

12-17-2009

INTERNATIONALIZATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM IN MISSOURI COMMUNITY COLLEGES: A FACULTY PERSPECTIVE

Gavin Cajé O'Connor

University of Missouri-St. Louis, occonnorg@otc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://irl.umsl.edu/dissertation>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

O'Connor, Gavin Cajé, "INTERNATIONALIZATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM IN MISSOURI COMMUNITY COLLEGES: A FACULTY PERSPECTIVE" (2009). *Dissertations*. 498.

<https://irl.umsl.edu/dissertation/498>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the UMSL Graduate Works at IRL @ UMSL. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of IRL @ UMSL. For more information, please contact marvinh@umsl.edu.

INTERNATIONALIZATION OF GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM IN
MISSOURI COMMUNITY COLLEGES: A FACULTY PERSPECTIVE

BY

GAVIN C. O'CONNOR

M.S., Missouri State University, 2001

B.S., Missouri State University, 1992

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education
In the Graduate School of the
University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2009

St. Louis, Missouri

Advisory Committee

Kent Farnsworth, PhD

Chairperson

Dixie Kohn, EdD

Mary Utley, PhD

Shawn Woodhouse, PhD

ABSTRACT

Providing global educational experiences for students in higher education has been a topic of discussion for decades. Although there is a common appreciation that students should be exposed to and gain awareness of other cultures, most institutions of higher education in the U.S. fall short in providing such opportunities. To accommodate for this need, some institutions are striving to internationalize the curriculum as well as the culture of the institution. Community colleges play a key role in the higher education system in the U.S. and may be the first, if not only opportunity for students to gain global awareness.

This study examined factors that might contribute to, or impede the development of internationalized general education curricula in Missouri community colleges. Two hundred forty-three (243) general education faculty members from each of the 18 community college campuses in Missouri responded to an online questionnaire. This provided a 32% response rate of the potential population. The survey instrument consisted of three areas; demographics of the participants and their respective colleges or campuses, faculty perspectives on internationalization of curriculum, and an open comment forum.

Descriptive statistics and multivariate analysis of variance were conducted to aid in determining the factors that affect internationalization efforts in community college general education curriculum. Additional quantitative and qualitative analyses were conducted to provide further insight into global education not directly related to the study's hypotheses.

Findings from this study indicate that administrative support of internationalization, the geographic location of the college, positive attitudes toward internationalization, and faculty who place a high value on such efforts have a significant effect on internationalization of the general education curriculum. For a college to improve in the area of global education, the faculty, staff and administration must have an understanding of how these factors influence the success of providing an internationalized curriculum.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation and gratitude to my dissertation committee and the help they have provided me along the way. I owe a great debt to Dr. Kent Farnsworth, my advisor, for being a role model of the community college leader I hope to one day become. Also, this debt comes in no small part from all his support and constructive guidance throughout my doctoral program. I must also offer a huge thanks to Dr. Mary Utley at Drury University for her assistance and guidance with the statistics and analysis of this research. Dr. Dixie Kohn and Dr. Shawn Woodhouse, I have truly appreciated your help and support throughout my doctoral program and during my dissertation work.

I must also thank my colleagues at Ozarks Technical Community College who have provided many encouraging words of support and also kept me motivated to finish this endeavor. A special thanks to those who have taken the time to proof read and edit many of my drafts and overall have put up with me throughout this process: Witt Salley, Marcia Wheeler, Lisa Reece, Stephen White, and many others I know I have missed.

Above all, I must pay a special tribute to my family, my wife Dawn and our children, Ella, Rory and Kian. Each has sacrificed a tremendous amount to allow me the time to complete this degree. I will never be able to express how much your love and support have meant to me during this process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	7
Purpose of the Study	8
Research Question and Hypotheses	9
Delimitations	10
Definition of Terms	10
Significance of the Study	12
Theoretical Framework	12
Organization of Study	13

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction	14
Community Colleges	16
Internationalization	19
Internationalization of Higher Education Curriculum	20
Internationalization Efforts	24
Organizations for Internationalization	25
Funding Resources	29
General Education	32
Theoretical Framework	33
Contributing Theory	35
Conclusion	38

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction	40
Theoretical Framework	41
Research Design	42
Instrument	44
Participants	45
Data Collection	47
Quantitative Analysis	49
Qualitative Analysis	50
Limitations	51

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Introduction	53
Research Question	53
Research Design	54
Demographics	57

Success Index	63
Analysis of Administrative Support	64
Analysis of International Experience	65
Analysis of Identified “Champion”	66
Analysis of College Location	67
Analysis of Faculty Attitudes	68
Analysis of Value of Internationalization	68
Additional Quantitative Analysis	69
Additional Qualitative Analysis	78
Summary and Conclusion	81

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction	84
Overview	84
Purpose Statement and Research Question	85
Review of Methodology	86
Major Findings	88
<i>Hypothesis One</i>	90
<i>Hypothesis Two</i>	92
<i>Hypothesis Three</i>	93
<i>Hypothesis Four</i>	94
<i>Hypothesis Five</i>	95
<i>Hypothesis Six</i>	96
Additional Data Analysis	98
<i>Quantitative Analysis</i>	98
<i>Qualitative Analysis</i>	102
Theoretical Implications	103
Conclusions	105
Recommendation for Further Research	107
Concluding Remarks	110

REFERENCES

List of References	111
--------------------------	-----

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Recipients of the Senator Paul Simon Award.....	122
Appendix B – Permission to Use Instrument	123
Appendix C – Survey	124
Appendix D – Request to Participate Letter	136
Appendix E – Follow-up Letter to Participate	137
Appendix F – Final Reminder to Participate	138
Appendix G – Letter of Consent	139
Appendix H – UMSL Institutional Review Board Approval	140

