

11-1-2009

Planning for Internationalization By Investing in Faculty

Lisa K. Childress Ed.D.

The George Washington University, wechsler@gwmail.gwu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/jigs>



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#), [Critical and Cultural Studies Commons](#), [Environmental Studies Commons](#), and the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Childress, Lisa K. Ed.D. (2009) "Planning for Internationalization By Investing in Faculty," *Journal of International and Global Studies*: Vol. 1: No. 1, Article 2.

DOI: 10.62608/2158-0669.1001

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/jigs/vol1/iss1/2>

This Essay is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of International and Global Studies by an authorized editor of Digital Commons@Lindenwood University. For more information, please contact phuffman@lindenwood.edu.

Planning for Internationalization By Investing in Faculty

Lisa K. Childress, Ed.D.
The George Washington University
wechsler@gwmail.gwu.edu

Abstract

Over the last half century, major world events have prompted higher education institutions to develop internationalization plans. In order engage faculty in internationalization, higher education scholars and practitioners have recommended that internationalization plans include allocated resources, such as budgets for academic exchanges, faculty development workshops, and international curricular development and research grants (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2006; Paige, 2005; Siaya & Hayward, 2003). Yet, a frequently cited obstacle to faculty engagement in internationalization plans is lack of funding (Backman, 1984; Bond, 2003; Ellingboe, 1998; Green & Olson, 2003; Steers & Ungsen, 1992; Woolston, 1983). A cross-case analysis reveals that differential investment leads to faculty engagement in internationalization plans. This article discusses how two institutions developed funds from a variety of sources and institutional levels to engage faculty in an institutional planning process. This study offers implications for institutional planning, resource dependency theory, and internationalization.

Introduction

Over the last half century, major world events have prompted higher education institutions to develop internationalization plans. As historian Frederick Rudolph (1977) noted, after World War II, higher education leaders turned their attention to the importance of internationalization when “the American Council on Education, the President’s Commission on Higher Education, the philanthropic foundations, and the Congress joined forces to counteract the exclusively Western orientation of the curriculum” (p. 264). Since then, numerous higher education associations, e.g. Education and World Affairs (1965), American Association of State Colleges and Universities (Harari, 1981), Association of American Colleges (1985), American Council on Education (Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005), have developed plans for internationalization, which is the process of integrating an international or intercultural perspective into the teaching, research, and service functions of a college or university (Knight, 1994, 1999, 2004).

In the decades following World War II, Education and World Affairs, a nonprofit organization created to study and assist in strengthening the international teaching, research, and service dimensions of U.S. colleges and universities, advocated the importance of both institutional and individual approaches to planning for international education. Education and World Affairs (1965) asserted that a strategic, intentional, institution-wide plan was critical in order to integrate an international dimension into a higher education institution in a meaningful way. In addition to this institutional approach, an individual approach was recommended in order to strategically reach out to individual faculty, disciplines, and colleges to encourage their engagement in international education.

Two decades later, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) conducted a study in which the AASCU vice president for international programs, Maurice Harari (1981), surveyed AASCU institutional members about their internationalization efforts. Based on analysis of the data collected from 77% of the AASCU membership (264 institutions), Harari (1981) concluded that “the degree of internationalization of a campus is not a function of size, location, or overall budget. *In the last analysis, it is a function of faculty competence and commitment and of institutional leadership*” (p. 29). Harari’s (1981) report underscored that in order to implement the strategic internationalization plan advocated by Education and World Affairs (1965), an intentional process to engage faculty is critical.

The need to develop faculty engagement in internationalization was affirmed by the Association of American Colleges (1985), which asserted that it is faculty who ultimately have the authority to foster students’ international education, as they control the curriculum. Thus, faculty should be encouraged to consider whether their curricula are designed to advance students’ understanding of foreign nations and cultures. The report acknowledged, however, that although calls for international education had become prevalent, such intentional, systematic efforts to develop faculty support remained rare. Moreover, the Association of American Colleges (1985) noted the existence of “obstacles to faculty responsibility that are embedded in academic practice” (p. 9). This report confirmed that despite the importance and challenges of developing faculty engagement in internationalization, little is known empirically about strategies to advance such faculty involvement.

In response to these calls, many institutional leaders have expressed intentions to develop internationalization plans (Childress, in press). As such, Green and Schoenberg (2006) noted that “it would be difficult to find a college or university today that is not making some effort to internationalize” (p. 1). In order to engage faculty in the implementation of

internationalization plans, internationalization scholars and practitioners recommend that such plans require dedicated resources, such as budgets for academic exchanges, faculty development workshops, international curricular development grants, and international research grants (Olson et al., 2006; Paige, 2005; Siaya & Hayward, 2003). Yet, a frequently cited reason for lack of faculty engagement in internationalization plans is deficient funding (Backman, 1984; Bond, 2003; Ellingboe, 1998; Green & Olson, 2003; Steers & Ungsen, 1992; Woolston, 1983). This study seeks to shed light on this problem through its investigation of the strategies used by two higher education institutions to overcome these barriers and effectively engage faculty in internationalization plans through differential investment.

