Case Studies of Internationalization in Adult and Higher Education: Inside the Processes of Four Universities in the United States and the United Kingdom

Joellen Elizabeth Coryell[1], Beth A. Durodoye[3],
Robin Redmon Wright[2], P. Elizabeth Pate[3],
and Shelbee Nguyen[3]

Abstract

This report outlines a method for learning about the internationalization processes at institutions of adult and higher education and then provides the analysis of data gathered from the researchers' own institution and from site visits to three additional universities in the United States and the United Kingdom. It was found that campus internationalization requires a deep understanding and appreciation of the institutional context. In addition, although elements of internationalization may be implemented, the findings indicate there is a need to underpin these approaches with (a) a shared understanding of what internationalization is and the ways it should ultimately impact student learning within an institution and (b) a collection of assessment methods for evaluating internationalization efforts and learning outcomes. Implications and recommendations for further research are also offered.

Keywords

[1]Texas State University, San Marcos
[2]Penn State University, Harrisburg
[3]University of Texas, San Antonio

Corresponding Author:
Joellen Elizabeth Coryell, Texas State University at San Marcos, 601 University Drive, San Marcos, Texas 78666
Email: coryell@txstate.edu

The sociopolitical and economic conditions of the world today beseech the global society to move toward an era of informed, culturally sensitive collaboration. Accordingly, institutions of higher education (IHEs) are including global and international themes in their mission statements and strategic plans. Knight and de Wit (1995) described internationalization as the integration of an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service of an institution. Internationalizing a university can require significant change and is certainly systematically complex. It requires dedicated faculty, staff, students, administrators, and community members who aspire to be transformational leaders in the 21st-century global community.

With an ultimate goal of garnering international research status, our university identified *globalization* as one of three foundational themes in its strategic plan. *Globalization* is defined by Altbach and Knight (2006) as the "economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement" (p. 1). However, identifying the vision and carrying out its implementation are two different matters. Thoughtful development of a new design in academic and organizational structure must intentionally advance the goals of developing and refining the institution's internationally related strategic vision. Rizvi (2001) suggests,

> A global university must now be characterised by its engagement with the processes of globalisation, its international networks and its internationalized curriculum. The field of international education has matured in recent years, with the greater recognition of how it uniquely spans the cultural, economic and interpersonal dimensions of global relations. (para. 3)

Ultimately, international education must be concerned with "both the individual adult as well as development of the greater context in which adults find themselves, whether it be the nation, society, the community, an organization, or a group" (Boucouvalas, 2005, p. 18). As Martin (2006) argues, it must be "about catalysing the relationship between politics and ethics" in which "the imagination as a social force works across national lines" (p. 290).

Our university is designated as a Hispanic and minority-serving institution with more than 58% of its students coming from underrepresented populations in academe. In addition, more than 41% are adult students between the ages of 23 and 50 years, and many students are the first persons in their families to attend university (UTSA Fact Book, 2009). The members of the interdisciplinary research team on this project hail from varying areas of educationally related disciplines. The first researches international and cross-cultural adult and higher education, as well as the professional development of adult educators; the second studies issues that encompass multicultural counseling and race and ethnicity in education; the third investigates international social justice issues surrounding education and popular culture's impact on adult identity development; the fourth focuses on service-learning/community-based research and democratic education; and the fifth investigates intercultural communication, international student perceptions, study abroad, and the role that adult learning and teaching plays in each

of these areas. The central administration asked us to examine how the institution is currently situated with respect to offering internationally focused educational experiences and to find ways to provide these experiences more widely for students, faculty, administration, and staff. As part of that effort, we conducted site visits to universities in the United States and the United Kingdom that are engaged in the process of internationalizing their own institutions and educative offerings.

In our site visits, we sought to identify how other institutions and scholars have learned through the change processes inherent in internationalizing the university experience. To answer these questions, and to make recommendations for future steps, we investigated these overarching research questions:

1. In what ways do national and international academic communities define the characteristics of how an internationalized perspective can be integrated into adult and higher education experiences?
2. How have national and international institutions internationalized the university experience through research and curricula and with international scholars and study abroad opportunities?
3. How is the impact of internationalization efforts documented?

In this article, we discuss an overview of recent research literature and the theoretical framework that guided our investigation and describe our site visit data gathering, analysis methodology, and findings. Finally, we offer a discussion of how the cross-case findings inform not only how our own institution is currently situated in its internationalization efforts but also how the findings impact current and future research on internationalization in the academy.

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Altbach and Knight (2006) cite several motivations universities choose to internationalize. These motivations include profit motivations, increased access and demand absorption, improved cultural composition of the student population, competitiveness, prestige, and enhanced strategic alliances with other institutions. To capture the ways in which higher education goes about internationalizing, Arum (1987) described international education with three overarching categories: international studies, international educational exchange, and technical assistance. Our approach is an adaptation to his categories, which distinguishes academic functions of the academy into international research, scholars and students, curricula, and study abroad. An overview of each of these areas is provided below.

International Research

In higher education, there are generally two frames of cross-national research: international and globalization. International research generally focuses on specific issues within

national systems of higher education. For example, Stevenson and Willot (2008) investigated the role of cultural capital theory in explaining the absence of refugees and other nontraditional students from adult and higher education in the United Kingdom. Likewise, Ng and Shan (2007) investigated the experiences of professional Chinese immigrant women in the Canadian labor market. Each of these studies focused on issues with respect to a particular context.

Globalization research, alternatively, is "seen as world-wide . . . it is not the special product or province of one particular group, nation, or empire, but rather the joint product of the total experience of humankind" (Modelski, Devezas, & Thompson, 2008, p. 420). Global research activities transcend national borders, often to research world-wide trends and growing global issues or concerns. Globalization research is often grounded in systems thinking, which focuses on the study of how individual components interact with other components within a system. Instead of isolating smaller and smaller parts of the system being studied, systems thinking works by expanding its view to take into account larger and larger numbers of interactions as an issue is being investigated (Aronson, 1998). To illustrate this approach, Holland and Pithers (2005) studied how issues and challenges of adult professional development were perceived by both Western and Chinese educators and how they were jointly solved to develop more creative and resourceful practitioners.