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1 – Frequency Counts and Percentages of Demographics of
General Education Full-Time Faculty at Missouri Community Colleges
- Table 2 – Frequency Counts and Percentages of Demographics of
Faculty Perceptions on College Internationalization Efforts
- Table 3 - Success Index Rating and Hypothesis Results of Individual Campuses
- Table 4 – Summary of Hypotheses Results
- Table 5 – General Education Faculty Perceived Value of Emphasizing
Specific Criteria in Community College General Education Curriculum
- Table 6 – General Education Faculty Perceived Value of Requirements
in Undergraduate Curriculum
- Table 7 – Frequency Counts and Percentages of “the Best Uses” of College
Resources to Support Internationalization of General Education
Curriculum
- Table 8 – Perceived Benefit to Faculty in Internationalizing Courses and
Programs
- Table 9 - Responses to Open-Ended Question Regarding Internationalization
Efforts

Chapter 1

Introduction

“The world is changing at a rapid pace, and many of our students lack the skills to succeed in the global knowledge economy” (Spelling, 2006, para. 8). Margaret Spelling, United States Secretary of Education, made this poignant statement as she addressed university and college presidents at the U.S. University Presidents Summit on International Education (UPSIE) in Washington, DC. Throughout the summit, high-ranking government officials, including the President of the United States, stressed the importance of providing greater international exposure and experiences to students in higher education (Bush, 2006; Hughes, 2006; Rice, 2006; Spelling, 2006). The topic of internationalization, or “integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education” (Knight, 2003b, para.5), has been an issue of concern for many years within the U.S. educational system.

The world is changing rapidly, and in doing so has become more interdependent. Once isolated communities are now able to communicate and have economic exchange with areas around the globe. At the UPSIE, U.S. Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice (2006), stated, “. . . the distance between here and there is getting smaller. The time it takes people and ideas to traverse the globe is rapidly shrinking. And the thoughts and actions of individuals carry more impact than ever” (para. 13). This interdependence has made it necessary for individuals in the United States, as well as all countries of the world, to have a more comprehensive understanding of the diverse cultures that make up our planet.

The issue of global awareness is not a novel concept of the 21st century. For centuries, countries have found it imperative to have an understanding of diverse cultures to develop commerce with, defend against, or even conquer other areas of the world. This was especially apparent at the beginning of the Cold War era. Increased resources were provided to improve the education of U.S. citizens in the areas of science and mathematics, so the country could regain its technological incomparability (United States Intelligence Community, 2002). Other emphases were placed on cultural awareness and linguistics, especially of communist-bloc countries (Altbach, 2004).

Decades later, the same issues were still being acknowledged when Oklahoman Senator David Boren recognized the need for international education in authoring the National Security Education Act of 1991. As chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Senator Boren had an obvious interest in the future of national security and the availability of qualified intelligence officers, yet the concern for lagging international education was evident when he was quoted during a press conference as saying,

We are facing, today, challenges no less urgent than threats posed by the launching of Sputnik, which led to the original Defense Education Act. . . Just as we were ill equipped to deal with the technological threats of the cold war era, today we lack the linguistic and cultural skills and resources fundamental to competing in the new international environment. . . Our ignorance of world cultures and languages represents a threat to our ability to remain a world leader. (Desruisseaux, 1991, para. 6-7)

Issues of world supremacy not only relate to U.S. politics and security, but also to the U.S. higher education system. In the past, the U.S. has been a preferred destination

for international students from around the world and into the 1990s, the U.S. led the world in educational attainment (Hayward, 2000). In recent years, more opportunities have become available for students to obtain quality higher education in their own countries or by studying abroad in countries other than the United States. During this time, the U.S. has seen a steady decline in educational standings. As acknowledged in a U.S. Department of Education (2006) report, the U.S. is failing to maintain the position as one of the most admired educational systems in the world. Further, the report indicates that at the time of its publication the U.S. was ranked twelfth in higher education attainment and sixteenth in high school graduation rates.

To help alleviate the issue of declining educational status in the U.S. and to address the lack of understanding of other peoples and cultures, higher education needs to provide an environment that will allow students to appreciate and work competently with individuals from various cultures and backgrounds. Institutions around the globe are striving to develop this atmosphere by incorporating international education into not only the curriculum but also within the culture of the institution. Therefore, internationalization within higher education institutions is a growing trend, not only in the U.S. but around the world (Altbach, 2002).

Internationalization of education, in particular higher education, has received broad support from both government officials and the general public. Students attending higher education institutions also express interest in coursework and travel opportunities related to increasing global perspectives (Hayward, 2000; Siaya & Hayward, 2003).

Around the globe, educating individuals about the complex issues of the world around them has become a priority. However, there are a number of concerns among

countries and regions when looking at the process that leads to globalization, or “the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas . . . across borders” (Knight, 2003b, para.10). One of the greatest threats perceived by some countries is the phenomenon of brain drain, which occurs when skilled professionals leaves their native land in search of employment and further opportunities in another country. Many times this search for opportunities occurs in the country where an individual attains higher education, denying the home country the value of the student’s learning (Kwok & Leland, 1982). Another area of concern for countries is the loss of cultural identity due to globalization. As globalization occurs, the world becomes more alike. Still, globalization continues as an unimpeded trend in higher education throughout the world (Altbach, 2002; Knight, 2003a).

The United States is seeing an increased need to develop internationally savvy graduates of higher education to compete in the globalized economy. Unfortunately, due to the size and variety of the U.S. educational system, no standard structure has been developed to address international learning needs (Thomas, 2007). Therefore, it has become difficult to measure internationalization in the context of education. One of the reasons for such difficulty is that no standard definition exists for the term internationalization. Across the spectrum of postsecondary institutions, various practices exist that provide what is referred to as “internationalization” within these colleges and universities, but the practices differ in both form and intent (Abdullahi, Kajberg, & Virkus, 2007).

United States community colleges are noted for having been quite effective in changing curriculum and college functions to adapt to the needs of their communities

(Cohen & Brawer, 2003). However, in a globalized world, “community needs” may take on a different meaning. Pierce (1996) observed that “Not only are local communities composed of growing numbers of immigrants whose culture and belief systems require understanding and regard, but also the economies of these communities are increasingly dependent on effective relationships with other countries” (p. v).