Literature Review

Research indicates that lack of financial resources prevents the development of incentives for faculty to engage in international activities, in general, and internationalization plans, in particular (Backman, 1984; Bond, 2003; Ellingboe, 1998; Green & Olson, 2003; Steers & Ungsen, 1992; Woolston, 1983). Engberg and Green (2002) noted that “the most frequently cited reason for inaction in higher education is lack of funding” (p. 16). A review of the literature indicates that internationalization is no exception to this tendency. Financial constraints preclude faculty from participating in teaching, research, and consulting projects overseas for meaningful periods of time (Ellingboe, 1998) due to the significant costs embedded in traveling and working overseas, as well as those associated with filling teaching vacancies on the home campus precipitated by a faculty member’s work overseas. Therefore, without financial support, faculty lack the resources necessary to promote their involvement in international teaching, research, and service activities.

A prevalent rationale for the lack of financial resources for internationalization includes the increase of financial constraints placed upon institutions despite increasing expectations that those same institutions internationalize their curricula; these financial constraints often ultimately turn internationalization into “yet another undervalued, unfunded initiative” (Bond, 2003, p. 9). In addition, Ellingboe (1998) emphasized that some senior institutional administrators perceive “faculty development [as the] responsibility of individual faculty and their departments, and will consequently not allocate any central funds to internationalize the faculty” (p. 211). Hence, due to increasing institutional financial cutbacks combined with dissension about the locus of responsibility for faculty development, lack of financial resources constrains the development of widespread faculty engagement in internationalization.

Furthermore, organizational learning and human behavior scholars note that individuals participate in activities for which they are rewarded (Armstrong & Brown, 2006; Brown, 2001; Herzberg, 2003; Lerner, 1999). A synthesis of these scholars’ recommendations reveals that financial resources allocated at the institutional and subunit levels can harness the faculty participation required to implement an institution’s internationalization plan (Armstrong & Brown, 2006; Bean & Kuh, 1984; Bond, 2003; Lerner, 1999; Peterson, 1999).

Essentially, the gap in the literature addressed by this study is that although research indicates that (a) financial resources are critical to faculty engagement in internationalization and (b) lack of financial resources impedes faculty from participating in international initiatives, no studies have examined how differential investment strategies have been used to facilitate faculty involvement in internationalization plans.

Theoretical Framework and Research Question

This study is based theoretically on Knight's (1994) internationalization cycle, which indicates that institutions proceed through six phases of internationalization, including (a) awareness, (b) commitment, (c) planning, (d) operationalization, (e) review, and (f) reinforcement. Although the literature to date addresses all six phases individually, a gap exists in understanding the transition from the planning phase to the operationalization phase. An umbrella study conducted by the researcher on faculty engagement in internationalization suggests that a critical organizational principle that can help institutions engage faculty in internationalization plans is differential investment (Childress, 2010). As such, the current study examines the following research question: How does differential investment serve as a catalyst for faculty engagement in internationalization plans at two higher education institutions? For the purpose of this study, differential investment is defined as the strategic allocation of funds from a variety of sources that are distributed at a variety of institutional levels in order to increase involvement in a particular institutional priority, i.e. internationalization.

Methodology

A qualitative, multiple-case study was selected as the research design for this study to shed light on a poorly understood phenomenon and discover thus far unspecified contextual variables (Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Merriam, 2002). A multiple-case study design enabled the researcher to (a) understand the complexities of each case and (b) identify components that can be compared and contrasted across cases. By addressing the same research question in multiple settings and using the same data collection and analysis procedures, this design allowed the researcher to consciously seek cross-site comparison without necessarily sacrificing within-site understanding (Herriott & Firestone, 1983).

Population and Sampling Strategy

The population for this study included the 194 institutional members of the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) (Association of International Education Administrators, 2006). AIEA was selected as the population for investigation in this study due to these institutions' demonstrated commitments to internationalization through their AIEA membership. Expert-driven, maximum variation, and criterion-based sampling methods comprised the sampling strategy for this study (see Table 1).

TABLE 1.

Sampling Methods

Sampling method	Description
Expert-driven	Expert-driven sampling involved consulting with internationalization expert Madeleine Green, ACE vice president, for a previous study the researcher conducted with ACE. Green selected 32 out of 194 total AIEA-member institutions, based upon knowledge of their internationalization efforts and participation in ACE’s internationalization programs.
Maximum variation	Maximum variation sampling was employed for the current study to select two institutions from the 31 responding institutions that collectively represented all three types of internationalization plans, based upon an internationalization plan typology, which the researcher developed in a previous study conducted with ACE and included (a) institutional strategic plans, (b) distinct documents, and (c) unit plans for internationalization (Childress, 2009).
Criterion-based	Criterion-based sampling was used to select institutions that had internationalization committees and plans. Among the 31 responding institutions, 18 institutions had such committees. Among those 18 institutions, five institutions had internationalization plans.
	Thus, five institutions in total met the criteria for inclusion in the study. After invitations were extended to all five institutions to participate in the study, two universities accepted the invitation. These institutions were Duke University and University of Richmond, which collectively represented all three types of internationalization plans on the researcher’s internationalization plan typology.

