HHSI’s institutional goals explicitly refers to preparing students to understand and appreciate cultures in today’s globalized world as well as attaining national and international recognition through research promoting life-long learning. In addition, within its Millennium Strategic Plan the HHSI identifies an international theme with the goal to respond to its mission by not only hiring faculty that has international expertise in their area of research as well as professional experience abroad but also encouraging students to develop global competencies by engaging in study abroad.

Third, as a part of the HHSI’s reaccreditation process, the university selected Global Learning for Global Citizenship as its Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The Global Learning for Global Citizenship QEP goal is to educate all of the institution’s undergraduate students for global citizenship through the curriculum and co-curriculum. The selection of this theme reinforces not only the HHSI’s purpose of promoting international learning but also its commitment to serving its community by providing a relevant education to all students focused on developing international/global citizens.

Fourth, HHSI displays an active approach on internationalization at home and abroad. The HHSI’s variety of offerings of programs abroad and exchanges, areas of study centers, and programs with international focus exemplify this HHSI’s internationalization efforts at home. Examples of this institution’s internationalization abroad undertakings include its engagement in several offshore (transnational) programs; the opening of Center for Education, Research, and Development in Madrid, Spain; as well as its offshore campus in China.

Fifth, for this HHSI, geography is destiny. As an urban and fast-growing university, the institution is one of...
the largest Hispanic serving universities in the United States. The Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU, 2009) describes a Hispanic serving institution as an institution whose Hispanic enrollment is at least 25% of its total undergraduate and graduate enrollment. Currently, the HHSI reports 63% of Hispanic enrollment.

Finally, this HHSI attracts foreign students from all over the world, hosting in the 2007-2008 academic year 2,882 foreign students enhancing the institution’s campus internationalization. Other considerations in the purposeful selection of this HHSI are the researcher’s knowledge of the institution and access to data.

**Significance of the Study**

The significance of the study includes both the macro- and micro (institutional) levels. At the macro-level, by applying the Internationalization Cube, the study adds to the theoretical body of literature on the internationalization process of IHEs. Due to the varied types of IHEs—research universities, public/private, liberal/comprehensive, and so forth—only by investigating all IHE types can a more accurate theoretical model on internationalization be developed (Krane, 1994). In addition, the application of the internationalization model to HHSI responds to an explicit need within the international education field to apply and assess theoretical models for the process of internationalization. Literature in the field shows that emphasis has been given on quantifiable outcomes measuring international activities, but less emphasis has been put on theoretical frameworks guiding institutional strategies toward the internationalization process within IHEs. Therefore, this study focuses on the application of a theoretical model for internationalization.

At the micro- or institutional level, the relevance of the study lies in presenting a model to assess the effectiveness of accomplishing the HHSI purpose toward international education. The study’s importance rests on assessing the HHSI international activities vis-à-vis its policy, support, and implementation strategies. By using this model, the study may provide to IHEs decision makers information about the internationalization process to guide its strategic planning and generate a plan to sustain its current internationalization process.

Also, the notion of self-assessment is closely related to an institution’s efforts in maintaining its quality assurance. Assessing the contribution of internationalization at the university-wide level is not only a concern for IHEs but also for accrediting bodies. De Wit (2002) elaborates on this by stating,

> But the analysis of an institution’s performance and achievements according to their articulated aims and objectives for internationalization is critical to assess and eventually ensure the quality of the international dimension and the contribution internationalization makes to the primary functions of the institution. The process must indicate directions for improvement and change of the internationalization strategy of the institution . . . (p. 161)

Above all, the Van Dijk and Meijer (1997) model for internationalization contributes to promoting a strategic management analysis to foster the understanding of the internationalization process. This analysis permits IHEs to assess the alignment of their policies, support, and implementation dimensions within and across the organizations as supported by recent models such as the Internationalization Quality Review (IQR) by the Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) and the Indicators for Mapping and Profiling Internationalization (IMPI; Beerkens et al., 2010).

**Van Dijk and Meijer Theoretical Framework**

The Van Dijk and Meijer (1997) Internationalization Cube is a three-dimensional, eight-cell cube analysis model for internationalization as shown in Appendix A. The Internationalization Cube presents the following three dimensions and specific level associated with each dimension: policy, can be either priority or marginal; support, either interactive (support provided with interaction between central, faculty, and departmental levels) or unilateral/one-sided (support provided at the central or peripheral level); and implementation, either structural/systematic or ad hoc.

The policy dimension of the Internationalization Cube refers to the importance attached to the internationalization aims within an institution visible (explicitly mentioned) in several of its documents. The policy dimension can be priority (high importance attached to the internationalization aims within the institution shown by explicit mention and/or attention to the institutional missions/goals in university documents, magazines, webpage, etc.), or marginal (low attention or importance given to the internationalization aims within the institution shown by no indication and/or attention or explicit commitment to global, international or multicultural commitment in university documents, magazines, webpage, etc.).