Efforts have occurred over the past two decades to increase the internationalization of curricula in community colleges. However, this initiative has gained little traction in most institutions (Raby, 2007). The American Council on Education report, *Measuring Internationalization at Community Colleges* (Green & Siaya, 2005), indicates that 61% of the 233 community colleges surveyed scored “low” in the level of internationalization of the institutions. Another indication that internationalization of community colleges is faring poorly is the lack of participation in study abroad programs. Although such programs are on the rise in community colleges, only about three percent of total U.S. students participating in study abroad are from community colleges (Raby, 2008).

Nationally, there have been organizations formed to address and lead efforts to increase internationalization in the community college sector. The Community Colleges for International Development, Incorporated (CCID) has been instrumental in advancing international education in the U.S. as well as in several other countries. This organization has worked in conjunction with state and local colleges and organizations to promote international education within community college systems around the world (CCID , 2007).

Another organization, Midwest Institute for International/Intercultural Education (MIIE), is a consortium of 123 colleges throughout the U.S. that originated in 1992 through Title VI program funding. This organization endeavors to advance curriculum development to further enhance international programs within two-year institutions (MIIE, 2007).

Other prominent organizations that promote international education include the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers (NAFSA), the College Consortium for International Studies (CCIS), the Center for International Community College Education and Leadership (CICCEL), and the American Association of Community College's (AACC) Office of International Programs and Services. Each of these organizations has developed its own objectives to aid in supporting international efforts both within the U.S. and around the world.

Community college systems in several states greatly accelerated internationalization efforts in the late 1970s through the late 1990s. Many state community college systems developed consortia to address the issue of international education. Although some state organizations failed, a number still survive and maintain an active role in the state community college system. The structures of these consortia vary and depend greatly on the number of colleges they represent. These numbers vary from seventy-two colleges in California to fourteen in Oklahoma (Korbel, 2007). Because this research project will focus on Missouri community colleges, it is beneficial to understand the structure of its consortium, the Missouri Consortium for Global Education (MCGE).

The MCGE represents seventeen community college districts within the state. The mission statement as found at this organization's website is "to design, deliver and promote international and intercultural (domestic) programs and activities that provide Missouri community colleges and the communities they serve with global experience and perspective" (MCGE, 2002). The MCGE, like other state consortia, is a strong advocate for international education at the community college level. Unfortunately, the presence of a state consortium does not provide all resources necessary for individual colleges to support or develop the requirements to incorporate internationalization into a community college's curriculum or culture.

Funding from federal, state, and local sources has been reduced for many areas within higher education and it is assumed that internationalization efforts are no exception. Personal support for such programs can also be difficult to obtain from all levels within the institution and from key players who are required for the success of these initiatives. Therefore, understanding what types of support are available, the logistics of the college mindset, and the experiences and attitudes of those involved can provide insight into the process of developing and maintaining an internationalized campus.

Statement of the Problem

Community colleges are a sizeable presence in the U.S. higher education system. With almost 1,200 institutions, community colleges serve approximately 46% of all U.S. undergraduates and award over 850,000 Associate degrees and certificates annually. Not only are the community colleges serving a large percentage of U.S. citizens but about 39% of all international undergraduate students coming to the U.S. attend community

colleges (AACC, 2008). Understanding the opportunities and limitations of internationalizing the curricula of community colleges is critical, yet little has been done to provide this understanding.

More specifically, limited research has been conducted on faculty perspectives about internationalization of curricula at four-year institutions within the U.S. to date (Backman, 1993; King, 1991; Navarro, 2004). Within community colleges, there has been none that this researcher has discovered. Given the impact of community colleges on the higher education scene in the U.S., an in-depth study is needed to help determine the requirements and resources necessary to encourage community colleges to develop or improve the internationalization efforts on their campuses.

Purpose of the Study

Due to the geographic location of Missouri in the center of the United States and the lack of access to international borders or ports of entry, some Missouri community colleges have few international students. Add to this that portions of Missouri may still view themselves as isolated from the effects of globalization, especially in more rural areas, and internationalization may not be a priority for the administration, governing boards, faculty or the “community” at large. The purpose of this study is two-fold. The first is to assess the perceived level of internationalization at Missouri community colleges by general education faculty within the institutions. The second is to evaluate, within Missouri community colleges, the difference between this perceived level of internationalization of the general education curriculum in association with a number of potentially influencing factors. These include faculty perceptions of administrative support for internationalization, the international experience of the faculty, if an

international “champion” is found on the campus, personal attitudes about internationalization, and the geographic location of the college.

Research Question and Hypotheses

The research question addressed by this study is, “What factors contribute to, or impede the development of internationalized general education curricula in Missouri community colleges?” The following hypotheses have been developed as the basis for examining the research question:

1. Missouri community colleges that have a higher level of administrative support will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.
2. Missouri community colleges that have faculty with at least some international experience will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.
3. Missouri community colleges where there is an identified “champion” of global education will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.
4. Missouri community colleges that are located in an urban area will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum than will colleges in a more rural area.
5. Missouri community colleges that have faculty with positive attitudes toward internationalization efforts will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.

6. Missouri community colleges that have faculty that place a relatively high value on international awareness will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.

Delimitations

Although internationalization has a noteworthy place in all areas of higher education, this study focuses on the public community college and specifically those located in Missouri. Due to the varied make up of the community colleges of this state, information from this study may be generalized to other community colleges in other states, but the study itself looks only at Missouri institutions.

Also, there has been an expressed need to see internationalization occur in all programs at community colleges, including technical and allied health (Dellow, 2007). This study will focus only on the general education curriculum provided in preparation for transfer to four-year institutions. There may well be other variables that could factor into the level of internationalization of curriculum, but the six areas of administrative support, international experience of faculty, an institutional champion, the geographic location of the college, faculty attitudes toward internationalization efforts, and faculty perceptions of international awareness appear to this researcher to be the main issues in Missouri community colleges and will be the focus of this research.