Data Collection

Data collection methods included document analysis, interviews, and focus groups. During document analysis, the researcher reviewed internationalization plans and related documents, e.g. internationalization committee charges, meeting minutes, agendas, and reports; mission statements and capital campaign case statements; institutional leader speeches; and tenure, promotion, and hiring policies. The researcher triangulated data obtained in document analysis through interviews and focus groups. Interviews were conducted with the AIEA representatives and two non-committee senior administrative leaders at each of the two institutions examined in this study. Focus groups were conducted with internationalization committee members at each of the two institutions examined in this study. The strength of

interviews and focus groups in providing in-depth insight into the perspectives of key actors in the phenomenon under investigation complemented the strength of documents in their provision of exact details. The weakness of focus groups in terms of participants' potential political concerns about how their perspectives might be perceived by fellow group members was compensated for through the use of one-on-one interviews. Overall, multiple methods of data collection allowed the researcher to triangulate to maximize the strengths and minimize the limitations of each.

Data Analysis

The constant comparative method served as the primary analytical method used to systematically and continually categorize, compare, synthesize, and interpret the data collected (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997; Merriam, 2002; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Particular to multiple-case studies, two stages of data analysis were involved: within-case and cross-case analysis (Merriam, 1998).

Within-case analysis. In the within-case analysis phase, the researcher examined the data of each individual case. Data were gathered so that the researcher could learn as much about the contextual variables affecting each case as possible (Merriam, 1998). After each document was imported into the qualitative data analysis software MAXqda, codes were assigned to segments of text based upon similar key words, phrases, and issues identified in the documents. In first-level coding, the researcher identified codes for emergent themes and text segments that related to each code. As much as possible, the researcher used "in vivo" codes (Creswell, 2005, p. 238), which are codes that reflect participants' actual wording. In second-level coding, the researcher conducted pattern coding in order to group initial codes into a smaller number of themes (Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Pattern coding was particularly important for this multiple-case study, as it led to the development of key themes, which laid the groundwork for cross-case analysis.

Cross-case analysis. In the cross-case analysis phase, abstractions were built across cases to generate a theory that fit the cases examined, although the cases varied in individual details (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 1994). To analyze data across cases, the researcher first relied upon the data collected and organized in the within-case analysis. By conducting "pattern clarification" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 175), comparisons and contrasts across the two cases were generated. Conceptually, clustered matrices were employed in order to further clarify patterns and draw conclusions across cases. Such matrices enabled the researcher to organize and analyze convergent and divergent findings.

To ensure that emergent findings matched reality, and to further enhance the credibility and dependability of the study, the researcher engaged in member checks (Janesick, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1981; Merriam, 1998) through follow-up interviews with key participants at each institution. Through this process, participants assisted the researcher in fine-tuning her interpretations to better capture their perspectives, and in so doing, further establish the credibility and dependability of the findings.

Limitations

There are limitations, however, to this study's findings. Although the research design included the collection of data from each institution's AIEA representative, two senior administrative leaders (who were not members of the internationalization committee), and

several internationalization committee members (six at Duke and four at Richmond), the number of faculty and administrator perspectives included in this study was limited. Interviews and focus groups with additional faculty and administrators would have likely elicited a greater range of perspectives on how support for faculty to engage in the two institutions' internationalization was developed.

Moreover, the qualitative nature of this study posed some restrictions on the data analysis process. In particular, it is possible that participant responses were subject to issues of social and political desirability, as well as others beyond the control of the researcher. Participants may have been concerned with portraying their institutions in the most favorable light through the interviews and focus groups conducted and documents shared. The researcher, however, sought to minimize this problem through triangulation of the data collected in interviews and focus groups with a diverse array of documentation from institutional and departmental Web sites, internationalization committee and faculty senate meeting minutes, agendas, and reports, institutional leader speeches and presentations, and external publications.

Findings

Differential investment emerged as an organizational practice that encouraged faculty to participate in internationalization plans at Duke University and the University of Richmond. This practice stimulated faculty engagement in internationalization by providing critical infrastructure, incentives, and communication mechanisms to support faculty in integrating international dimensions into their teaching, research, and service. Findings of how differential investment served as an avenue through which faculty engaged in internationalization at Duke and Richmond will be discussed in turn.

Duke University

Differential investment in faculty engagement in internationalization plans was implemented at Duke through a five-pronged process, which included the following components: (a) development of a strategic investment plan, (b) incentives provided by schools and centers, (c) distinguished international scholar endowments, (d) curriculum internationalization grants, and (e) central international office matching grants.

Development of a Strategic Investment Plan

As Duke's (2006) institutional strategic plan identified internationalization as one of its six university-wide priorities, a strategic investment plan was created to allocate resources throughout the institution so as to permit faculty to engage in the process. In essence, the strategic investment plan underwrote and targeted resources to ensure the implementation of the internationalization priorities indicated in the institutional strategic plan. Notably, this strategic investment plan built in the expectation that while financial support would be initially allocated from central university administrative funds, after five years, the source of funding would shift to external grants, new endowment income, or the budgets of individual schools (Duke University, 2006). Thus, responsibility for funding faculty engagement in internationalization plans was spread throughout the institution, which disseminated ownership among multiple institutional units.