According to Van Dijk and Meijer (1997), the implementation dimension refers to “a way or manner on which international activities are managed” (p. 159) within an IHE. The support dimension refers to the type of support, assistance, or management practices provided to international activities within IHEs. Internationalization, as Van Dijk and Meijer (1997) explains, can be established in a top-down (centralized) or bottom-up (decentralized) manner. However, at some level of activities interaction is required between the central, faculty, and department levels (Van Dijk & Meijer, 1997). Thus, the implementation dimension can be systematic (the management and/or introduction of international activities in a systematic manner; following explicit and
precise procedures) or ad hoc (the management and/or introduction of international activities as they occur without reference to established procedures).

The support dimension refers to the type of support, assistance, or management practices provided to international activities within HEIs characterized as interactive (support provided with interaction between central, faculty, and departmental levels) or unilateral (support provided at the central or peripheral level).

The model’s three dimensions embody the organizational framework of analysis (such as the governance, operations, services, human resources, and curriculum and academic offerings, among others) not only described by advocates such as Knight (2004), De Wit (2002), Mestenhauser (2002), Beerkens et al. (2010), and Henard, Diamond, and Roseveare (2012), but also reinforces the complexity and interrelations of processes that constitute the university-wide internationalization efforts.

In addition, it is important to acknowledge that Van Dijk and Meijer’s model comes from two sound theoretical foundations on academic strategy. First, as already noted, one of Van Dijk and Meijer’s model pillars comes from Davies’ (1992) model for internationalization. According to Davies (1992),

the considerable expansion of international activities in universities over the last decade is a phenomenon closely linked with financial reductions, the rise of academic entrepreneurialism, and a genuine philosophical commitment to close cultural perspectives in the advancement and dissemination of knowledge. (p. 177)

Finally, Keller’s (1983) work Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education significantly influenced Davies’ model. Keller’s work introduces the concept of applying strategic management thinking to academics. For Keller, an academic strategy is the result of the analysis and interaction of internal and external factors. Keller (1983) describes internal factors as a university’s values and traditions, its strengths and weakness, and the leadership capabilities, whereas the external factors as the environmental trends, market directions, and the institutions’ opportunities and threats.

Van Dijk and Meijer’s (1997) Internationalization Cube with its three dimensions of analysis (policy, support, and implementation) takes into account Keller’s internal and external factors, though less emphasis is put on the external forces influencing the university.

However, this lesser emphasis on external factors can be considered a deficiency, as it assumes that such factors are already manifested in the universities’ current policies, support, and implementation dimensions.

In summary, Van Dijk and Meijer’s Internationalization Cube serves as a preliminary assessment model to guide the understanding of where on the Internationalization Cube HEIs find themselves, and allows for the development or enhancement of an academic strategy toward internationalization.

Method

A case study design served as the methodological framework using qualitative and quantitative research techniques such as documents analysis, interviews, the IDI, and the IRI.

Data Sources

The original study looked at the HHSI policies, support, and implementation dimensions toward internationalization. Data collection on the three dimensions included qualitative elements such as document analysis and interviews. Data for the three dimensions were collected throughout the academic year 2008-2009. The cutoff time frame for data collection was the end of the Fall semester 2009.

The primary source for data collection for the policy dimension consisted of review of institutional documents, such as the institution’s mission statement, millennium strategic planning documents, and the institution’s international policy papers, among others.

The primary source for data collection for the implementation dimension consisted of review of institutional documents describing organizational charts, policies, and established procedures toward internationalization. The collection of data format utilized in this section was developed using the Chief International Administrator (CIEA) survey (Burriss, 2006).

Secondary sources of data collection for the policy and implementation dimension consisted of structured interviews. The primary source of data collection for the support dimension involved structured interviews with the administrators listed on Appendix B.

Data collection for the results of internationalization was collected in two steps the following academic years: 2007-2008 and 2008-2009: (a) collection of descriptive data of the HHSI’s results of internationalization and (b) the calculation of the 12-member panel of experts’ IRI based on Lynn’s (1986) Content Validity Index.

The descriptive results of internationalization for the INFAT were gathered using the IDI consisting of 14 quantitative variables closely correlated to an international dimension within IHEs. These variables can be grouped under seven broad categories (Afonso, 1990): foreign language study, international curriculum, study abroad opportunities, number of foreign students, international movement of faculty, international development assistance (funds), and advanced training and research. For the purpose of this study, the last two categories were combined into the International Development Projects category. In addition, two categories were added: the number of offshore (transnational) programs
and co-curriculum. The number of offshore programs was added to the IDI developed by Afonso (1990) and Krane (1994), as an indicator relevant to the HHSI. The co-curriculum category was added as an important indicator of the extracurricular international learning enhancing internationalization (Green, Luu, & Burriss, 2008). These indicators, though identified by Afonso and Krane in the earlier 1990s, remain relevant and are aligned to the internationalization indicators described in the IMPI report (Beerkens et al., 2010).