Definitions of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions are provided for key terms and concepts used throughout:

Administrative support – sustainable encouragement through budgets, policies and procedures by presidents, governing boards, and other upper level administration of the college

Curriculum – “the formal instruction from which students graduate and attain qualifications needed for employment” (Mestenhauser, 1998, p.xviii). For community colleges’ general education curricula, this quote may be more appropriately stated as “the formal instruction from which students graduate and attain qualifications needed for employment [or transfer to four-year institutions]”.

General Education – Those courses within the community college that are developed to provide a broad foundation of knowledge required of all degree-seeking students, and intended for transfer to four-year institutions to complete a baccalaureate degree.

Globalization – “the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas . . . across borders” (Knight, 2003b, para.12)

Global Studies – global studies may be used interchangeably with international education for purposes of this study.

Internationalization – “integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education” (Knight, 2003b, para.5)

International champion – a faculty, staff or administrative member who is viewed by others as an outspoken advocate for institutional involvement in international education.

International experience – personal and professional travels, living abroad and studies of cultures beyond the United States.

Significance of the Study

This research will add to the body of knowledge related to internationalization of curriculum in higher education, and specifically at community colleges. The research will also provide information as to the benefits to the community college of increasing the internationalization of the curriculum in general education courses. Through this project, issues will be exposed that hinder the development, implementation, and progression of the internationalization process within community colleges, and recommendations to alleviate those issues will be presented.

Missouri community colleges have assorted structures, ranging from single-campus with extension sites to multi-campus, semi-autonomous colleges. This variability will provide the opportunity for this research to become a model that can be generalized to other community colleges within the United States to evaluate the internationalization of curriculum within comparable institutions, based on faculty perspectives. The continued research of internationalization and the effects of globalization can provide a benefit to society by demonstrating the need to understand other cultures and customs within a global community.

Theoretical Framework

The principal theoretical foundation for this study is the work of Gary Becker (1962) on human capital theory. This work demonstrates how gaining education appropriate to the demands of the existing workplace can increase the economic value of an individual, as well as society-at-large. How international education adds to one's

preparation to work effectively in today's globally integrated economy will be informed by the work of Milton Bennett (1986) that focuses on how people gain greater intercultural sensitivity. Bennett demonstrates that among individuals there can be various levels of understanding and acceptance of other cultures. As individuals increase their knowledge of other cultures they will move across a spectrum of degrees of awareness and sensitivity, a shift that is highly desired if students are to increase their 'human capital' in an internationally interdependent world.

Organization of Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter One, the Introduction, introduces the research topic and presents the purpose and significance of the research. Chapter Two, Literature Review, examines previous studies and information focusing on internationalization and curriculum change within higher education institutions, and demonstrates why the research question is important, and needs further examination. Chapter Three, Methodology, describes the theoretical foundation and analytical methods applied to this study. Chapter Four, Results, presents the data and analysis produced by this research. Chapter Five, Discussion, provides an interpretation of the analyzed data and presents recommendations for future research to expand the knowledge base on this topic.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The world has become a place of interdependent people and cultures. At the early part of the twenty-first century, it is relatively commonplace for an individual to be located in a particular place on the globe and within minutes communicate or conduct business transactions with someone on the other side of the world. Within just hours, this same individual could be standing in front of that person having a face-to-face exchange of ideas. Bartell (2003) notes that “. . . the compelling pressure to internationalize, owing to the instantaneity in communication and rapid advances in transportation, which result in an increased need for intercultural and international understanding and knowledge, has become an urgent priority” (p. 49). Therefore, it has become critical for individuals to become more aware of, and more sensitive to other cultures.

Unfortunately, as indicated in a National Geographic Roper Poll (2006), young people between the ages of 18-24 in the contiguous United States lack knowledge related to global competence. For example, survey results indicate that of the 510 participants, six in ten (63%) cannot find Iraq on a map of the Middle East, despite near-constant news coverage since the U.S. invasion of March 2003. Three-quarters cannot find Indonesia on a map Three-quarters (75%) of young men and women do not know that a majority of Indonesia’s population is Muslim. . . . Three-quarters (74%) believe English is the most commonly spoken native language in the world, rather than Mandarin Chinese (p. 6).

This and other similar reports demonstrate that individuals need the resources to become better prepared to function in this globally interdependent society. A main source for this

preparation should be the educational process and in particular, the general education courses provided within higher education.

Higher education institutions around the world are striving to meet the demand for globally competent graduates who are sensitive to other cultures. A number of strategies are employed by these institutions to meet the changing needs of their students and stakeholders. Some include increasing study abroad opportunities for students and faculty, internationalization of curriculum, recruitment of international students, and development of education and industry partnerships internationally (Hayward, 2000).

One educational sector that has a large impact on students within U.S. higher education is the community college system. During the last half of the twentieth century, community colleges emerged as a major force in higher education in the United States, with over 1,200 community colleges nationwide, and almost half of all first-time postsecondary students beginning college through these institutions (AACC, 2008). Due to the various career programs offered at community colleges, many students attain their educational goals within these institutions and complete their educational journeys. It therefore becomes more critical that community colleges expose these students to information that will help them become more globally aware and able to function in this interdependent world.

The purpose of this study is to investigate Missouri community colleges and the perceptions of full-time faculty members teaching general education courses about the internationalization of curricula within their institutions. This chapter presents a review of the literature related to internationalization of curriculum within higher education institutions from around the world and within the United States. Special attention will

focus on international efforts at community colleges and in particular, general education courses at these institutions. The literature review demonstrates the importance of internationalizing the curriculum in community colleges, and the critical need for further research on how this can be done effectively.