Incentives Provided by Schools and Centers

Furthermore, faculty at Duke are given incentives by schools and institutional centers to pursue research and teaching initiatives that promote internationalization themes. A senior administrative leader shed light onto how differential investment has affected faculty involvement in the internationalization of Duke's Trinity College of Arts & Sciences:

As we were thinking about major [internationalization] themes that we wanted to invest in differentially, [two themes] emerged Global health is one. Given our medical center, given our social sciences, the combination does make great sense that we would make a major investment in global health The second is something that affects humanities and the social sciences and that is "transcultural perspectives". . . . How [is] it that cultures connect and how [is] it they evolve? So, we can have a number of disciplines with faculty looking at that question from different perspectives. (personal communication, interview, May 8, 2007)

For example, to encourage faculty involvement in Duke's internationalization themes, faculty are eligible for \$5,000 travel awards from Duke's Center for International Studies and Global Health Institute to conduct research that addresses global health through the lens of any disciplinary framework (Duke University Center for International Studies, 2007). Faculty from a variety of disciplines, including public policy, nursing, and environmental sciences have received these awards to conduct research respectively on orphanhood in India, cardiovascular disease management in the Caribbean, and social factors in malaria control in Tanzania (administrator, personal communication, November 1, 2007). Thus, Duke has allocated special funding through individual schools and centers to support faculty engagement in internationalization initiatives.

Distinguished International Scholar Endowments

Through the multiple university endowments intended to bring distinguished international scholars to Duke, faculty have developed communications with leading scholars from other countries. Such endowments have enabled faculty to gain insight into their disciplines from a variety of national and regional perspectives. These endowments include the Karl von der Heyden International Fellows Program Endowment, Semans Professorship for Distinguished International Visiting Scholars Endowment, and the Bernstein Memorial International and Comparative Law Endowment (Duke University Office of the Vice Provost for International Affairs & Development, 2005; Duke University School of Law, 2002). Thus, by connecting alumni, who had been (a) international students, (b) participants in study abroad, or (c) participants in international degree programs with meaningful, personal opportunities to contribute to their alma mater, Duke solicited funds from private donors to support faculty engagement in internationalization plans.

Curriculum Internationalization Grants

Duke used both internal and external sources to offer curriculum internationalization grants to faculty. Internally, Duke's Office of Study Abroad's "Curriculum Integration Initiative" has provided incentives for faculty to integrate study abroad into their courses, including

financial awards to departments for course developments and to individual faculty members for their site visits to overseas partner institutions and their attendance at conferences (administrator, personal communication, electronic mail, July 27, 2007). Externally, Duke has solicited funds through the U.S. Department of Education Title VI, which funds international and area studies centers to support faculty engagement in international scholarship. Duke's Title VI Centers served the dual function of providing (a) support for faculty who were already interested in internationalizing their courses and (b) incentives for faculty had not yet integrated international components into their curricula (Asian/Pacific Studies Institute at Duke University, 2007; Duke Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies, 2007). For example, Duke's Asian/Pacific Studies Institute has provided \$3,000 grants for faculty to develop courses that have at least 35% East Asian (i.e. Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Taiwanese) content and will be taught at least twice in the next five years (Asian/Pacific Studies Institute at Duke University, 2007). As such, Duke has used both internal departments and external government funds to augment the financial resources available for faculty to internationalize their curricula.

Central International Office Matching Research and Travel Grants

Duke's central international office has not served as the sole provider of funds for faculty involvement in internationalization, but rather has matched funds provided by other sources. This central office, Duke's Office of the Vice Provost for International Affairs, has functioned like an "internal foundation," which supports faculty involvement in international activities (G. W. Merckx, personal communication, interview, May 8, 2007). Through the vice provost's office, faculty have received matching grants for international research proposals. Moreover, the international travel grants provided by this office have afforded faculty opportunities to attend conferences, conduct research, and pursue service projects overseas (G. W. Merckx, personal communication, interview, May 8, 2007). Thus, Duke's central international office has strategically increased the number of sources investing in faculty participation in international scholarship, and has thereby spread the responsibility for funding faculty engagement in internationalization plans among multiple institutional stakeholders.

Duke Summary

As indicated, through a strategic investment plan, Duke has targeted investments in internationalization plans from a variety of sources that have been distributed at a variety of institutional levels to support faculty involvement in international activities. Individual schools and centers have provided support for faculty to integrate international perspectives into their personal scholarly agendas based on their regional and disciplinary interests. Multiple distinguished international scholar endowments have provided avenues through which faculty have gained insights into various national and regional perspectives on their disciplines. Curriculum internationalization grants from internal and external stakeholders have provided financial incentives for faculty to internationalize their courses. Finally, Duke's central international office has matched the funds received from a variety of sources, spread the responsibility of providing support for faculty to engage in international scholarship among a variety of parties, and thereby increased the amount of funds available for faculty to participate in internationalization.