International Scholars and Students

There is no one way to be an international scholar or to define international scholarship. The history of internationalization in the academy is multifaceted (Dolby & Rahman, 2008), as are the experiences of faculty and student scholars whose endeavors may take the form of administrative and managerial opportunities, leadership on projects that are both local and far-reaching, teaching and curriculum revisions, instruction/study abroad participation, or the employment of global, social, economic, political, and educational resources (Dolby & Rahman, 2008; Ruther, 2002). Moreover, participating in international academic activities and conferences provides scholars with what Solomon and Zukas (2006) have termed "globalising academic communities." These communities, they suggest, create a "ceremonial space" (p. 372) in which scholarship is "played" and "performed" (p. 373) and both "knowledge and academic identities" are produced (p. 377). All these activities may assist individuals to expand and enrich their critical international perspectives, practices, and identities.

The expansion of a scholar's worldview rests on his or her ability to examine self, understand others, and demonstrate proficient interpersonal skills. Deardorff (2006) focuses on this issue through the demonstration of a pyramid model of intercultural competence, whereby one's attitudes, knowledge, and skills are consistently processed to learn more about one's self in relation to others. Requisite attitudes involve the scholar's appreciation and respect for diverse groups, as well as his or her willingness to learn from others. Awareness of one's personal attitudes and beliefs and their impact on the cross-cultural dynamic constitutes the knowledge and comprehension level of the pyramid.

Also important here is the self-study into the salience of one's various cultural identities, such as nationality, religious orientation, language, and family characteristics.

In many universities outside of the United States, internationalizing the institution often focuses on increasing the number of international students enrolled. Competition for international students is a global trend (Brown & Jones, 2007). According to Jones (2007),

> international students are now seen to be at the heart of the University and a valuable source of cultural capital. They help to provide the means of delivering the strategy in that, amongst other things, they add to the diversity of the institution and offer focal points for themed activities, such as events celebrating particular cultures. (pp. 25-26)

Another trend includes the export of education to other countries, which entails student enrollment in a foreign university but with most of their study occurring "offshore" (Harmon, 2004, p. 102). Whether present on campus or off, international students provide significant increases in tuition and fees, making them highly desirable additions to the university community.

Faculty or student scholars, whether international or domestically reared and educated, must be willing to analyze, interpret, and reevaluate their cross-cultural interactions. Such competencies can lead to rich, complex, and insightful learning and teaching outcomes that are characteristic of the international scholar experience (Deardorff, 2006; Green & Shoenberg, 2006).

International Curricula

Not surprisingly, a review of the literature from the past 5 years on university-wide efforts at internationalizing curriculum yielded a substantial number of articles on initiatives led by the business colleges of both public and private universities. For-profit institutions have also made internationalized curricula their mantra. The goal, it seems, is most often profit as "global capital has, for the first time, heavily invested in knowledge industries worldwide, including higher education and advanced training" (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 290). In a rush to compete in a global economy, many postsecondary educational efforts toward internationalized curricula have been compartmentalized, with little assessment done to determine the success of the results (Deardorff, 2006).

According to De Vita (2007), curriculum internationalization has traditionally been approached in two ways—by imported or infused methods. The import method includes a commercialized agenda to increase higher education institutions' financial base through vying for international fee-paying students (McNamara & Harris, 1997). Government efforts to mandate internationalization of curricula and assessment, such as the International Baccalaureate in Australia (Wylie, 2008) and the globalized National Curriculum in the United Kingdom, tend to focus on "the desire to secure a role in this new global knowledge economy" and often result in the "McDonaldization of the state education system" (Wilkinson, 2006, pp. 82-88). According to Wilkinson (2006), these efforts

"subjugate educational objectives to economic policy" and can be seen in the "ideological shackling of education by the principles of money, the market and its managers and the prioritization of economy as a first-order value" (p. 88). In this view, the new "McWorld" (p. 88) is served internationalized curricula of efficiency, calculability, and state control. Such systems create an environment where "debate about the wider purposes of education and its role within a western liberal democracy is suffocated beneath the heavy pillow of abstracted, managerialist 'objectivity' and global economics" (p. 95).

The infusion method, however, approaches internationalization by permeating existing curricula with diverse perspectives and knowledge gleaned from professional practices across cultures (Whalley, Langley, Villarreal, & College, 1997). The results of the infusion method led to reconceptualizing traditional subject areas to include comparative studies, expanding cross-cultural communication skills, and increasing foreign language offerings (de Wit, 1995). Unfortunately, however, this strategy for internationalizing the curriculum can neglect the need to systematically indoctrinate cultural inclusion into teaching and learning (De Vita, 2007; Edwards, Crosling, Petrovic-Lazarovic, & O'Neil, 2003). Ibrahim (2005) suggests instead that an international curriculum must draw on "insights from human rights education, peace education, anti-racist and multicultural education as well as development education" (p. 178). As Martin (2006) points out, "globalisation now calls for a more cosmopolitan framing of the issues in a way which recognizes a third dimension of justice" (p. 289).

Study Abroad

Study abroad can be defined as any opportunity for an individual to learn in an international locale. This may be in a short- or long-term program, be led by faculty from the students' home institution or by instructors in the international setting, be unilateral or bilateral, include a service component, and be offered within one or more fields of study. These programs are typically focused on the humanities and social sciences but are increasing in fields of study including engineering, political science, business, agriculture, and the sciences (Arum, 1987; Dekaney, 2008). Ultimately, study abroad programs can provide students an opportunity to learn about global diversity and the interdependence and interrelationships of local, national, and international issues affecting the world's population today. These experiences are often significantly transforming for students and faculty alike and can be an important vehicle for attaining institutional internationalization goals.

Study abroad programs provide opportunities to learn formally and informally outside of the institution, the native country, and the learners' comfort zone. Although Chieffo and Griffiths (2009) found that short-term programs tend to be more attractive to adults and working students who are unable to afford the time and money investments inherent in longer programs, Dwyer's (2004) study discovered that both long- and short-term study abroad programs can produce impressive results on measures of intercultural development and personal growth. Engle and Engle (2003), however, suggest that the instructional design, learning outcome objectives, and specific characteristics of the

program are essential for academic and student development to occur. Focused and reflexive interaction with the host country and culture, and time to process the experience, are paramount in providing a meaningful outcome (Spencer, Murray, & Tuma, 2005).