Community Colleges

A major challenge facing U.S. higher education as it struggles to produce a globally competent graduate is that 46% of all undergraduates are now enrolled in the U.S. community college system (AACC, 2008). To fully appreciate the impact that this has on internationalization efforts, it is critical to have an understanding of this system and its place within the structure of U.S. higher education.

The term “community college” became widely accepted after the President’s Commission on Higher Education in 1947 released its report entitled *Higher Education for Democracy*. These institutions “were a major focus in the commission report, which called for a dramatic expansion of ‘grades thirteen and fourteen’ with no tuition to broaden access” (Kim & Rury, 2007, p. 31). Although junior colleges had been present in the U.S. for almost a half century, this report aided in the increase of public acceptance of these institutions and in a broader sense of their mission. The report and other opportunities allowed community colleges to become a major factor in higher education within the U.S. during the last quarter of the twentieth century (Cohen and Brawer, 2003).

History

In 1901, Joliet Junior College in Illinois became the first two-year public institution. The college was formed to provide high school postgraduates the opportunity

to take courses that would parallel the first two years of course work at the University of Chicago. Providing this opportunity allowed the students to stay in the Joliet community and begin their higher education journey. Over the next century, junior colleges were developed across the U.S. and accompanied by a dramatic change in structure and function from the original Joliet model. By the end of the twentieth century, most had changed their names to community colleges to express a mission that also incorporated vocational and technical education and extensive community education and training programs. With the majority being developed from local high school taxing districts, one of the standards established for most community colleges was to serve the needs of the local community (AACC, 2008; Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Joliet Junior College, 2007).

Although the American Association of Community Colleges was founded in 1920, it was not until the 1960s that a national network of community colleges emerged, with over 450 colleges established in the U.S by the end of that decade. This provided an education system that was able to respond quickly to the changing needs of the country. As described by the AACC website, community colleges saw many changes throughout a relatively short history (AACC, 2008).

During their early years, these colleges mainly offered courses in general studies. Community colleges provided educational opportunities for the local area based on events occurring not only in the community but also nationally and internationally. Events such as the Great Depression, world wars and other significant actions affected the training required by individuals and the courses offered by community colleges. During these changing times, community colleges adapted by offering individuals the

courses and educational options that met the need of the growing economy (AACC, 2006).

Community colleges, as well as four-year institutions, saw enormous growth during the postwar era, which can be largely attributed to several closely related events. As Kim and Rury (2007) point out, increases in college attendance took dramatic leaps in the 1950s and 1960s due, in part, to the GI bill and returning veterans, increased populations in secondary education as a result of “baby boomers” reaching postsecondary ages, and greater acceptance and accessibility to higher education.

Current status

During the decade of the 1960s, community colleges were coming into existence at the average rate of one per week. By 2008, just under 1,200 colleges were in existence, with an enrollment of approximately 11.5 million students (AACC, 2008).

Community colleges not only educate 46% of all undergraduates, but 41% of first-time freshmen begin their education within the community college system. A major portion of the minority population in the U.S. seeking higher education enroll at community colleges. Native American and Hispanic student populations have 55% attending community colleges and 46% of Asian/Pacific Islanders and Blacks are enrolled in these institutions (AACC, 2008). Beyond U.S. citizenry, community colleges serve approximately 100,000 international students, or close to 39% of this student demographic attending U.S. institutions.

Adams and Earwood (1982) report that “for many students, community college is the last opportunity for formal education” (p. 5). This is a reflection of the fact that many individuals utilize community colleges to pursue educational goals other than obtaining a

bachelors degree. These goals may include options such as taking only selected courses for professional development, obtaining professional certification from short-term programs, personal development in the form of continuing education, or obtaining an associate degree as the terminal certification (AACC, 2008). Therefore, community colleges must embrace the concept of internationalizing their campuses not only to provide a well-rounded educational experience for bachelors degree-seeking students, but also to help create more globally competent students who may solely attend community colleges for higher education.

Internationalization

With community colleges receiving such a large percentage of students beginning their postsecondary education, it has become even more critical that these institutions understand what an internationalized curriculum is, and how it can be achieved. To begin the process, internationalization must be clearly defined and a direction must be determined to aid in the process. Unfortunately, little research and review of the development and effectiveness of internationalization within the community college system has been completed.

The lack of research may be a reflection of an ongoing debate as to the exact definition of the term internationalization, especially as it pertains to higher education. In a study by Abdullahi et al. (2007), they note that there are several “terms which are confused with or used in conjunction with internationalization” (p. 10). These include, “globalization, regionalization, transnational education, borderless education, global education, world education, intercultural education, comparative education, multicultural education, and international education” (p.10). In many instances, the country or

institution to which the term is being applied has determined the exact definition that was utilized. This researcher will employ the definition presented by Knight (2003b) that states that academic internationalization is “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension in the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education” (p.2).

Internationalization of Higher Education Curriculum

With a working definition of internationalization established, it is beneficial to understand the justifications and motivations for countries and institutions to internationalize the curriculum within higher education. Qiang (2003) summarizes several reports that establish various rationales for incorporating international aspects into the curriculum. These rationales include such aspects as countries being economically competitive, the realization of environmental interdependence, diversity of communities, maintaining international security, and cultivating cultural awareness.

These various motives demonstrate that the reasons to internationalize colleges and universities differ between countries and institutions. The literature also illustrates that internationalization of higher education can take on a broader definition when referring to multiple countries, and may include significant cross-border activities for institutions, educational programs and individuals to enhance mobility (Abdullahi et al., 2007; Qiang, 2003).

Knight and de Wit (1997) place rationales for internationalization of curricula into four concise categories: political, economic, academic, and cultural/social. As the world, individual countries, independent governments, and educational institutions evolve, the rationale may vary according to the purpose that each institution seeks to emphasize.

The political rationale demonstrates the benefits of global education in helping one understand the relationship between and among governments. The economic rationale refers to how a globally educated population assists a country by increasing the value of its financial and human capital. The academic rationale relates to recognizing the goals and purposes of academic standards in other societies. The cultural and social rationale is related to understanding the importance of culture and society in another country (Knight & de Wit, 1997).