University of Richmond

Differential investment has similarly served as an organizational principle that opened the doors to faculty engagement in internationalization plans at the University of Richmond. As such, Richmond has used a four-pronged process to strategically allocate financial investments to support faculty engagement in international initiatives throughout the institution. This process has included the following components: (a) “Quest International” faculty programming and course development grants, (b) curriculum internationalization grants, (c) Weinstein summer international project grants, and (d) School of Arts & Sciences overseas conference travel grants. As the first three grant programs emerged as particularly significant sources of funding for faculty to participate in international scholarship, they will be addressed in further detail.

Quest International Faculty Programming and Course Development Grants

The university’s signature program, “The Richmond Quest,” which was launched by the president in 2000, has provided significant funding for faculty to internationalize their courses and research (University of Richmond, 2007a). The Richmond Quest is a unique program through which, for periods of two years, faculty, students, and administrators collectively explore a single pervasive question, submitted by a student (University of Richmond, 2007a). Through its parallel program, “Quest International,” the offices of the president, provost, and dean of international education provide support for faculty to create internationally focused courses and research projects related to the current Quest theme (University of Richmond, 2007e). Specifically, “Quest International” has offered faculty (a) programming grants, of up to approximately \$10,000, to support internationally focused research, curricular, and co-curricular endeavors, (b) course development grants of up to \$3,500 to support the creation of new internationally focused courses, and (c) course revision grants of up to \$1,500 to support the integration of international components into existing courses (University of Richmond, 2007b, 2007c, 2007d). For example, in 2004, Quest grants enabled two English department faculty to take ten students to Bombay, India to conduct research for a study on “Negotiating Change: Twenty-First Century Indian Identity in Mumbai” (University of Richmond International Education Committee, 2004). As such, the Quest program has served as an innovative mechanism through which a variety of administrative offices collaborate to provide resources with which faculty members can integrate international components into their teaching and research.

Curriculum Internationalization Grants

Apart from the Quest program, curriculum internationalization grants funded by the office of international education have encouraged faculty to develop new courses with significant international content and to substantially infuse international perspectives into existing courses. Faculty applications to this grant program have increased by 40% since the program’s inception in 2003 (University of Richmond International Education Committee, 2004, 2007). Awards of \$3,000 to \$3,500 for the development of new courses and \$1,500 to \$2,000 for revised courses have been granted to faculty as incentives to internationalize their curricula (University of Richmond Office of International Education, 2007b). In illustration of the effect of curriculum internationalization grants, in 2006, a law school professor received a curriculum internationalization grant to create an international intellectual property course and a psychology

professor received a grant to create a cross-cultural psychopathology course (University of Richmond Office of International Education, 2007b). Although awards were granted to only 17% of the faculty who submitted grant applications in 2007, this funding program has promoted widespread faculty engagement in internationalization, as all applicants have developed foundations for internationalizing their courses through the grant application process (U. F. Gabara, personal communication, interview, May 3, 2007, University of Richmond International Education Committee, 2007b). Thus, Richmond's office of international education has allocated funds that are specifically targeted to increase faculty involvement in internationalization plans.

Endowed Grants for Summer International Projects

Furthermore, Richmond alumni have also been tapped to provide additional resources with which to encourage faculty involvement in internationalization. In particular, Richmond alumna and former trustee Carole Weinstein, a longtime advocate of internationalization, has endowed summer international project grants to support faculty engagement in innovative, international teaching, research, and service endeavors (Gabara, 2005; University of Richmond Communications, 2003; University of Richmond Office of International Education, 2007a). For example, in 2006, a faculty member received funding to work with women and children from the Mixtecan, southwestern region of Mexico who reside in the Richmond community (University of Richmond International Education Committee, 2006; University of Richmond Office of International Education, 2007a). Like the curriculum internationalization grant program, faculty interest in the Weinstein international grants has continued to rise. In fact, from 2006 to 2007, faculty applications to this grant program increased by 20% (University of Richmond International Education Committee, 2007). Thus, the Weinstein summer international grant program has served as a unique mechanism through which an alumna passionate about international education has been enabled to make a meaningful contribution to the institution and, in so doing, has provided an additional pool of resources with which faculty have explored international dimensions in their scholarship and service.

Richmond Summary

Akin to Duke, Richmond has solicited funds from a variety of sources in order to (a) make targeted investments in internationalization plans and (b) offer faculty a variety of programs through which to connect their scholarly agendas with their institution's internationalization agenda. Specifically, through Richmond's unique Quest program, the president, provost, and dean of international education provide resources for faculty to internationalize their teaching, research, and service. Because of the institutional emphases on teaching and internationalization, the office of international education offers additional curriculum internationalization grants to encourage faculty to internationalize existing courses and develop new courses infused with international perspectives. Finally, Richmond alumni have complemented the funds provided by internal institutional stakeholders by providing grants for faculty to participate in international initiatives and have thereby augmented the types and amount of support for faculty engagement in internationalization plans.

Discussion

As previous research indicated that lack of financial resources prevents the development of incentives for faculty to engage in international activities (e.g. Backman, 1984; Bond, 2003; Ellingboe, 1998; Green & Olson, 2003; Steers & Ungsen, 1992), Duke and Richmond have planned for this institutional challenge by distributing responsibility for financial support of faculty engagement through multiple institutional levels and through soliciting support from a variety of types of sources (e.g. federal, private, and institutional).