In addition, faculty and staff can engage in international technical assistance that "involves US faculty and staff working to develop institutions and human resources abroad, primarily in Third World countries" (Arum, 1987, p. 18). Some of the most popular programs provide agricultural assistance. Finally, Arum (1987) highlights faculty exchanges, which result in instructors teaching, studying, and doing research. These experiences offer instructors a new understanding of international, as well as domestic, student populations.

However, without intentional, comprehensive instructional design, study and service abroad experiences do not always produce the kind of learning, development, and transformation that is intended (Gray, Murdock, & Stebbins, 2002; Green, 2007). For example, Wu (2006) found that students who study abroad often need special assistance dealing with language issues that affect test taking, academic assignments, and social interaction. Woolf (2007) suggests international field-based teaching has remained essentially static and curricula and instructional practices must be significantly revised to meet new global-diversity learning needs. In addition, the impact of studying abroad is still not well documented and often based on assumptions made by administrators and faculty (Dekaney, 2008). Vande Berg (2007) advises that the increase in study abroad enrollment (more than 300% in the past 20 years) is leading governments, institutions, and faculty to focus on the effectiveness of teaching and learning in these programs. He stresses that if study abroad programs are to facilitate learning effectively, faculty in these programs must intervene before, during, and after these experiences. Green (2007) also contends that faculty must develop an internationalized mindset to create learning that is comparative, integrative, interdisciplinary, contextual, and global.

Theoretical Framework

To evaluate current perspectives on international education in the academic community as well as in our local context, we based our plans in knowledge gained from research literature, multidisciplinary conceptions of internationalization, and a critical self-examination and assessment of our collective assumptions (Schoorman, 2000). We found that to keep pace with an ever-changing social, political, and economic climate, as well as to produce graduates equipped with tools to advance global social justice and human rights, IHEs must prepare adults who can successfully participate in an increasingly interdependent world (De Vita, 2007; Francis, 1993). Green (2003) argues that the responsibility of internationalizing higher education lies with faculty, yet it necessitates significant support from institutional administrators. She adds that resource availability, disciplinary paradigm shifts, and structured incentives are essential if these initiatives are to be successful.

Likewise, the institutional context commands attention and bears heavily on any changes undertaken. In this study, we define institutional context as the history, geographical

location, demographics of the university community, mission, goals, and culture of an institution. Correspondingly, we viewed this study through the lens of situated cognition (Lave, 1988; Lave & Wenger, 1991), a theory often underpinning the discipline of adult education, which places the social context and influences inherent in an educational environment as the focus of the learning experience. Central to the theory are communities of practice, which Lave and Wenger (1991) refer to as "a set of relations among person, activity, and world, over time and in relation with other tangential and overlapping communities" (p. 98). Within this framework, learning is a function of the context including the actions, behaviors, and culture in which it takes place. This approach also considers the historical, social, and cultural contexts that community participants convey in the educational environment.

Research Design

Data Gathering

We first designed a semistructured protocol (see appendix) that would help us determine institutional understandings about internationalization and to identify those understandings within the four themes we identified (international curricula, international research, international scholars and students, and study abroad). We requested a meeting based on this protocol with our own home university's (HU) Office of International Programs (IP) and senior international officer (SIO) to situate our institution within the larger findings of the study.

As our travel funding was limited, the research team could make three trips—one locally, one out of state, and one internationally. We then set about identifying universities who were entrenched in internationalization efforts and who had contextual similarity to that of our institution or because of their internationally prestigious research reputations. We contacted the campus administrators at five universities who were responsible for international education and programs, explained our study, and requested an opportunity to meet. The administrators were chosen based on their responsibilities and their ability to be the "voice of their institutions" to discuss procedures, policies, infrastructure, and other contextual components that influence their internationalization processes. Three institutions agreed to participate.

The first is a large university in the Western United States. We chose to include this institution because its student population and size is similar to ours. It is a primarily nonresidential, selective, 4-year doctoral degree–granting university with high research activity (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2005). We identify it as WU.

The second is a very large university in the Southwestern United States (SWU). It is a 4-year, more selective, doctoral and medical/veterinary degree-granting institution with very high research activity (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2005). We chose to include this institution based on its research status and geographical proximity to our institution.

The third university, which we refer to as UKU, is a smaller, top-tier research institution in the United Kingdom. Ranked among the world's top universities over the past 7 years (Academic Ranking of World Universities, 2009), we chose this institution because of its preeminent research status and international reputation for excellence in higher education.

The protocol was sent via email in advance of the meeting. Some administrators chose to include additional staff members in the dialogue. We also collected additional documentation that included organization charts, program descriptions, strategic plans, and student enrollment demographic information during the meetings, from the university websites, and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching website. The conversations were semistructured, which allowed us to ask follow-up questions and request additional information or examples of their responses. Each researcher took extensive observational notes during each of the four visits and shared their notes with the research team. These notes and institutional documents established the raw data sets. Follow-up email correspondence allowed for additional clarification.

Analysis

The data were analyzed qualitatively using a within-case and across-case study approach (Yin, 1994). Case studies are bounded investigations that aim to uncover deeper situational understandings by highlighting the features or attributes of social life through studying a set of interactions, common behavior patterns, or specific contextual structures (Hamel, Dufour, & Fortin, 1993). Constant comparison and thematic analyses were employed to get a connective sense of the data set by identifying codes and grouping them into categories and subcategories (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). In this method, we listed specific words and phrases (codes) used in each meeting when discussing and describing the institutional responses to the protocol questions. Next, we used these codes to create categories and subcategories for each institution (within case) to identify themes and glean an overall contextual portrait of each university. These collections were read and reread to get an overall impression of the data. Finally, we analyzed how the specific responses compared across the data set (across case) and then compared the categories and themes, as well, to identify recurring patterns and insights that surfaced.

Findings

In this section, we first provide a contextual and thematic illustration of each institution, beginning with our own, to provide a foundation for the findings (Yin, 1994). We then offer the collective synthesis across the institutions with a discussion of the patterns which provide insight into the collective processes, understandings, influences, trends, and challenges that offer our institution and others insight into the complex process institutions of adult and higher education face in their quests to internationalize.