The 22 items in the revised IDI were sent via email to a 12-member panel of experts in international education to establish an IRI for each item on the IDI, and the minimum item quantity output for an HEI placed on Position 7 of Van Dijk and Meijer’s (1997) Internationalization Cube. The expert panel was formed using individuals who were faculty and administrators from the HHSI and partner institutions. The criteria for inclusion in the expert panel were as follows: (a) have more than 5 years of experience in the international education field and (b) be currently involved in the development and/or management of international activities within higher education institutions.

**Data Analysis**

The data analysis for the policy, support, and implementation dimensions, as well as the rubrics used to determine each dimension’s subcategories, was guided by their respective analysis models shown in Appendix C. After careful consideration of all information gathered, the overall analysis for each dimension helped determine the HHSI’s position on the Internationalization Cube.

To respond to the second question of the study, the researcher used descriptive data on the HHSI’s results of internationalization and the experts panel’s IRI. The descriptive data on the results of internationalization, as demonstrated in previous studies by Afonso (1990), Krane (1994), and Burriss (2006), showed the current level of international activities present at the HHSI. The IRI obtained from the experts shows item relevancy to an HEI placed on Position 7 of Van Dijk and Meijer’s (1997) Internationalization Cube served as final criteria of analysis.

The level of alignment between the HHSI’s placement on the cube and the results of internationalization was determined in two steps.

The first step consisted of tabulating the 12-member expert panel’s responses to determine the IRI, and the minimum number requirement for the items on the IDI. The IRI for each item was calculated as the proportion of experts who rate the item as Relevant on a 2-point scale (Relevant and Not Relevant). A minimum IRI of 80% (10 out of 12) was desired among the panel members for an item to be considered as relevant. The minimum number requirement for an item was reported based on the panel’s tabulated responses. Finally, the HHSI’s descriptive data on the results of internationalization were analyzed in relation to the panel’s IRI.

**Results**

**HHSI’s Position on the Van Dijk and Meijer Internationalization Cube**

**Policy on internationalization.** The HHSI was established with three founding purposes: provide a valuable education to students, provide service to the local community, and promote international understanding. The institution’s third purpose—to promote a greater international understanding, to become a major international education center with the primary emphasis on creating greater mutual understanding among the Americas and throughout the world (Florida Department of State, 1976)—has provided a founding pillar and ethos guiding the university’s international activities since it opened its doors.

Yet, the international purpose has not always been a priority. Rather, the international part had a more implicit connotation of the diverse community the institution serves. In 2008, the university president at the time gave a speech calling all stakeholders to truly live up to the institution’s purpose and name. Furthermore, it demonstrated a commitment and change in conversations from the upper university administration toward internationalization, setting the background and top-down approach for the QEP initiative.

Another significant document reviewed was the HHSI mission statement. John Heyl (2007) writes in the book *The Senior International Office (SIO) as Change Agent* that a mission statement “usually relates most closely to the original terms of its founding and both the historic and ongoing setting of the institution. The mission statement thus explains succinctly why the institution exists” (p. 23). A careful analysis of the HHSI mission statement illustrates a lack of attention to internationalization. The HHSI mission statement emphasizes generating knowledge, promoting creativity, and solving problems through research, but it does not make relevant its international purpose or “include the importance of preparing students for ‘global citizenry’” (Heyl, 2007, p. 23). On the other hand, research has been an explicit priority at the HHSI fulfilling its mission by achieving the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Classification of Doctoral/Research University-Extensive.

The HHSI Millennium Strategic Plan developed in the Spring of 2001 explicitly incorporates “international” as one of the university’s strategic themes. In particular, the strategic Millennium Plan puts emphasis on faculty international research as well as students’ bilingual competence and study abroad. It should be noted that a New Strategic Plan 2010-2015, called *Worlds Ahead*, is in the process of being developed to reflect the changing times affecting the HHSI.

The HHSI is undergoing a rebirth of its internationalization ethos. As part of its reaffirmation of accreditation process in 2010, the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) (2011) required that the HHSI develop and present a QEP. As the Director of the Global Learning Initiatives Office explains,
Our plan, our quality enhancement plan or our QEP, titled Global Learning Initiatives, focuses on educating students to be global citizens, meaning students should be able to function in the 21st century by having relevant skills such as critical thinking and cultural awareness.

The assessment of HHSI’s documents and interviews with deans and university interim provost and executive vice president demonstrates that HHSI’s policy toward internationalization is a priority.