At Duke and Richmond, funding to support faculty engagement in internationalization plans has not been the responsibility of only the central international office (see Table 2). Rather the responsibility for supporting faculty engagement in internationalization has been disseminated among various institutional units (e.g. president's office, provost's office, central international office, and individual schools and centers). Funding has been solicited from a variety of sources, including U.S. Department of Education programs (e.g. Duke's Title VI faculty international research and conference travel grants) and alumni endowed contributions (e.g. Duke's "Bernstein Memorial International and Comparative Law Endowment" and Richmond's "Weinstein Summer International Project Grants"). Moreover, the alignment of internationalization with other institution-wide initiatives (e.g. Richmond's "Quest International" and Duke's "Global Health" initiatives) has also promoted the dispersement of international resources to faculty. For example, Duke's "Global Health" initiative has provided \$5,000 travel awards for faculty pursuing global health research. Thus, through the alignment of internationalization plans with other institution-wide initiatives, various sources of funding, and dispersement of resources at multiple institutional levels, differential investment has enabled Duke and Richmond faculty to engage in the implementation of their institutions' internationalization plans.

TABLE 2

Differential Investments in Faculty Engagement in Internationalization Plans

Institutional level	Example	Amount
President	Richmond’s “Quest” Program	\$10,000 for international research, curricular, and co-curricular endeavors
		\$1,500 for existing course revisions
		\$3,500 for new course developments
Provost	Richmond’s Faculty Seminar Abroad	\$50,000 (every two years for 10-12 faculty members)
School	Richmond’s School of Arts & Sciences	\$1,200 for overseas conference travel grants
Central International Office	Richmond’s Weinstein Grants for Summer International Projects	\$1,500 for existing course revisions
		\$3,000 for new course developments
International Centers	Duke’s Office of Study Abroad	\$500 for exchange university site visits and international conference attendance
		\$4,000 for development of new courses that integrate study abroad
	Duke’s Title VI Faculty Research and Conference	\$500 for presentation on Latin American topics at U.S. conferences
		International Travel Grants
		\$2,500 for research on Asian theme
		\$3,000 for development of course on Asian theme
		\$5,000 for development of conference on Asian theme

Implications for Practice

To develop a strong financial foundation from which to support faculty engagement in international plans, internationalization leaders should assess current funding sources, types, and allocations that support faculty involvement in international initiatives. These leaders must ask: Are there additional sources of federal, state, local, private, and institutional funds (e.g. U.S. Department of Education Title IV, president's and provost's office, interdisciplinary centers, school research committees, alumni donors) that could be solicited to develop faculty engagement in international teaching, research, and service? If an institution has made a commitment to internationalization through the development of its internationalization plans, it is important to consider the following: How could funds be reallocated internally to operationalize those plans? The answers to these questions can help institutional leaders recognize opportunities and resources for differential investment in internationalization and, thereby, engage faculty in the operationalization of their internationalization plans. By spreading the responsibility for funding faculty participation in international initiatives throughout the institution, institutional leaders can increase ownership and reinforce support for the operationalization of the plan.

When institutions develop an internationalization plan, it is critical to develop a corresponding strategic investment plan to ensure that resources are allocated to enable faculty to engage in the implementation of the plan. In particular, to ensure the long-term operationalization of an institution's internationalization plans, internationalization leaders should solicit financial support from a diversity of sources, such as those aforementioned, to create a global initiatives fund to support faculty members' international initiatives. This fund could provide seed grants for a limited period of time (e.g. one to two years) to get projects off the ground, after which time the responsibility for supporting such projects would shift to the departments so that the responsibility for funding faculty members' international initiatives is shared between central institutional offices and disciplinary units. In addition to providing long-term support for faculty initiatives, the global initiatives fund could provide travel support for faculty to travel with colleagues or students for periods of time, ranging from one or two weeks to an entire semester, for courses or research overseas.

Moreover, institutions can advance faculty engagement in internationalization by incorporating international, transnational, and cross-cultural scholarship as priority funding areas in institution-wide and unit-wide research grant competitions. This prioritization would spread the responsibility for funding faculty involvement in international research among central institutional offices and academic subunits, as well as reinforce the importance of international research to the institution.

Although Duke and Richmond rely heavily on internal sources of funding, public institutions may find it beneficial to focus attention on external funding sources, so as not to strain or deplete already limited funds. Specifically, developing a solid database of alumni who participated in study abroad programs and international degree programs may help institutions to target alumni who have a genuine concern for promoting the internationalization of their alma maters. The U.S. Department of Education's Title VI international education resources may also help institutions secure funding to strengthen faculty involvement in international scholarship.

Ultimately, differential investments can enable institutions to create and sustain the resources necessary for widespread and long-term faculty engagement in internationalization. As such, the allocation of funds from a variety of internal and external sources and distribution at a variety of institutional levels can ensure that faculty have access to resources that will encourage their participation in the implementation of their institution's internationalization plans.