Although these rationales demonstrate beneficial aspects of international education, several create areas of concern. Some countries are apprehensive about internationalization. One of the primary reasons is the issue of brain drain, or the likelihood of having “skilled professionals who leave their native lands in order to seek more promising opportunities elsewhere” (Kwok & Leland, 1982, p. 91). As an example, Altbach (2002) notes that India has seen a great rise in the number of students who study abroad, especially in the United States, and do not return after obtaining their education. Another issue within some countries is the fear that they could lose their own cultural identities as the world becomes more globalized. These fears are central to the theory of cultural imperialism, the notion that one nation can dominate and eventually destroy the culture of another through widespread adoption of the popular culture of the dominant country. Such realizations have been observed in many regions throughout the history of humankind (Hamm & Smandych, 2005).

This demonstrates the need to understand the distinction between internationalization and globalization. Internationalization, as mentioned previously, is a process to gain understanding of various cultures while respecting those differences.

Globalization on the other hand is “the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas . . . across borders” (Knight, 2003b, para.12). Therefore, globalization occurs as the world becomes more homogeneous place and a reduction in the awareness of individual cultures may occur.

In the past, globalization has been shown to be beneficial to certain countries, particularly the United States. Other countries internationalized their educational institutions to allow students to become familiar with the language and cultures of the United States, and eventually English developed into “the official language of international business” (Jackman & Jones, 2002, p. 2) and the common language for scientific communication (Altbach & Knight, 2006). The English speaking population of the world reveled in the fact that the world was adopting its way of communicating and conducting business. However, as Hayward (2000) notes,

to be sure, much of the rest of the world speaks English. Yet, in the long run, that is to their advantage – not ours. They have a kind of access to our society that we deny ourselves to theirs, given our ignorance of their languages and cultures (p. 30).

The economic and political dominance that the United States has been afforded could be reversing due to this fact, which segues into the political rationale for internationalization.

Following the Second World War, the U.S. educational system gained increased funding, especially from the State and Defense Departments. This increase was to encourage colleges and universities to develop or improve areas with global emphases. Institutions were challenged to educate individuals to be able to work with, appreciate, and understand other cultures to provide the country with the security it required. “For

Americans to maintain and to expand their influence, the knowledge of other cultures, languages, and systems became a crucial importance” (de Wit, 2000, p. 13). Literature, however, indicates that this trend has not continued.

To evaluate these trends, a 2008 study for the American Council on Education was conducted (Green, Luu, & Burris, 2008) entitled “Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses” as a follow-up to a report of the same title that was released in 2003. This report further supports the the fact that international education in higher education institutions is seriously deficient. A *Chronicle of Higher Education* news item (Fischer, 2008a) related to the results of this study indicated that, “despite a growing public consensus that it is important to educate students about different countries and cultures, internationalization is not a high priority on most campuses” (para. 4). Although it has been difficult to measure the international efforts on U.S. college campuses, the lack of non-Western curriculum and poor understanding of international issues and cultures by graduates indicate that there is a need for change within the U.S. higher education system (Hayward, 2000).

As Ellingboe (1998) points out, “most U.S. higher education institutions react slowly to external environmental factors, especially to those factors attempting to influence or shape thinking from a monocultural, parochial, singular point of view to a broadly based, future-oriented, internationally focused, interdisciplinary dimension” (p. 199). One area of the U.S. higher education system that has prided itself as being effective in initiating relatively rapid change due to public demand is the U.S. community college system. As stated on the Center for International Community College Leadership website, “Community colleges are designed to be responsive to specific economic

development and learning needs of the communities in which they are established” (CICCEL, 2008, para. 1). Yet the literature indicates that when it comes to internationalizing curricula, community colleges have been no more responsive than have their four-year colleagues.

It has been noted that most community colleges tend to be in agreement with the concept of the benefits and necessity of educating individuals on global issues and international awareness. However, many of these institutions, for whatever reason, have been limited in their focus to move in that direction (Romano, 2002). Despite the fact that community colleges have increased their efforts to internationalize their campuses, many lack a large number of faculty, staff, or administrators with international expertise. As a result, it becomes necessary for many of these institutions to look for other sources to provide assistance if they are to progress in this effort.

Internationalization Efforts

Although it has been noted that internationalization efforts in higher education have been sluggish at best, there have been colleges and universities that made the commitment to attempt integration of global awareness into their institutions. Yet, in the community college sector, Quimbita (1989) notes that even as “many community colleges have made great progress toward internationalizing their campuses, fully 80% of the two-year colleges in the country have yet to take their first step” (para. 14).

Since 2003, several colleges and universities have been recognized for their internationalization efforts through the Senator Paul Simon Award for Campus Internationalization. This award is provided through the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers and is in honor of the late senator who was a strong advocate for

international education and other humanitarian issues (Schock, 2007). Those colleges and universities receiving the award (for a list of recipients, see Appendix A) were recognized for being “institutions where international education has been ‘broadly infused’ across all facets of the institution” (p.v.) and exhibit many of the aspects of internationalization summarized in this study. Three community colleges, Community College of Philadelphia, Bellevue Community College in Washington, and Howard Community College in Maryland, have been awarded this honor. Each of these institutions are large, urban colleges in coastal states with considerable intercultural populations.

Although a small group of institutions are honored with the Simon Award each year, other institutions are working to improve their internationalization efforts. A recent Chronicle of Higher Education article highlighted the endeavors of Rollins College and other institutions that provide international travel opportunities for faculty (Fischer, 2008b). As stated by the President of Rollins College, Lewis M. Duncan, these programs provide the ability for ‘Faculty . . . to model the lives of global citizenship we want for our students’ (para. 4). As the Simon Award winning colleges and others are making progress in internationalization efforts, many require assistance in making this transition. For those institutions, several organizations and funding opportunities are available to aid in the process.