Implementation of internationalization. HHSI’s organizational structure for internationalization though scattered among several offices, explicit guidelines toward internationalization efforts are present. The most prominent offices to date are the Office of Global Learning Initiatives (OGLI), the newly created School of International Public Affairs (SIPA), the Study Abroad Office, International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS), and the Office of Academic Planning and Accountability. Each of these offices oversees different aspects of internationalization at HHSI but with no official chief international educator administrator (CIEA) overseeing the university’s comprehensive internationalization efforts. However, the interim provost and executive vice president has currently taken on the responsibilities of the CIEA. The interim provost and executive vice president stated that “I have assumed the role when external delegations come to campus. They used to meet with the Vice Provost for International Studies. They tend to meet with me now, in some cases, or with the director of SIPA.”

It should be pointed out that the position of Vice Provost for International Studies and the Office of International Studies were eliminated in the Spring 2008 term. The former Office of International Studies comprised different centers and institutes (now under SIPA) and the Office of Study Abroad (now under undergraduate education). The Office of International Studies was eliminated due to budget cuts that the Office of the Provost suffered leading to the office’s reorganization.

The OGLI reports to the interim provost and executive vice president. This office is driving internationalization at HHSI mainly through the internationalization of the curriculum and co-curriculum shaping students learning and experiences at HHSI. In the words of the Director of the OGLI, “The office of the GLI is facilitating the development, design and implementation of our QEP, which is an essential component of the SACS reaccreditation.” The OGLI will operate until 2015, and by then as the Provost indicated, it will go away as the main core of the QEP process. Internationalization of the curriculum will have been incorporated into the university undergraduate lower- and upper-division courses. Undergraduate education will be responsible for the lower-division courses, while the different schools and colleges will focus on the upper-division courses tied to the students’ majors.

In terms of internationalizing the curriculum, the Global Learning for Global Citizenship Curricular Framework has been developed as a response to the QEP. The new curriculum strives to ensure that all students from the HHSI have the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to become global citizens even if they are not able to participate in study abroad or have any other international experience. As one Dean stated, “I think they [QEP] outline the goals for those [international classes for the students who aren’t studying abroad or may not have another international type of experience . . .”

The Global Learning for Global Citizenship Curricular Framework will require students to take one lower-division course in global learning foundations within their core curriculum and one upper-division global learning course as part of their major or field of study. The development of the new courses has taken place in a collaborative manner among the OGLI and faculty from the different schools and colleges.

A taskforce for internationalization is present at the HHSI but it is mainly related to the QEP. The taskforce or “development team” established in 2008 composed of faculty representatives from the institutions’ colleges and schools, students, and administrators. The development team was responsible for the initial drafting of the blueprint for the QEP strategic plan, as well as providing recommendations to the OGLI, among other tasks.

In regard to explicit procedures toward internationalization, the HHSI has processes and guidelines in place for international students (visa applications and Optional Practical Training, known as OPT), study abroad, offshore programs, and dual degrees. An approval policy on International Education Agreements is available, setting clear guidelines for units, colleges, and schools, initiating international activities. As one Dean stated,

Ten years ago, when the college started some international activities, I would say it was unstructured, but I believe that our initiatives forced structure on the process. So today we have a very structured process . . . We have contracts for how we do the dual degrees. We know what the rules and procedures are for offering programs offshore, and those are the two main areas where we need to have the procedures.

Yet, the initial development of any international activity rests mainly on faculty initiative and willingness to engage in international endeavors. Furthermore, the office of Academic Planning and Accountability is responsible for monitoring the HHSI’s international agreements and accreditation compliance.

Personnel policies toward internationalization, referring to hiring, annual evaluation, tenure and promotion, and/or facilitating research abroad seem less structured. A review of HHSI’s Tenure and Promotion Manual does not mention international work or activities as a requirement for tenure. Instead, its broad language leaves it up to the departments,
colleges and schools, to determine if international work is relevant.

HHSI’s implementation dimension for internationalization can be categorized as structured. There are multiple offices as well as policies and guidelines for the management of HHSI’s internationalization efforts.

**HHSI’s support of internationalization.** HHSI’s support for internationalization can be characterized as mainly one-sided, college/school/department-based, due to the peripheral nature of international activities and support, with specific areas of explicit interactive support for areas that cut across the university like the QEP, Study Abroad Office, and the Office of ISSS that are officially sanctioned.

Conversations with deans show a high level of agreement on the limited funding support available at HHSI for international activities except for the QEP efforts and the construction of new building for SIPA. Deans within their schools and colleges are responsible for supporting their own international activities. For example, offshore programs are offered as self-supporting programs, and during the 2008-2009 academic year the Director of the Study Abroad office explained that the study abroad programs were moved from full-time equivalency (FTE) generating to self-supporting.

