Internationalization of Higher Education: Key Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks
Rationales for U.S. Internationalization

- Political (building what is now termed “soft power”) (particularly influential during the Cold War); battle for the hearts and minds of others
- Economic (international students and higher education as an “export”) (increasingly important over time as U.S. trade deficits continue to grow). Economic value 2012-2013 in the U.S., $24b
- Preparing students for an increasingly global multicultural labor market
- Ineffective tongue-tied Americans (the late visionary Senator Paul Simon)
- Idealism (building world peace)
- Idealism (enhancing the liberal arts and liberal education)
Theoretical Frameworks

• Forms of Human Capital (Bordieu); Social Capital (Coleman, Putnam); Human Capital (Becker, Schultz, W. A. Lewis)

• Signaling theory (Spence); example “chup dua” (Thai emic term meaning to acquire personal prestige through study or training abroad).
Theoretical Frameworks--continued

- Social contact theory (Allport, Pettigrew)
- Interdisciplinary systems theory (Mestenhauser, Kline, Klein)
Conceptual Frameworks

The need to distinguish globalization and internationalization

Comprehensive internationalization (Hudzik)

Internationalizing the academic self (Sanderson)
Conceptual Frameworks-continued

A continuum of shallow versus deep internationalization
Internationalization at Home (IaH)
“Peace dividend” and “soft power”
“The four Ds of study abroad” (Paige and Fry)
The Four Ds of Study Abroad

Demography, who studies abroad?
Destination, where do they study abroad?
Duration, how long do they study abroad?
Depth, how much depth in their program?
A fifth question, why do they study abroad?
Horn, Hendel, and Fry Model for Assessing the Internationalization of Institutions of Higher Education

inspired by Paige’s Conceptual Multidimensional Model
Developed at Nagoya University
Internationalization of Higher Education: Key Concepts and Indicators

R. Michael Paige
Professor Emeritus of International and Intercultural Education
University of Minnesota
Forum on Education Abroad
April 3, 2014
San Diego, California
Internationalization Model – Framing International Education

1. Leading the Process: Internationalization at the Top
2. Guiding and Integrating the Process: The internationalization Strategic Plan
3. Supporting the Process: Institutionalization of International Education
4. Implementing the Process: Professional International Education Units and Staff
5. Implementing the Process: Internationalized Curriculum
6. Implementing the Process: International Students and Scholars
7. Implementing the Process: Study Abroad
8. Implementing the Process: The University Faculty
9. Implementing the Process: Campus Life – Co-Curricular Programs
10. Monitoring the Process: Performance Assessment/Performance Indicators
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University Leadership for Internationalization</td>
<td>Presidents, Provosts or CAOs, but also by people acting at other levels such as IEs or faculty</td>
<td>(a) mission statement, (b) promotion and publicity, (c) budget, (d) leadership positions, (e) promotion and tenure, and (f) student recruitment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Internationalization Strategic Plan</td>
<td>Provides strong sense of purpose and focus</td>
<td>(a) goals, (b) objectives, (c) inputs, (d) activities, and (e) timelines and targets;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institutionalization of International Education</td>
<td>Governance structure for internationalization</td>
<td>(a) committees, and (b) accountability structures;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Infrastructure-Professional International Education Units and Staff</td>
<td>Reflecting the relevance of hiring, retaining, and further developing professionals responsible for each of the internationalization areas</td>
<td>(a) International students and scholars; (b) Study abroad, and (c) International exchanges, projects, grants and contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Internationalized Curriculum</td>
<td>The curriculum is placed at the center of internationalization efforts</td>
<td>(a) international majors, (b) international minors, (c) international courses, (d) languages, (e) scholarships and awards, and (f) resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. International Students and Scholars</td>
<td>Interaction with local students, faculty, and staff, and immersion in the host community</td>
<td>(a) international student recruitment, (b) international student support, (c) integration of international students into university life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Study Abroad</td>
<td>Considered a “major focus of internationalization” (p. 109), especially in the EHEA where it is one of the consistently stated goals</td>
<td>(a) academic study abroad, (b) work and tourism abroad, (c) specialized academic study abroad, (d) study abroad requirements, (e) exchange agreements, and (f) student support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Faculty involvement in International Activities</td>
<td>As actors responsible for incorporating an international dimension into their courses, with increasing numbers of international students in their classrooms.</td>
<td>(a) faculty support, (b) exchange agreements, and (c) international grants and contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Campus Life-Co-Curricular Programs</td>
<td>Extra-academic activities and other international activities and services taking place outside of the classroom</td>
<td>(a) campus life office, (b) student organizations, and (c) campus programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Monitoring the Process</td>
<td>A structure ensuring the collection and interpretation of data, suggesting where and when improvements should be made</td>
<td>(a) performance assessment process, (b) performance indicators, and (c) performance reviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions: Based on the internationalization performance indicators, come up with an assessment score for each area from 0 (low) – 10 (high). After scoring each area, add up the scores to arrive at the overall internationalization index score.