HU

Decentralized internationalization and fractionated efforts. Our university is in the early stages of understanding what internationalization across the institution is. Most of the individual colleges contend the global economy and international influences are important factors in the future within their disciplines. With respect to international efforts and activities, each college works independently from the others. The IP, therefore, is currently "working to understand exactly what they [the colleges] are currently doing, and how they are doing it." They admit that although they would like to identify a shared vision for the university, at present only a few common beliefs and some anecdotal information underpin their work. IP's current focus has been primarily on supporting study abroad program opportunities and risks, and managing HU's international education fund, which offers financial assistance to some students studying abroad. However, less than 1% of HU's student population studied abroad in 2008.

There has not been an outright focus on systematically internationalizing the learning or research experiences at HU. Although there exist courses, programs of study, and research endeavors with an international focus, traditionally, these efforts have been "driven by individual faculty through individual interests." An objective for new faculty hires is to "work toward bringing faculty on board who have an international research agenda." In addition, approximately 4.5% of HU's students are international, and increasing the international student population is a priority. However, they acknowledge the HU's programs and services for international scholars and students "are not well-supported or executed."

A need for new expertise and dialogue across the university. One of the concerns at HU is that the current business processes have not adapted to internationalization. For example, "there is not someone in Human Resources that has the expertise about international visitors, consultants, or even employees." Recently, however, a new position was created, executive vice provost and senior international officer. This position has the responsibility to build the capacity of the institution to systematically internationalize the learning experience at HU within a centrally organized structure. The SIO and the IP are currently working toward clarifying procedures and policies and establishing "an infrastructure that supports a global perspective in the curriculum across all programs." However, they recognize one of the biggest challenges they face is determining how to provide centralized services to colleges that have traditionally operated with autonomy in their internationalization efforts. At this point, "The infrastructure and business processes sometimes overwhelm the dialogue."

WU

Decentralized internationalization. WU, a U.S. institution with an ethnically diverse student population of approximately 34,000 students, has a specifically decentralized structure underpinning its internationalization processes. Initially, the university was against establishing a dean of international programs because they wanted to "avoid being

perceived as competition for resources with the other colleges." Consequently, they formed an international programs council made up of students, faculty, and researchers. It is the only council that reports directly to the provost. The activities of this council began to magnetize people to the ideas of internationalization. The primary goal is to increase significantly student and faculty opportunities to learn and teach abroad. They contend, "International programs are an important part of the university context with respect to teaching and research."

Service orientation and focus on study abroad. Over time, the university community began to recognize that there was a serious attempt to organize international activities for students, and many chose to be supportive. Although they believe the key to globalizing the campus is the faculty, they stress that they do not force anyone to engage in internationalization efforts. Their continued approach is to "find out who wants to be a part of this movement, rather than trying to co-opt cynics."

The IP is made up of two active faculty researchers who are the assistant vice president and an assistant director of international programs, two full-time administrative staff members, and a student worker. They package themselves as "a service to faculty and as professional development." In addition, they work with satellite representatives (IP coordinators) who are cosupported in each college.

The IP office primarily focuses on study abroad and on integrating their support and services throughout the institutional and greater communities. They engage in multiple types of programs: independent, bilateral exchange, summer courses, internships abroad, semesters abroad, international and transborder research projects, and international student exchange programs. Local community members and parents are invited also on study abroad trips. They suggest, "Internationalization has become a part of the culture of the institution, and it comes from within." In addition, a competitive grants program became a main faculty development tool.

Funding for IP scholarships are internally supported via a US$5 student fee that passed a student referendum a number of years ago. Their continued approach to internationalization focuses on increasing required study abroad experiences in degree programs with the goal of 30% or more of the student body involved in study abroad. Although they did not articulate how they proposed to do so, they also indicated they wanted to emphasize the influence of exchange students' contributions to the life of the university community.

WU's institutional context of unforced involvement and decentralized support structures immerses the internationalization and change processes in what might be akin to a ripple in a warm bath. Sweeping change was not forced on the faculty, funds were not overtly stolen from the college coffers and rerouted to champion internationalization, and students voted to fund scholarships that supported study abroad. Programs and faculty could choose to ride the wave, or not, and the IP office was not required to justify its actions or existence. Unfortunately, though, they may be a bit too comfortable to attain their next level of goals. They seem to be in a holding pattern; they do not critically assess the impact that their services and study abroad have on the greater student learning or faculty development experiences. It became clear that systematic

connections among teaching and research, and integration of international curricula outside of study abroad were missing. Indeed, they may be afraid of rocking the proverbial boat.

SWU

Centralized internationalization. Although WU's approach to internationalization is greatly decentralized, SWU's is quite the opposite. Diversifying and globalizing the university community is an essential component of their current strategic plan. As such, the IP is taking on the task of "making internationalization a tradition at [the institution]." With a large office and a vice president heading an extensive staff of executive directors, directors, and support personnel, SWU employs a centralized leadership with logistical and regional specialization and expertise. The unarticulated framework that guides their work is a flexible, mentoring approach influenced primarily by a number of national associations' guidelines and best practice recommendations.

Internationalization across the curriculum. Two years of coursework in the same foreign language and a new international and diversity core-curriculum category with two courses are now required for graduation in undergraduate programs. The foreign language course-work can, however, be fulfilled in high school. The core curriculum category courses may be satisfied in either on-campus courses or by any academic, credit-bearing experience abroad. Study abroad services are funded by student service fees, fees for service from users (students studying abroad), and one third from centralized university government (not soft money). Currently, 14% of graduating students have had an academic experience outside of the United States. Their next goal is to increase that number to 25%.

Service-oriented internationalization support. SWU's IP office understands they have "to be an integral part of academic service . . . under the Provost . . . with interaction with colleges, deans, and faculty." Consequently, they have put in place a variety of requirements and opportunities to interact and connect with academics and academic leadership through a goal-setting method of moving the agenda forward. The IP objective is to make sure students have access to all kinds of international education. To achieve this goal, they make sure an IP representative is involved in all student learning/core curriculum meetings.

Yet they assert their function is to "facilitate international education." They "do not tell faculty what to do or how to do it." Rather, their facilitator role entails offering specialized sets of expertise "to help faculty do what they want to do." Serving as a resource, they offer scholar services to international faculty, international student services, and an international outreach office which provides assistance in country-specific protocol, putting together large events, conferences, and memoranda of agreements (MOAs) routing, warehousing, administration (e.g., expirations, etc.), and processes through the bureaucracy. However, no one from IP is involved in creating MOAs; they "just work and channel them." International student services are funded by a fee-based model.