Implications for Theory

Resource dependence theory indicates that individuals and institutions are dependent upon resources to implement their goals (Dooris & Lozier, 1990). Yet, previous research has indicated the tendency for internationalization plans to become yet another undervalued, underfunded initiative, which precludes faculty involvement in internationalization (Bond, 2003; Ellingboe 1998). Through the process of differential investment, Duke and Richmond demonstrate that it is possible to strategically allocate various types and amounts of financial resources throughout the institution so that ownership and implementation of strategies to engage faculty in internationalization are dispersed to all corners of the institution. In other words, *how* and *where* funds are dispersed throughout the institution is more influential than *how many* funds are dispersed. Thus, if funds are allocated strategically at a variety of institutional levels, including through the offices of senior institutional leaders (e.g. offices of the president and provost), chief international education administrators, individual centers (i.e. international, area studies, and interdisciplinary centers), and individual schools or departments, the importance and support for faculty engagement in internationalization is reinforced throughout the institution.

This study confirms the contentions of institutional planning and internationalization scholars that even relatively small financial grants can yield significant benefits (Eckel, Green, Hill, & Mallon, 1999; Green & Olson, 2003). For example, stipends of \$1,500 for curricular integration at Richmond and \$750 for international travel at Duke energized faculty to engage in the operationalization of their institutions' internationalization plans. Overall, this study indicates that by developing funds to support faculty engagement in internationalization through differential investment, institutions can multiply the development and operationalization of their resources.

Conclusion

Duke and Richmond support faculty to engage in internationalization plans through investments from diverse external and internal sources (i.e. federal, private, and institutional), which are distributed at various institutional levels (i.e. central international offices, interdisciplinary and area studies centers, individual schools). For example, through the federal government's Title VI program, Duke has provided grants for international research and conference attendance to faculty. Through endowed alumni funds, Richmond has provided funds for faculty to conduct international research and service projects. Through institutional funds, both Duke and Richmond have provided faculty with financial and symbolic support to internationalize existing and new curricula. Importantly, the symbolism of institutional support for internationalization provided by differential investments plays a critical role in increasing faculty engagement in international activities. As a small but powerful example of the institution's willingness to invest in faculty members' readiness to engage in international scholarly activities, Richmond offers to cover faculty members' passport application fees. Moreover, internationalization funds at the institutions have not been restricted to one unit; rather, funds have been allocated through numerous institutional units, e.g. Duke's Trinity College of Arts and Sciences, Duke's Office of the Vice Provost for International Affairs, Duke's Office of Study Abroad, Richmond's College of Arts and Sciences, and Richmond's Office of International Education, which has increased faculty awareness of and access to resources with which to engage in international initiatives.

As such, it can be postulated that through differential investment, institutional leaders can signify to faculty that their institutions are committed to enabling faculty involvement in international scholarship and service. Thus, through the process of differential investment in internationalization plans, institutions can provide financial resources from a variety of sources, in a variety of increments, dispersed at a variety of locations throughout the institution, which thereby grant faculty the resources necessary to engage in the implementation of their institutions' internationalization plans.

References

- Armstrong, M. A., & Brown, D. (2006). *Strategic reward: Making it happen*. London: Kogan Page.
- Asian/Pacific Studies Institute at Duke University. (2007). Faculty grants. Retrieved August 27, 2007, from <http://www.duke.edu/APSI/grants/index.html#conference>
- Association of American Colleges. (1985). *Integrity of the college curriculum: A report to the academic community*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.
- Association of International Education Administrators. (2006). Institutional members. Retrieved June 9, 2006, from <http://aieaworld.american-data.net/memberservices/institutional.php>
- Backman, E. L. (Ed.). (1984). *Approaches to international education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Bean, J. P., & Kuh, G. (1984). A typology of planning programs. *Journal of Higher Education*, 55(1), 35-55.
- Bond, S. (2003). Untapped resources: Internationalization of the curriculum and classroom experience. *Canadian Bureau for International Education Research*, 7, 1-15.
- Brown, D. (2001). *Reward strategies: From intent to impact*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Childress, L. K. (2009). Internationalization Plans for Higher Education Institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(1), 289-309.
- Childress, L. K. (in press). Interdisciplinarity: A Catalyst for Faculty Engagement in Internationalization. *Journal of Global Initiatives*, 4(1).
- Childress, L. K. (2010). *The Twenty-first Century University: Developing Faculty Engagement in Internationalization*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Dooris, M. J., & Lozier, G. (1990). Adapting formal planning approaches: The Pennsylvania State University. In F. A. Schmidlein & T. H. Milton (Eds.), *Adapting strategic planning to campus realities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Duke Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies. (2007). Faculty funding. Retrieved June 7, 2007, from <http://clacs.aas.duke.edu/funding/faculty/factitleVIconffunds.php>
- Duke University Center for International Studies. (2007). Call for applications for new initiatives in global health: Faculty travel grants. Retrieved June 7, 2007, from <http://www.jhfc.duke.edu/ducis/documents/callforapplicationsguidelines.pdf>