On the other hand, according to the Director of the OGLI, the support comes from top down, and the support comes from bottom up, meaning there are dedicated resources to faculty development and to global learning, implementation of global learning curriculum, global learning faculty development, global learning co-curriculum. And from the bottom up, we have support from the Student Government Association.

In terms of funding for the QEP, beginning in the Spring of 2008, HHSI has committed half a million dollars annually for the next 5 years. Starting in 2016, Undergraduate Education and the Office of Assessment Planning and Accountability (APA) will receive the same half million dollars per year to support internationalization efforts across the university. Until 2015, these funds are dedicated to supporting the Global Learning Initiatives Office’s personnel and activities.

The provost and deans were asked how faculty members were rewarded for their international efforts. Their responses show a high level of agreement that rewards for international efforts depend primarily on the school or college the faculty belongs to. In terms of international grantsmanship, HHSI pays significant attention to faculty research/grantsmanship but it does not differentiate or provide any emphasis/reward for international research or involvement in international projects.

**HHSI’s International Activities**

**IRI.** The response rate to the IDI survey from the panel of experts was 80%. According to the experts’ responses, all items of the IDI are relevant for an IHE placed on Position 7 of the Internationalization Cube as their IRIs are above the established minimum level of 80%. For the foreign language item, however, the subcategory foreign language entrance requirement and foreign language graduation requirement were not considered as relevant as both presented an IRI below 80% (41% and 75%, respectively).

The panel of experts was also requested to determine a minimum number or percentage for each relevant item on the IDI. A comparison of HHSI’s International Activities Results with the experts’ numerical estimation showed the following about HHSI’s results on international activities.

**Foreign languages.** According to the Modern Language Association (2006) survey, Enrollments in Languages Other Than English in United States IHEs, Fall 2006, HHSI reported a total undergraduate enrollment of 1,784, an upper-division undergraduate enrollment of 720, and a graduate enrollment of 72. At the undergraduate level, the HHSI is above the panel’s response (40 of the panel of experts agreed on the minimum number of undergraduate enrollment in foreign language of more than 1,501). Yet, there is a difference between the lower- and upper-division undergraduate enrollment. This may be due to the fact that lower-division undergraduate students are taking courses to meet the foreign language entrance requirement. At the graduate level, the enrollment is below the panel’s response. Forty percent of the panel indicated the minimum number of graduate enrollment in foreign language to be 500 to 1,000. In addition, enrollment in foreign language degree programs is significantly lower. HHSI reported 219 students for the 2007-2008 academic year and 203 students for the 2008-2009 academic year. HHSI had 90 graduate students in 2007-2008 and 99 graduate students in 2008-2009.

**International students.** For the academic years 2007-2008 and 2008-2009, the percentage of international students enrolled at HHSI was 6.25% and 6.38%, respectively, representing far below the 10% to 25% the expert panel indicated as minimum enrollment of international students. The slight increase in international students from one academic year to the next points to the lack of a strategic recruitment plan.

**International movement of faculty.** Data collected from the Council for International Exchange of Scholars (CIES) Scholar directory show that the HHSI had no Fulbright Awards for the Academic year 2007-2008 but did host three Fulbright Awardees. For the 2008-2009 academic year, HHSI had four Fulbright Awards and hosted no Fulbright Awardees. According to the expert panel, 59% agreed that a university placed on Position 7 of the Internationalization Cube should have a minimum of 50 to 100 faculty members with Fulbright Awards. At the same time, 50% agree that it should host a minimum of 50 to 100 faculty Fulbright awardees. A look at the HHSI data demonstrates that HHSI is far below what the experts estimated.
Study abroad. Although the Study Abroad mission statement is aligned to HHSI’s efforts of promoting global knowledge, the number of students participating abroad is low. According to the panel of experts, 42% agree that the minimum number of students going abroad should range from 11% to 20%. Currently, HHSI has an average of 600 students going abroad, which translates to less than 5% of the student population, and an average of 25 exchange students coming to HHSI.

Discussion of Findings and Policy Implications

HHSI’s Position on the Van Dijk and Mejier International Cube

The analysis of the HHSI’s policy, support, and implementation dimensions places HHSI in Cell 6 of the Internationalization Cube. An analysis of HHSI’s policy documents and interview data on internationalization demonstrates that HHSI’s commitment toward internationalization has been present since its establishment. Yet, for HHSI, a fast-growing urban university facing economic challenges, internationalization has not always been at the top of the agenda.

Today, HHSI’s internationalization process has been reinvigorated with the QEP initiative. The QEP aligns HHSI’s strategic goals and institutional priority to educating global citizens expressed in the theme Global Learning for Global Citizenship. As a result, the QEP has led to changes in the undergraduate curriculum and the development of new co-curriculum. At the same time, the interactive support and systematic implementation nature of the QEP demonstrate that it is a top-down project. However, it should be noted that the QEP initiative focuses on one aspect of internationalization, that is, student learning as manifested in the curriculum and co-curriculum.