The influence of traditions and community. Traditions and networking are essential to SWU's institutional context. This foundation permeates the IP office's approach to awareness and fund-raising throughout the university and local community and across the global

association of alumni. Celebrations, projects, activities, symposia, festivals, and international lecturers throughout the year are marketed through a university-wide committee. They "cultivate" their board of regents with regular student presentations of study abroad experiences and produce brochures and reports about what each college is doing abroad to the local community, greater alumni network, and academic leadership and faculty.

The challenge of creating systematic ownership of internationalization. Whereas learning is evaluated by faculty, IP conducts program evaluations. Annual data-driven reporting justifies their existence and funding. They tally the number of students taking language classes, the number of students and types of activities in which they engage abroad, active MOAs, and the amount of external funding toward globalization/internationalization efforts they bring in (currently at US$1 million).

Finally, they insist, "Internationalization requires developing attitudinal goals." However, the marketing, interactions, and even assertive presence at institutional and local community meetings have not thus far produced the kind of systematic buy-in for which SWU's IP strives. This is evidenced in the IP's identification that they still have much work to do in creating ownership for internationalization at all levels. Resources are still in high demand, and the IP office staff turnover is high.

UKU

Decentralized service. Of 18,000 students, one in five is an international student at UKU, and "all academic staff are engaged in some kind of international activity." The small international office (IO) houses seven people and a head of office. There are four regional office directors, the international database manager, and an office secretary. The IO oversees the administration of the Erasmus Program, which provides study and work exchange programs focused on mobility and enhanced career opportunities through learning and training in European Union countries, as well as other student and staff exchanges. The IO also manages a large scholarship fund to help with the costs of student academic activities in other European countries. The institution, as a whole, is exceptionally decentralized. At UKU, "there is only consensus; no one person can ever make a [final] decision." Everything is faculty led, "the vision, infrastructure, even business processes." Correspondingly, the approach the office takes toward internationalizing the institution is to be visible, accessible, and accountable, yet not forceful.

Integration of research, teaching, and learning. Teaching and research are integrated and inseparable at UKU. As such, instruction is framed as "research-led teaching." Courses focus on each faculty's current personal research, which may or may not be international in nature. One way the UKU community can gain international experience is through the Erasmus Program. In addition, students are expected to travel during their breaks and can apply for travel grants (managed through the IO) to do so. These scholarships can help fund a variety of endeavors, which may or may not connect directly with their university studies, yet which involve learning about the culture, languages, history, and/or politics of European countries. Students are also encouraged to work or volunteer internationally, but they are to make their own arrangements.

The IO recently undertook the task of capturing international activities, research, and collaborations (and the researchers/faculty connected to them) by developing a database that functions as an international directory. The directory is publicly searchable and documents international activities around the university. They created a full-time position of which 50% of work time is devoted to its management. Interestingly, UKU does not think of itself as an "international university . . . we're just a university." High-level leadership responsible for the institution's international strategy, therefore, states UKU must become accountable in its quest to become international.

Across-Case Findings

Internationalization and Research, Scholars, and Students

Research, with respect to institutional internationalization, appears uncharted in the four universities studied. Although research is indeed occurring internationally in these institutions, it is focused on individual faculty and their interests with little attention to capturing the current efforts in the university community as a whole. The institutions in this study recognize the importance of international/global research on internationalization processes, and they also acknowledge the need for increased resources to support these endeavors. In addition, the data suggested that the more international and globalized research that is occurring, new measures will need to be developed to capture what these activities entail and to document the impact they make on both students' and the university's development.

Each institution stressed its hiring practices were shifting toward individuals with international research pursuits. These universities now place a higher value on international/global research for new faculty lines and want to emphasize the importance of international students' and faculty's contributions to the life of the university and broader community. However, the data suggest that the efforts that are currently in effect to integrate international scholars and students into the educational experience tend to be departmentalized and infrequent. As with international research activities, none of the institutions measure the impact that international scholars and students have on the educational experience on their campuses.

Universities interested in internationalizing the learning experience need to take advantage of the rich learning opportunities individuals can have when peoples of different cultures, ethnicities, and nations come together in dialogue and collaboration. As such, the institutions in this study suggest that IP offices and academic departments need to work together to improve scholar services and enhance activities that provide the support and community involvement necessary for integration to occur.

Internationalization, Curricula, and Study Abroad

Approaches to internationalizing the curricula varied across the institutions. For WU, only study abroad and foreign language courses comprised the internationalization of the curricula. They have 17 programs that require study abroad, while "foreign language

courses provide international themes into the on-campus curricula." SWU, however, is forming committees to help facilitate international perspectives across the curricula. In addition, undergraduates must take six hours of internationally themed core coursework which can include study abroad, foreign languages, and on-campus offerings. Along these lines, SWU offers its faculty professional development grants for international curriculum development.

Both of these universities focus on study abroad opportunities as essential to the internationalization process. They insist "study abroad is not an elite program." However, it is expensive. For these programs to continue and grow, faculty need to be able to engage in their development and students need to be able to afford go. WU's and SWU's next steps involve increasing the number of programs that require study abroad experiences and the overall number of students who enroll in these experiences. Correspondingly, each institution spends extensive energy toward raising funds to support these activities. In fact, for the American universities, the vast majority of internationalization efforts are focused on study abroad. They provide professional development and varying levels of support for faculty interested in designing and offering study abroad programs.

Internationalization of the curricula is approached from a different angle at UKU. With its decentralized administration and faculty autonomy, UKU's students benefit from an internationalized curriculum only if the instructors with whom they study incorporate international perspectives in their own research. UKU also is engaged in only limited study abroad exchanges with the United States and through European Erasmus partnerships. However, the essential difference about internationalization for this institution is its expectations that students should travel between semesters to gain new global perspectives. UKU believes international leisure travel, work, and service projects are essential to student development and preparation for life in a globally connected world.

Although foreign experiences and study abroad are essential components of internationalization goals, they cannot be the sole, nor even main foci of internationalization in higher education. For international perspectives to be offered, institutions need to internationalize the learning experiences at home, as well. The data suggest that there is no consensus within these institutions about how to internationalize the curricula. It appears these functions are left to the individual colleges, programs, and faculty, with little to no information sharing, collaboration, or accountability. Even with aggressive percentage goals of 30% (WU) of the student population studying abroad, IHEs must provide alternative offerings to undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, and staff to develop global skills and mindsets for those who cannot afford the financial costs or time to study in an international locale. Opportunities to study, work, conduct research, and learn with and about individuals from other nations and cultures must also be developed on campus (and surrounding areas) for the university community to fully embrace internationalization development.