- Duke University Office of the Vice Provost for International Affairs & Development. (2005). Sponsored visiting professorships & lectureships. Retrieved June 7, 2007, from <http://www.international.duke.edu/academics/ovpia/sponsored>
- Duke University School of Law. (2002). Comparative law scholar gives inaugural Herbert L. Bernstein Memorial Lecture. *Duke Law Magazine*, 20(2).
- Eckel, P., Green, M., Hill, B., & Mallon, W. (1999). *Taking charge of change: A primer for colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Education and World Affairs. (1965). *The university looks abroad: Approaches to world affairs at six American universities*. New York: Walker and Company.
- Ellingboe, B. J. (1998). Divisional strategies to internationalize a campus portrait. In J. A. Mestenhauser & B. A. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus* (pp. 198-228). Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.
- Gabara, U. (2005). Internationalization transforms Richmond. Retrieved June 29, 2007, from http://oncampus.richmond.edu/alumni/magazine/summer2005/vantage_point/index.html
- Green, M. F., & Olson, C. L. (2003). *Internationalizing the campus: A user's guide*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Green, M. F., & Shoenberg, R. (2006). *Where faculty live: Internationalizing the disciplines*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Harari, M. (1981). *Internationalizing the curriculum and the campus: Guidelines for AASCU institutions*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- Herriott, R. E., & Firestone, W. A. (1983). Multi-site qualitative policy research: Optimizing description and generalizability. *Educational Researcher*, 12, 14-19.
- Herzberg, F. (2003). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 81(1), 87-96.
- Janesick, V. (2000). The choreography of qualitative research design: Minuets, improvisations, and crystallization. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 379-400). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Knight, J. (1994). Internationalization: Elements and checkpoints. *Canadian Bureau for International Education Research*, 7, 1-15.
- Knight, J. (1999). Internationalisation of higher education. In J. Knight & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Quality and internationalisation in higher education*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definitions, approaches and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.
- Lerner, A. L. (1999). A strategic planning primer for higher education. Retrieved March 14, 2007, from http://www.sonoma.edu/aa/planning/Strategic_Planning_Primer.pdf
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1981). *Effective evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1995). *Designing qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (1997). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (4th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Olson, C. L., Green, M. F., & Hill, B. A. (2005). *Building a strategic framework for comprehensive internationalization*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Olson, C. L., Green, M. F., & Hill, B. A. (2006). *A handbook for advancing comprehensive internationalization: What institutions can do and what students should learn*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Paige, R. M. (2005). Internationalization of higher education: Performance assessment and indicators. *Nagoya Journal of Higher Education*, 5, 99-122.
- Peterson, M. W. (1999). Using contextual planning to transform institutions. In M. W. Peterson, L. A. Mets, A. Trice & D. D. Dill (Eds.), *ASHE reader on planning and institutional research* (pp. 60-78). Needham Heights, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Rudolph, F. (1977). *Curriculum: A history of the American undergraduate course of study since 1636*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Siaya, L., & Hayward, F. (2003). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: Final report*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Steers, R. M., & Ungsen, G. R. (1992). In search of the holy grail: Reflections on the internationalization of business education. In A. M. Rugman & W. T. Stanbury (Eds.), *Global Perspective: Internationalizing management education* (pp. 301-316). Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- University of Richmond. (2007a). History of the university. Retrieved July 1, 2007, from <http://www.richmond.edu/about/history.htm>
- University of Richmond. (2007b). Quest international: Course development grant. Retrieved June 29, 2007, from http://quest.richmond.edu/forms/Quest_Int'l_Course_Development_Grant_QV.pdf
- University of Richmond. (2007c). Quest international: Course revision grant. Retrieved June 29, 2007, from http://quest.richmond.edu/forms/Quest_Int'l_Faculty_Course_Revision_Grant_QV.pdf
- University of Richmond. (2007d). Quest international: Faculty programming grant. Retrieved June 29, 2007, from http://quest.richmond.edu/forms/Quest_Int'l_Faculty_Programming_Grant_QV.pdf
- University of Richmond. (2007e). Quest V: Quest international. Retrieved July 1, 2007, from <http://quest.richmond.edu/international/>
- University of Richmond Communications. (2003). University of Richmond creates endowed chair of international education with \$1 million gift. Retrieved June 29, 2007, from <http://oncampus.richmond.edu/news/aug03/Gabara.html>
- University of Richmond International Education Committee. (2004). *International Education Committee: Annual report 2003-2004*. Richmond, VA: University of Richmond.
- University of Richmond International Education Committee. (2006). *International Education Committee: Annual report 2005-2006*. Richmond, VA: University of Richmond.
- University of Richmond International Education Committee. (2007). *Minutes of the International Education Committee's February 28, 2007 meeting*. Richmond, VA: University of Richmond.
- University of Richmond Office of International Education. (2007a). C. Weinstein grants for summer international projects and study. Retrieved June 29, 2007, from http://oncampus.richmond.edu/academics/international/Weinstein/weinstein_grantannouncement.shtml
- University of Richmond Office of International Education. (2007b). Curriculum internationalization grants. Retrieved June 29, 2007, from <http://oncampus.richmond.edu/academics/international/Faculty/>
- Woolston, V. (1983). Administration: Coordinating and integrating programs and services. In H. M. Jenkins (Ed.), *Educating students from other nations: American colleges and universities in international educational exchange* (pp. 184-209). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.