Organizations for Internationalization

Several organizations exist that aid community colleges in their efforts to increase global competency within their student populations. Each of these organizations has a somewhat unique mission, but all possess a common interest of improving higher

education to meet the needs of an interconnected world. Some prominent organizations include those detailed below.

National Association of Foreign Student Advisers (NAFSA).

NAFSA is an organization that promotes international education and offers a wide range of professional development opportunities for member institutions, both in the U.S. and around the world, to help support international education. The organization also strives to encourage and facilitate educational exchange among countries. NAFSA is dedicated to institutions and those working as international educators by providing resources and other opportunities to further the process of global awareness (NAFSA, 2008).

College Consortium for International Studies (CCIS).

CCIS is an organization that works with higher education institutions to promote all aspects of international education. “CCIS members sponsor a variety of programs, notably study abroad programs and professional development seminars for faculty and administrators, which are designed to enhance international/intercultural perspectives within the academic community” (CCIS, 2008, para.2).

Community Colleges for International Development (CCID).

“The mission of CCID is to provide opportunities for building global relationships that strengthen educational programs, and promote economic development” (CCID, 2007, para.1). CCID works in a variety of areas related to two-year colleges to aid in increasing international education opportunities (CCID, 2007). In 2007, another organization which had strong ties to international education initiatives merged with CCID. This organization, The American Council on International Intercultural Education

(ACCIIE), did extensive work in the areas of global studies and curricular development. With this merger, CCID has continued the work previously accomplished within the ACCIIE (Frost, 2007)

Midwest Institute for International/Intercultural Education (MIIE).

MIIE is a consortium of 123 two-year colleges located in the Midwest region of the United States. The Institute was developed in 1992 with funds obtained from a federal Title VI grant, a program sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education to promote international education and foreign language development. MIIE works primarily with its member colleges to establish and increase support of global education at each of these institutions (MIIE, 2007).

Center for International Community College Education and Leadership (CICCEL).

CICCEL is a division of the Community College Leadership Academy at the University of Missouri – St. Louis. Individuals involved with this organization have worked with countries outside of the U.S. and their governmental organizations to aid in developing community colleges based on the U.S. model (CICCEL, 2008). This organization also provides graduate degree opportunities in the area of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies with an international community college emphasis. Students within this program have the opportunity to gain international experience through studies and travels, which can be utilized on their community college campuses to increase international awareness.

American Association of Community College (AACC) Office of International Programs and Services.

Within the community college system in the United States, the AACC stands as the primary advocate for community colleges at the national level. The organization was formed in 1920 and has since been striving to promote its five strategic action areas. These five areas include, (a) “recognition and advocacy for community colleges”, (b) “student access, learning and success”, (c) “community college leadership development”, (d) “economic and workforce development”, and e) “global and intercultural education” (AACC, 2006, para. 6). In support of the fifth area the AACC in 2006, in conjunction with the Association of Community College Trustees developed the *Joint Statement on the Role of Community Colleges in International Education*. This publication stressed the AACC’s commitment to support community college efforts of increasing international education initiatives.

The AACC also maintains the Office of International Programs and Services within its organization. This office has the goals of supporting community colleges in global education initiatives and to encourage international awareness and appreciation throughout the community college system both at the national and international level (AACC, 2006).

Missouri Consortium for Global Education (MCGE).

Within the United States community college system, several consortia have been established for support of international education. Missouri community colleges through its state organization, the Missouri Community College Association (MCCA), established such a consortium which is described here as typical of the activities of these state

groups, where they exist. The Missouri Consortium for Global Education (MCGE), identifies its mission as being “to design, deliver and promote international and intercultural (domestic) programs and activities that provide Missouri community colleges and the communities they serve with global experience and perspective” (MCGE, 2002, para. 1).

The MCGE, other consortia, and each of the previously mentioned organizations provide valuable information and resources for colleges and universities. However, many of the country’s 1200 community colleges still have minimal involvement in international education, highlighting the need for further research on other factors that encourage or discourage institutional involvement. One factor may be that at the current time many higher education institutions are finding difficulties obtaining financial support for all areas of curriculum expansion. During periods of budgetary constraints, international efforts can be one of the first areas to receive cutbacks. Therefore, other sources of funding may be needed to begin or continue international efforts.

Funding Resources

With the need for greater international education of the population in the United States, there have been several funding sources developed to provide aid in these areas for postsecondary institutions; two are described below.

Title VI.

In 1957, the world and especially the United States began to understand that there was a need for individuals with expertise in international affairs. This realization was sparked by the Soviet Union’s launch of the satellite, Sputnik 1 and demonstrated the USSR’s technological advances and possible threats to U.S. national security.

Consequently, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 was passed which included Title VI. This program provided funds for U.S. institutions of higher education to increase essential areas of knowledge necessary for individuals from the U.S. to have a solid background in international affairs and foreign languages (USDE, 2005).

After almost 50 years, Title VI continues to provide a viable source of funding for internationalization efforts. Although the program is still available, several inclusions have changed over the years. One of these changes, with obvious connections to this research, occurred in 1972 when Title VI was expanded to include programs to fund internationalization of curriculum (McDonnell, Berryman, & Scott, 1981).

In 2002, the MCGE received its first Title VI-A grant, supporting language development in Spanish and Chinese, and travel for faculty from each member college to China and Mexico. A second grant was obtained in 2006, focusing on language training in Arabic and French, and supporting travel to West Africa and Morocco. Through these two grants approximately 60 college faculty from across the state of Missouri were provided with international travel and curriculum development opportunities (Jefferson College, n.d.)

Fulbright programs.

U.S. Senator J. William Fulbright introduced legislation to the Congress in 1945 that would help develop international understanding in critical fields of study. These fields included education, culture, and science. The bill was signed in August 1946 by President Harry S. Truman, at which time Congress established the Fulbright Program which is governed by the J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board (Institute of International Education, n.d.).