The Next Phases of Internationalization

The data identified several challenges institutions will likely face in the coming years. These challenges primarily center on an institution's ability to create collaborative dialogue

across the campus' faculty and administrative factions as well as into the local, regional, national, and even international communities. Dialogue across the institution is seen as essential if internationalization is to become an integral component of the university experience. Oftentimes, "Individual faculty own the power and are responsible for any initiatives," but the administrative and academic organizational structure frequently precludes collaborative engagements resulting in a duplication of efforts or barriers to needed progress and change. The data also suggest administrators and faculty across the campus collectively need to assume ownership of internationalization. IP offices realize there is a general lack of understanding with regard to study abroad (definition, program, and curricular connections) and the support and services the office provides. Their services and expertise tend to be an afterthought rather than an integral part of the initial conversation and continued planning processes. They suggest that IP offices also need to market their ideas and services more broadly across the campus.

The universities in this study believe a connection with the community and focused public relations around international programs is also essential to the future of internationalization at their institutions. Sharing their internationalization efforts outside of the university, highlighting study abroad faculty reports, providing an international directory of international research being conducted, and networking with the chamber of commerce, local and state officials, local, regional, and international businesses, and international alumni are intentional mechanisms for reciprocal exchanges of information and moving the agenda forward.

Evaluating Internationalization Efforts

Ultimately, for all of the institutions to continue in their efforts in internationalization, they will need to be able to document their efforts in meaningful ways. Across the institutions, evaluating internationalization was found to be primarily descriptive in nature. Evaluation focuses on tallying the number of (a) students in specific courses (foreign language and international curricula), (b) students enrolled in study abroad programs, (c) active MOAs, (d) other types of activities conducted abroad (research, service), and (e) international visits. In addition, cross-case analyses found that internationalization is also measured by students' evaluation/satisfaction of study abroad programs and program logistics and through performance evaluations of IP office staff. Only one institution (SWU) is considering the possibility of evaluating college deans on internationalization in the future. This collection of evaluation methods is useful for our institution's consideration as we begin to document the internationalization efforts at our university.

Discussion and Implications

The differences among the universities in this study indicate there is no one way to implement international education across the institution. However, there are some common insights that we can take from those who are firmly entrenched in the change process. The data indicate there is a need for the entire university community (faculty, students, administration, and staff) to develop and acquire intercommunication skills, knowledge

of international practices in one's discipline, and transcultural sensitivity. This study highlights the fact that institutional context greatly influences internationalization processes, yet these contexts may limit important change. Indeed, although elements of internationalization may be occurring, our findings emphasize the need to underpin these approaches with (a) a shared understanding of what internationalization is and how it should ultimately impact student learning and (b) an integrated approach to assessment and evaluation. We also discuss the impact this research has on our own institution's next steps as well as on future research required to support systematic internationalization of adult and higher education.

Internationalization as a Shared Vision and Academic Purpose

Our research points to the need for an institution to identify a contextually influenced grounding in which faculty, students, administrators, and staff can come together to work toward consensus. An overarching understanding of *internationalization*, as a concept, needs first to be commonly understood across the institution and then must be operationalized within and across academic programs and administrative functions.

Our cross-case analysis suggests that when there is no clear campus vision of what internationalization is, the change process can become stymied. Patterns in the data point to the need for partnerships, collaboration, networking, and tradition-building enterprises. Future developments in internationalization at our own institution cannot transpire without academic and administrative factions at all levels coming together toward this common goal. As well, in the ensuing years, IHEs will need to fully consider the funding structures currently in place and decide whether to and how they may support internationalization in an era of decreased government funding and shrinking budgets. Efforts to engage in dialogue with the larger community may be essential in securing the extensive financial support needed.

Evaluation of Internationalization Efforts

This study is the first to address the issue of how internationalization processes can be evaluated. The cross-case analyses provided a collection of assessment measures from which our own university and others can choose depending on specific institutional context and needs. The collection of methods offered help describe the *input* that university entities (IP offices, academic departments, individual faculty, etc.) contribute to internationalization efforts. However, each of the universities in this study also recognized a need for enhanced, systematic ways to evaluate their efforts. What is missing in these institutions are ways to assess how their work actually impacts overall student learning and university development. Indeed, it may be more complex to measure the *outcomes* of these processes and initiatives than it is to measure the inputs.

One reason this may be is that although the institutions in this study have vastly different contextual influences, there is a hesitancy to overlap the "business of internationalization" (numbers of programs, MOAs, funding, risk management) with academic (learning) outcomes in their evaluation efforts. Perhaps, this has led to an inability

(or unwillingness) to define what internationalization represents more broadly for an IHE and, more importantly, what specific learning outcomes internationalization is to support. Just as in our own university, there was no purposeful articulation about what *internationalization/globalization* means specifically within any of the institutions. The findings suggest that IP offices may not know how to situate international education within their own particular institutional contexts without the important work of identifying international learning outcome goals and objectives for their student populations. Although much of this work should arguably be done by faculty groups, the bridging of the logistics of internationalization and the learning that needs to occur on internationalized campuses must be constructed through collaborations representative of the entire university community.

Unfortunately, the philosophical and ideological gap between business/administrative operations and academic functions can shut down the essential dialogue that must influence systematic transformations. The findings of this study call for new systems of dialogue, information sharing, collective goal setting, and learning objective development across institutional units and into the broader local and international communities to be developed in ways that support the kind of change needed in internationalizing universities today. Future research on new models for consensus building and collaboration in internationalization efforts and processes must also be conducted.

This study, therefore, begins the conversation about how to more fully evaluate the complex and integrated efforts required of effective internationalization above and beyond the methods which are currently in place. Future investigations should be focused on identifying an array of assessment measures that incorporate both internationalization efforts (input) and learning outcome assessments from which institutions can choose according to their needs.