Overall, HHSI’s development and support of international activities remain a one-sided effort, with faculty and colleges/schools engaging in international activities—from study abroad programs, offshore programs, to faculty research abroad—as funding permits. The study done by Van Dijk and Mejier (1997) on the internationalization process of Dutch universities reported that a priority policy on internationalization correlates to the support for internationalization available within higher education institutions. At the HHSI, this seems to be true for the international activities or efforts that are university-wide directives like the QEP, creating a gap in the support available to other international activities despite HHSI’s priority policy on internationalization. This one-sided, decentralized support can be considered a hindering factor of internationalization (Childress, 2009).

The implementation of international activities follows a highly systematic approach for internationalization. Although international activities originally surfaced with few or no processes in place, the on-the-go learning process has led to carefully drafted processes and offices that monitor the activities (especially study abroad and offshore programs) and make sure they maintain the HHSI’s quality assurance. Despite the systematic approach, HHSI shows a blurry organizational structure when it comes to internationalization. The lack of a CIEA contradicts HHSI’s priority policy toward internationalization, and creates a void for the university-wide internationalization process in terms of communication and coordination. According to Green and Olson (2003), the CIEAs are the “champions for internationalization,” providing a clear policy of where the institution is going as well as gathering support and implementations processes. It is relevant to mention that up until 2 years ago, HHSI had an Office of International Programs headed by a Vice Provost for International Studies. Interestingly enough, the Office of International Programs and the position of Vice Provost for International Studies were abolished and their functions were distributed among SIPA, the OGLI, and other units of the university.

Finally, the study has identified some challenges facing the HHSI’s internationalization process. The most cited challenges were the lack of funding to engage in more international activities or provide financial support, as well as faculty feelings of overwhelming in terms of administrative reporting pertaining to quality assurance.

Results on International Activities

A comparison of HHSI’s results on international activities with the panel of experts’ responses shows that (a) an alignment exists between HHSI’s international activities and the panel of experts’ IRI, and (b) a difference exists in the numbers or percentages HHSI reported on five out of eight items’ subcategories of its international activities results based on the minimum requirement estimated by the panel of experts.

The presence of the highly correlated quantitative indicators on internationalization shows that HHSI’s advancement of internationalization has been slow-moving. Given HHSI’s student and faculty size population, an assessment of the student and faculty participation and/or involvement in different international activities depicts a history of an overlooked policy in the areas of foreign language enrollment, study abroad participation, percentage of international students on campus, international movement of faculty, and involvement in international development projects.

Implications of the Study

Practical Implications

In this study, internationalization is defined as the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institution (Knight & De Wit, 1997). A deconstruction of the definition
of internationalization means embedding an international and/or global perspective in all university processes, from what faculty teaches, to what students learn through formal activities or co-curriculum, and to faculty research and involvement in international/global issues. All these components provide the starting point for setting goals and rationales for the internationalization of IHE.

HHSI’s current approach that focuses on the development of students’ global competencies certainly sets the ground for an internationalization effort. Yet, to advance internationalization and the HHSI’s position on the Internationalization Cube, this approach should be expanded to manifest a coherent policy on internationalization in the following areas:

HHSI’s current mission statement emphasizes HHSI’s research aspect but overlooks HHSI’s international goal. The mission statement of an IHE is a written declaration of what the university stands for setting the path for processes and support to follow. Therefore, a clear and articulated HHSI mission statement including the importance of international education will “create a stronger foundation for operationalizing this commitment and intent” (Childress, p. 304). An instructive mission statement will endorse an organizational ethos that champions internationalization at all university levels, from admission recruitment pamphlets to human resources practices while reinforcing its sustainability.

Second, focusing internationalization on just the QEP or student outcomes can be a constraint. HHSI’s institutional policy of internationalization is the QEP, which is tied to HHSI’s Southern Association for Colleges and Schools’ (SACS) reaffirmation of accreditation process. Defining internationalization as a QEP effort underlines internationalization as a priority, while the QEP efforts are in place. Moving from an “Outcome Approach” to a “Process Approach” can be instrumental in the sustainability of HHSI’s internationalization efforts. Although the outcome and process approaches are not mutually exclusive, the process approach will compel HHSI to revisit its current policies, procedures, hiring practices, and resources in all aspects of the organizational process, and develop additional performance indicators aside from the QEP. The process approach will present a framework for HHSI’s internationalization efforts focusing on the input (HHSI’s organizational elements) and output (students’ competencies) at the same time (McNeil, Newman, & Steinhauser, 2005). In addition, it will remove the perception of a top-down project and convey the intrinsic nature of an internationalization process.