1. Leading the Process: Internationalization at the Top Score (0-10) __
2. Guiding and Integrating the Process: The Internationalization Strategic Plan Score (0-10) __
3. Supporting the Process: Institutionalization of International Education Score (0-10) __
4. Implementing the Process: Professional International Education Units and Staff Score (0-10) ____
5. Implementing the Process: Internationalized Curriculum Score (0-10) __

6. Implementing the Process: International Students and Scholars Score (0-10) __

7. Implementing the Process: Study Abroad Score (0-10) __

8. Implementing the Process: The University Faculty Score (0-10) __

9. Implementing the Process: Campus Life – Co-Curricular Programs Score (0-10) __

10. Monitoring the Process: Performance Assessment and Performance Indicators Score (0-10) __

Overall Internationalization Index Score (0-100) __
Methodology and Methods

- Development of a multidimensional synthetic empirical index of internationalization
- Use of extant data
- Consultation with key international educators around the country with regard to the choice and weighting of indicators
Methodology and Methods

• Sensitivity analysis related to weighted versus unweighted indicators
Sampling

• Complete population of top research universities in the United States, N= 87
• Thus, all results are population, not sample, values. Thus, there are no issues of statistical inference (Hirschi & Selvin)
Results

• On some indicators, large amounts of variance
• Others much less so
Results

• Huge variations in the index scores
• Good face validity
• However, numerous anomalies, outstanding universities with low internationalization levels? e.g., MIT, Northwestern, Washington University, Case Western University Why?
Results

Large variation among universities on the various indicators

Coefficient of variation (V) is a good measure of disparities.

Least variation: Percent of international graduate students
Results

Largest variation:

international visibility on Home Page: 2.23
requiring language credits: 1.87
requiring international perspectives credits: 1.76
Results

Largest variation:
- Having Rhodes, Marshall scholars: 1.64
- Having international FIPSE, Ford Foundation grants: 1.30
- Having Title VI centers: 1.28
Potential for Errors

• Specification error
• Measurement error
Major Obstacles to Internationalization

- “Teaching to the Test”; importance of rankings
- Privileging the traditional academic disciplines
- Marginalization of interdisciplinary fields
- Top administrators not seeing the centrality of internationalization to genuine liberal education
Major Obstacles to Internationalization

• Not strategic in hiring decisions
• Not strategic in faculty development
• Too much shallow superficial token internationalization
Major Obstacles to Internationalization

- Inadequate utilization of international students to enhance learning for US students (Mestenhauser)
- Inadequate commitment to IaH
- US national commitment to hard power, higher education and internationalization are not a priority
Other Studies

• J. Y. Jang (2009), study of the correlation of internationalization with academic quality
• P. Campion (2014), study of the relationship between internationalization and sports success
Findings of Jang and Campion

• Jang: Correlation between internationalization and academic quality: .46
• Campion: Correlation between internationalization and sports success: .22
Final Reflections: What Then Must We Do?

• Fight for a peace dividend; fund the Senator Simon Study Abroad Foundation with a solid endowment to diversify, expand, and add depth to study abroad

• Do more rigorous systematic tracer studies related to the impact of internationalization on students
Final Reflections: What Then Must We Do?

- Enhance university ranking systems by including more emphasis on internationalization
- Need more studies of the impact of internationalization on research
- Make international /intercultural education central to a liberal education (Stanford, Princeton)
Final Reflections: What Then Must We Do?

- More actively promote international internships to enhance intercultural learning/practical skills and at the same time to improve the productivity of higher education
- Examples: Volunteers in Asia (VIA), HarvardTeach, Princeton in Asia, Yale in China, IE3 (Oregon)