Conclusion

With all of the institutional initiatives, personal agendas, and political forces competing for limited financial resources, time and effort, and academic validity, we found that the path toward internationalization requires special attention to historic and traditional institutional contexts. As well, there are significant costs attached to internationalizing the academy, which are not only financial in nature. Certainly, the high expense of international travel, coupled with a weak domestic currency in a global economic recession, shapes the nature of the activities that will be validated and afforded in the internationalization process at our own institution now and in the near future.

Rizvi (2001) suggests internationalization requires higher education to design opportunities which focus on skills of inquiry and analysis toward developing a global imagination. We argue that the development of these skills requires a new mindset that transcends research, teaching, and service and must be fostered not just in traditional and adult undergraduate and graduate students but also supported by the professional development of faculty, administrators, and staff. The Erasmus Program in Europe,

which encourages and supports not only students but also faculty and staff to study and work in foreign settings, may be an appropriate model the academic community in the United States could adopt to support institutionalizing internationalization.

Our research suggests that intellectual, emotional, and temporal expenses must also be paid if systematic internationalization and significant impact can result. Intellectual costs comprise the ideological, pedagogical, and curricular redesign required in internationalizing learning, as well as additional training and knowledge construction necessary to support the interactions inherent in living and working in a global society. Internationalization is also emotionally difficult. Personal research agendas and conflicting pedagogical and program pathways all require emotional engagement by administration, staff, and faculty in the change process. Passion is fundamental, but open, sensitive dialogue on specific contextual influences must be the conduit to change. Finally, internationalization is time-consuming. Transforming the institutional identity cannot occur overnight (or in a semester or two). We contend that these costs are more likely to be endorsed if there is a shared vision and academic purpose underpinning international program design across the institution and meaningful ways to recognize the impact made on student learning and adult development.

This study adds to the growing research literature on internationalizing adult and higher education by comparing the practical processes and challenges across four different universities in the United States and the United Kingdom. The limitations of this research include the small number of institutions investigated, the limited geographic locations that were represented, and the limited voices heard from within those institutions. Our hope is that the method we have provided may inform and guide additional research in diverse institutions and regions around the world. New research may also want to include participants within IHEs who represent faculty, students, and staff, as well as administrators. The effort to implement international perspectives and develop a global imagination, with a capacity to establish how knowledge is linked internationally, is in its infancy at our own university. Learning from other institutions that are in the change process is invaluable for us and others who are invested in the complex and contextual course of internationalizing the campus experience.

Appendix

Institutional Site Visit Protocol

1. What is the institution's articulated definition of internationalization?
2. What theoretical framework guides the institutions' internationalization processes?
3. How has your institution internationalized the university experience through research (e.g., student, faculty, program, symposia)?
   a. In what ways has your institution measured the impact of these efforts?

(continued)

Appendix (continued)

4. How has your institution internationalized the university experience through curricula (e.g., program goals, course objectives, assignments, symposia)?
    a. In what ways has your institution measured the impact of these efforts?
5. How has your institution internationalized the university experience with international scholars (e.g., guest speakers, Fulbright scholars, faculty, students)?
    a. In what ways has your institution measured the impact of these efforts?
6. How has your institution internationalized the university experience through study abroad opportunities (e.g., short-term, long-term, internships, assignments/reports, reflections)?
    a. In what ways has your institution measured the impact of these efforts?
7. How does your institution measure the overall impact of its internationalization efforts?
8. What are the three main challenges or obstacles your institution has faced in regard to its internationalization efforts?
9. What mechanism(s) does your institution use to share its efforts with the public?
10. What should be the next internationalization/globalization efforts at your institution?

In addition, may we have a copy of the organizational structure of internationalization efforts at your institution?

References

Academic Ranking of World Universities. (2009). Retrieved from http://www.arwu.org/

Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. K. (2006). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *The NEA 2006 Almanac of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/assets/img/PubAlmanac/ALM_06_03.pdf

Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. K. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*, 290-305.

Aronson, D. (1998). *Introduction to systems thinking*. Retrieved from http://www.thinking.net/Systems_Thinking/Intro_to_ST/intro_to_st.html

Arum, S. (1987). International education: What is it? A taxonomy of international education of U.S. universities. *CIEE Occasional Papers on International Educational Exchange, 23*, 5-22.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Data analysis and interpretation of qualitative research for education* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Boucouvalas, M. (2005). Forging the family of humankind through international adult education. *Adult Learning, 16*(1-2), 17-19.

Brown, S., & Jones, E. (2007). Introduction: Values, valuing and value in an internationalised higher education context. In E. Jones & S. Brown (Eds.), *Internationalising higher education* (pp. 1-6). New York, NY: Routledge.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2005). *The Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education*. Retrieved from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/

Chieffo, L., & Griffiths, L. (2009). Here to stay: Increasing acceptance of short-term study abroad programs. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship* (pp. 365-380). New York, NY: Routledge.

De Vita, G. (2007). Taking stock: An appraisal of the literature on internationalising HE learning. In E. Jones & S. Brown (Eds.), *Internationalising higher education* (pp. 154-167). New York, NY: Routledge.

de Wit, H. (1995). *Strategies for internationalisation of higher education: A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States of America*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: European Associate for International Education.

Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10*, 241-266.

Dekaney, E. M. (2008). Students' pre-departure expectations and post-sojourn observations in a short-term international program abroad on the culture, music, and art of Brazil. *International Education, 37*(2), 17-29.

Dolby, N., & Rahman, A. (2008). Research in international education. *Review of Educational Research, 78*, 676-727.

Dwyer, M. M. (2004, Fall). More is better: The impact of study abroad program duration. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 10*, 151-163.

Edwards, R., Crosling, G., Petrovic-Lazarovic, S., & O'Neil, P. (2003). Internationalisation of business education: Meaning and implementation. *Higher Education Research and Development, 22*, 184-192.

Engle, L., & Engle, J. (2003, Fall). Study abroad levels: Toward a classification of program types. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 9*, 1-20.

Francis, A. (1993). *Facing the future: The internationalization of post-secondary institutions in British Columbia*. *Task Force Report*. Vancouver, Canada: British Columbia Centre for International Education.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Gray, K. S., Murdock, G. K., & Stebbins, C. D. (2002, May/June). Assessing study abroad's effect on an international mission. *Change*, 45-51.

Green, M. F. (2003). *The challenge of internationalizing undergraduate education: Global learning for all*. Paper presented at the Global Challenges and US Higher Education Conference, Duke University, Durham, NC.