Third, the analysis of HHSI’s position on the Internationalization Cube in relation to its results in international activities identified five areas of weaknesses. To continue enhancing its internationalization efforts, HHSI will need to re-examine its commitment, policies, and support to (a) foreign language study, (b) study abroad, (c) international students, (d) international movement of faculty, and (e) international development projects. Therefore, by addressing these shortcomings, HHSI could move from a far-reaching typology change to an institution nurturing Transformational Change, high depth and high pervasiveness (Eckel, Green, & Hill, 2001).

Fourth, HHSI will benefit by defining its organizational structure when it comes to the internationalization process. Given the OGLI has taken on the task of HHSI’s QEP efforts, it seems effective and efficient to expand its role. The OGLI has the potential to become the core office for internationalization while supporting and maintaining high priority on internationalization. The study done by Childress (2009) suggests that with support and infrastructure “internationalization may become more fully integrated into an institution’s activities and ethos” (p. 302). Furthermore, a dedicated office responsible for the monitoring of the internationalization process is a key component in making sure that the internationalization efforts are sustained.

Fifth, literature on internationalization describes leadership from the top as an essential factor in making internationalization sustainable (Green & Olson, 2003; Knight, 2004). Consequently, the HHSI current leadership’s (President and Provost) explicit commitment to internationalization is crucial to advancing organizational change. The top leadership should continue to encourage discussions on internationalization among faculty, students, and administrators by addressing areas of weaknesses within the institution’s internationalization process. This ongoing dialogue, having in mind students’ age, ethnicity/race, and class, as well as faculty’s age and students and faculty past experiences, will keep the internationalization efforts current and allow for incremental modifications in terms of values, beliefs, practices, and secure financial assistance where needed.

Finally, though no generalization can be made from the analysis of the HHSI, IHE can use this institution’s experience when evaluating their internationalization process by paying attention to the different elements looked at in the model: A priority policy should have a clear and explicit statement toward internationalization that all university stakeholders understand and are aware of. This policy should guide the implementation process with the outlining of clear organizational structures and personnel guidelines—faculty and administrative personnel—while fostering an interactive support among and across units of the IHEs. Importantly, this study attempted to stay away from the fragmented nature of assessing internationalization just by looking at an IHE international activities, but rather highlight the intrinsic relationship between policy, implementation, and support that should exist if internationalization is to be sustained.

Research Implications

The focus of this research was to apply the Internationalization Cube to an IHE to assess its internationalization process. The research, however, believes that one of the drawbacks of the model is that it takes for granted the external factors influencing an IHE’s policy, support, and implementation. The
research believes that for the model to be more effective, such external factors need to be included in the model to provide a deeper understanding of IHE decision-making processes. In addition, the researcher understands that the application and analysis of this model by future researchers will lead to a constant improvement of other theoretical models for internationalization that currently exist.

Second, the application and expansion of the IRI as a tool to assess IHE’s international activities in relation to an IHE position on the Internationalization Cube will contribute to close the theoretical gap of evaluating internationalization on the bases of separate/fragmented elements. This will address one of the main challenges facing the assessment of internationalization today (Green, 2002). In addition, the researcher understands and encourages as the possible next step in research to assess the degree that the IHE’s international activities foster the internationalization or development of global competencies in students.

Finally, the research believes that due to the fast changing dynamics of IHE continuous research needs to be conducted to fully comprehend how IHE can make their internationalization process sustainable. A comparative analysis of models for internationalization such as the IMPI or the IQR and its application on different IHE will be beneficial.

Societal Implications

IHE engage in internalization to respond to the need to educate 21st-century students that possess the global competencies needed in today’s society (Abraham Lincoln Commission, 2005; U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2008; National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges [NASULGC], 2004). Hunter (2004) defines global competency as “having an open mind while actively seeking to understand cultural norms and expectations of others, leveraging this gained knowledge to interact, communicate and work effectively outside one’s environment” (pp. 130-131). Therefore, an IHE would benefit society by assessing how its internationalization efforts are indeed fostering students’ global competencies, through the analysis of its student learning outcomes, internationalization of the curriculum, co-curricular activities, offering of foreign languages, study abroad, faculty engagement in international projects among others, and no less important how the institution’s decision-making processes are aligned to its internationalization efforts.

Conclusion

The study attempted to present a conceptual framework for examining IHEs’ internationalization process. The Van Dijk and Meijer (1997) Model was used in assessing the internationalization process in terms of HHSI’s policies, support, and implementation dimensions. The results in these three areas placed HHSI on Position 6 of the Internationalization Cube—Priority Policy, One-Sided Support, and Structured Implementation. This explorative model for understanding HHSI’s internationalization process suggests to decision-makers that to move on to the next level on the Internationalization Cube (if desired), they should address appropriate adjustments in the policy, support, or implementation dimensions.