Green, M. F. (2007). Internationalizing community colleges: Barriers and strategies. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 138*, 15-24.

Green, R., & Shoenberg, R. (2006). *Where faculty live: Internationalizing the disciplines*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Hamel, J., Dufour, S., & Fortin, D. (1993). *Case study methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Harmon, G. (2004). New directions in internationalizing higher education: Australia's development as an exporter of higher education services. *Higher Education Policy, 17*, 101-120.

Holland, T., & Pithers, R. T. (2005, July). *Making a difference: A cross-cultural challenge*. Proceedings of the 35th Annual SCUTREA Conference, University of Sussex, Brighton, UK.

Ibrahim, T. (2005). Global citizenship education: Mainstreaming the curriculum? *Cambridge Journal of Education, 35*, 177-194.

Jones, E. (2007). International reflections and culture change. In E. Jones & S. Brown (Eds.), *Internationalising higher education* (pp. 25-41). New York, NY: Routledge.

Knight, J., & de Wit, H. (1995). Strategies for internationalisation of higher education: Historical and conceptual perspectives. In H. de Wit (Ed.), *Strategies for internationalisation of higher education* (pp. 5-32). Amsterdam, Netherlands: European Associate for International Education.

Lave, J. (1988). *Cognition in practice: Mind, mathematics, and culture in everyday life*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Martin, I. (2006, July). *"Principled positions" for adult learning: Where have all the flowers gone?* Proceedings of the 36th Annual SCUTREA Conference, Trinity and All Saints College, Leeds, UK.

McNamara, D., & Harris, R. (Eds.). (1997). *Overseas students in higher education*. London, UK: Routledge.

Modelski, G., Devezas, T., & Thompson, W. R. (2008). Assessment: What have we learnt? In G. Modelski, T. Devezas, & W. R. Thompson (Eds.), G*lobalization as evolutionary process: Modeling global change* (pp. 417-430). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ng, R., & Shan, H. (2007, July). *Learning to navigate the Canadian labour market: The experiences of professional Chinese immigrant women*. Proceedings of the 37th Annual SCUTREA Conference, Queen's University, Belfast, UK.

Rizvi, F. (2001). *Internationalisation of curriculum*. Melbourne, Australia: RMIT University Press. Retrieved from http://www.eotu.uiuc.edu/events/RIZVIPaperInternatRMIT.pdf

Ruther, N. L. (2002). *Barely there, powerfully present: Thirty years of US policy on international higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge-Farmer.

Schoorman, F. D. (2000). *How is internationalization implemented: A framework for organizational practice* (ED 444426). Retrieved from ERIC database.

Solomon, N., & Zukas, M. (2006, July). *Globalizing academic communities: New ceremonial spaces for academic identities*. Proceedings of the 36th Annual SCUTREA Conference (pp. 371-378), Trinity and All Saints College, Leeds, UK.

Spencer, S., Murray, T., & Tuma, K. (2005). Short-term programs abroad. In J. Brockington, W. Hoffa, & P. Martin (Eds.), *NAFSA's guide to education abroad for advisers and administrators* (3rd ed., pp. 373-387). Washington, DC: NAFSA—Association of International Educators.

Stevenson, J., & Willot, J. (2008, July). *The role of cultural capital theory in explaining the absence from U.K. higher education of refugees and other non-traditional students*. Proceedings of the 38th Annual SCUTREA Conference, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK.

The University of Texas at San Antonio Fact Book. (2009, Fall). *Student enrollment*. Retrieved from the University of Texas at San Antonio Office of Institutional Research website http://www.UTSA.edu/ir/FactBook.html

Vande Berg, M. (2007). Intervening in the learning of U.S. students abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*, 392-399.

Whalley, T., Langley, L., Villarreal, L., & College, D. (1997). *Best practice guidelines for internationalizing the curriculu*m. Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: Ministry of Education, Skills and Training and Centre for Curriculum, Transfer and Technology. Retrieved from http://www.jcu.edu.au/teaching/idc/groups/public/documents/ebook/jcuprd_018292.pdf

Wilkinson, G. (2006). McSchools for McWorld? Mediating global pressures with a McDonalidizing education policy response. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 1*, 81-98.

Woolf, M. (2007). Impossible things before breakfast: Myths in education abroad. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*, 496-509.

Wu, W. (2006, July). *East Asian international postgraduate students in on U.K. university: A cross-cultural perspective*. Proceedings of the 36th Annual SCUTREA Conference (pp. 446-474), Trinity and All Saints College, Leeds, UK.

Wylie, M. (2008). Internationalizing curriculum: Framing theory and practice in international schools. *Journal of Research on International Education, 7*(1), 5-19.

Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Bios

Joellen Elizabeth Coryell is an assistant professor of Adult, Professional, and Community Education at Texas State University. At the time of the study, she was the principal investigator and chair of the Internationalization Task Force Evaluation Study at the University of Texas at San Antonio. Within the discipline of the learning and teaching that occurs in adulthood, her research encompasses international adult and higher education and the professional development of adult educators.

Beth A. Durodoye earned her EdD in counselor education from the University of Virginia. She is currently a professor of counseling at the UTSA. Her areas of scholarly interests include race and education, multicultural counseling competencies, and the mental health needs of diverse populations.

Robin Redmon Wright is an Assistant Professor of Adult Education at Penn State University, Harrisburg. Her research is framed in critical and critical feminist theory and includes analysis of popular culture as public pedagogy, adult identity development, global perspectives on race, class and gender, and social justice issues surrounding education. She has published in *Adult Education Quarterly*, *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, and the *Journal of Curriculum & Pedagogy*.

P. Elizabeth Pate is a professor in and chair of the Department of Interdisciplinary Learning and Teaching at the UTSA. Her research agenda focuses on systems thinking, democratic education,

and curriculum, instruction, and assessment. She is a coeditor for *Voices from the Middle* for The National Council of Teachers of English. She served on the research advisory board for the National Middle School Association and as president, vice president, and treasurer of the Middle Level Education Research Special Interest Group (MLER) of the American Educational Research Association.

Shelbee Nguyen is a research assistant and doctoral student in interdisciplinary learning and teaching with an adult learning and teaching cognate. Her professional experience includes work with international student exchange programs, language and cultural enrichment instruction as well as instruction in the area of communication.