The study also identified, through the use of the IDI, the international activities in need of improvement. It is desired that these findings will serve as a starting point for conversations among the different stakeholders within the university. Certainly, attending to these shortcomings will have a positive impact on HHSI’s policy, support, and implementation dimensions. In particular, by addressing these challenges, HHSI will need to revisit its current policies toward foreign language study, international students, study abroad, faculty movement and involvement in international projects by connecting these activities to the university’s overall internationalization efforts. The provision of financial and personnel resources for these activities should also be enhanced. Changes in any of these areas will certainly further HHSI’s internationalization efforts and position in the Internationalization Cube.

### Appendix A

**Van Dijk and Meijer Internationalization Cube**

| Cell | A Policy | B Support | C Implementation |
|------|---------|----------|-----------------|
| 1    | Marginal| One-sided| Ad hoc          |
| 2    | Marginal| One-sided| Systematic      |
| 3    | Marginal| Interactive| Ad hoc        |
| 4    | Marginal| Interactive| Systematic     |
| 5    | Priority| One-sided| Ad hoc          |
| 6    | Priority| One-sided| Systematic      |
| 7    | Priority| Interactive| Ad hoc         |
| 8    | Priority| Interactive| Systematic    |
Appendix B

List of Interviewees

Executive Vice President and Provost/Chief Operating Officer
Director of the Office of Global Learning Initiatives
Director of Graduate Admissions
College of Education, Dean
College of Arts & Sciences, Dean
School of International and Public Affairs, Director
College of Business Administration, Dean
School of Hospitality & Tourism Management, Dean

Appendix C

Sample Analysis Models

---

Policy Model Analysis

| Document                        | Criteria:                                                                 |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                | Explicit mention and/or attention or commitment to global, international,   |
|                                | multicultural mission/goals in university documents, magazines, webpage,  |
|                                | etc. = Priority (P)                                                      |
|                                | Low attention or importance given to the internationalization aims within |
|                                | the institution shown by no indication and/or attention or explicit        |
|                                | commitment to global, international, or multicultural commitment in        |
|                                | university documents, magazines, webpage, etc. = Marginal (M)             |
| Mission Statement              | Mention of Global, international, multicultural mission/goals, commitment  |
|                                | to diversity = P                                                          |
|                                | No indication of global, international, or multicultural commitment = M    |
| Faculty Bios                   | Article I. Strong Emphasis on global = P                                 |
| Experience                     | No mention of global dimension = M                                       |
| Admissions Catalogs           | Wide distribution = P                                                     |
| Institution Magazine          | Prominence of Statement                                                  |
|                                | Frequency = P                                                             |
|                                | Strong International Component = P                                        |
|                                | Little/no global content = M                                              |

Implementation analysis model

| ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE for internationalization | Criteria:                                                                 |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| CIEA TITLE                                        | Clear Indication or Presence of organizational structure/guidelines:absolute/ procedures toward internationalization = structured/systematic |
| Level of Reporting line                         | No clear Indication or Presence of organizational structure/guidelines:absolute/procedures toward internationalization = Ad hoc |
| PRIMARY LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY                 |                                                                           |
| SECONDARY LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY               |                                                                           |
| EXISTENCE OF CAMPUS-WIDE INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD COMMITTEE |                |
| Appointed                                       |                                                                           |
| Elected                                         |                                                                           |
| Number of Meetings/Years                        |                                                                           |

(continued)
Appendix C (continued)

Implementation analysis model

Student Representation
External/Internal/Combined

PERSONNEL policies
International Faculty
Faculty Interests
Faculty backgrounds
Inclusion of International efforts/expertise for tenure,
hiring, and rewarding decisions

Clear Indication or Presence of organizational structure/
guidelines/procedures = Structured/Systematic
No clear Indication or Presence of organizational structure/
guidelines/procedures = Ad hoc

Explicit Procedures developed in an orderly or systematic
fashion
International Students recruitment plan
Study Abroad, Offshore programs, internationalization of
the curriculum, faculty travel to teach abroad

Support Model of Analysis

Criteria:
Support provided with interaction among central, faculty, and
departmental levels = Interactive
Support provided at the central or peripheral level = Unilateral/
One-sided

Foreign Languages
   FL Department
   FL Requirement
   Entry Requirements
International Studies
   IS Majors/Minors
Internationalization of the Curriculum
Study Abroad
   Internal Programs
   Non-academic Support
International Students
   Administrative and Staff
   Services (i.e., Financial Aid)
International Faculty
   Recognition
   Integrated into Campus
Faculty Expertise
   External Grants
   Institutional Support (research)
Other Resources
   Funding Sources (external and internal sources)
   Library Resources (international newspapers, foreign
films, language aids, etc.).
Organization of International Conference
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