Senator Fulbright was also instrumental in the passage of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. The Act is more commonly referred to as the Fulbright-Hays Act. This legislation provides the benefit of increasing proficiency in world languages, especially those of non-West European origin, and increasing knowledge in the U.S. of foreign locations. One of the main ways this is accomplished is by offering study abroad opportunities (USDE, 2005)

In 2007, the MCGE obtained a Fulbright-Hays grant which supported 14 faculty for a month of travel and study in Turkey and Syria. Each participant was expected to develop a curriculum unit related to the experience, to be integrated into his/her teaching during the following year.

Despite the two statewide Title VI-A grants, involving all community colleges in the state and involvement in a Fulbright-Hays project that was open to all community colleges in Missouri, the degree of involvement in international education varies dramatically from college to college. This further highlights the need for focused research on other factors that add to or detract from a college's involvement in international studies (K. A. Farnsworth, personal communication, July 8, 2008) .

To reach the goals associated with each of these organizational and financial resources, and to meet the demand for an internationally competent society, higher education must increase its efforts in offering curricula that provide the knowledge and exposure required to develop individuals that are sensitive to various cultures and customs. Although all areas of a college or university must embrace the processes of internationalization, general education courses provide a natural fit for incorporating internationalized curriculum.

General Education

Some might argue that historically, general education curricula are based on the concept of internationalization. Since the beginning of human civilizations, having an understanding of other cultures has been critical. For some this was motivated by the purist view of embracing diversity and benefiting from cultural exchange; however, many times it was a way of maintaining political dominance over other countries (de Wit, 2000). Although the roots of general education extend back for centuries, the modern concept of general education developed in the early 1900s and has evolved greatly in the following years (Rudolph, 1990).

The modern general education movement strives to provide a curriculum that will develop individuals into graduates with a broad range of experiences and understandings that encourage them to become more culturally sensitive. Rudolph (1990) expressed this when he wrote,

the general education movement, from its beginnings at Columbia in 1919 to the celebrated Harvard Report on the subject in 1945, was an attempt to capture some of the sense of a continuing intellectual and spiritual heritage that had fallen victim to the elective principle. In the 1920s, together with the various devices of concentration and distribution by which most institutions were accommodating the elective principle, the movement marked a halt in the tendency toward specialization, as well as a new respect for the concept of education as the mark of a gentleman and a passport to understanding (p. 455-456).

Unfortunately, general education in U.S. higher education has had an oscillating history and with the autonomy within these institutions, finding a common ground for general

education has been difficult. This is evident in the work undertaken by Cronk (2004) where the concepts and definitions of general education at nine individual higher education institutions were evaluated and compared. Although there are variations across the institutions, fundamental educational experiences that produce well rounded, educated citizens appears as a frequent theme of general education for many.

Lundy-Dobbert (1998) claims “American universities cannot honestly claim to be generally educating students, or faculty, to live in the internationalized, corporate, bureaucratic world of today” (p.67). To rectify this concern, higher education institutions in the United States and especially community colleges are striving to educate globally competent graduates and to help develop a population that is more culturally sensitive. However, more work is required and one of the main areas for improvement must be internationalizing the general education curriculum.

Theoretical Framework

This study is theoretically grounded in the work of Gary Becker and his colleagues in economics at the University of Chicago, commonly known as Human Capital Theory. This theory examines how becoming educated in ways appropriate to the demands of the existing world of work – in this case becoming more globally aware – translates into greater economic value for the individual and for society. The ability of individuals to function effectively in an interdependent world is vital. As individuals gain increased knowledge and appreciation of other cultures to become more ethno-relative, and develop the skills necessary to successfully work with various cultures, human capital accumulates. Human capital refers to those “activities that influence future real income through the imbedding of resources in people” (Becker, 1962, p.9).

Human Capital Theory gained particular attention during the mid-1900s with the work of Becker and others in the field of economics. However, the concept of placing an economic value on people has a long and convoluted history. As Kiker (1966) points out, “one of the first attempts to estimate the money value of a human being was made around 1691 by Sir William Petty” (p.482). Over the next several centuries, others added to the literature and provided various procedures for estimating these monetary values.

Adam Smith was one of the first to focus on skills and abilities as a component of fixed capital in his book *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (Smith, 1776). Through Smith’s work, the key ideas on the economics of education were established. Smith, along with Say, Mill, Roscher, Bagehot, and Sidgwick, each contended that those things that increase worker productivity should be considered as capital (Kiker, 1966, p. 486). Unfortunately, much of the work done by these classical theorists met with disapproval as many individuals felt that categorizing humans as capital was immoral and degrading, and the term “human capital” fell out of favor for several decades. During the late 1950s and early 1960s, economists reestablished the usage of the term.

It was during this time that several researchers began to evaluate “investments” in human capital. Many modern theorists have encouraged investments in higher education and studies indicate that increased education and on-the-job training are highly regarded as means for escalating human capital. The increase in human capital is expressed, not only as a benefit to individuals but as an asset to society in general (Becker, 1962; Mincer, 1958; Schultz, 1960; Weisbrod, 1962).

Higher education, including internationalization efforts, plays a key role in increasing human capital, as indicated by the work of Becker and others (Sorensen, 2000). The advanced knowledge gained through increased levels of education and appreciation of other cultures, enhances the internal resources of individuals. This increase in human capital can provide a greater rate of return on investment to the individual, and aid in strengthening society at the local, national, and international level (World Bank, 1995; Becker, 1962; Becker, 1964). This study examines the effectiveness of community colleges in Missouri with integrating international context into their general education curricula, thereby adding value to the human capital of their students.

Contributing Theory

How education contributes to greater multicultural understanding can perhaps best be understood through the work of Milton Bennett on intercultural sensitivity, which demonstrates why a liberally educated person must have more than just a passing acquaintance with other peoples and cultures. Bennett (1986) observed that the degree of understanding and acceptance of other cultures varies considerably among individuals. In his seminal developmental model, he proposes that individuals may be at any one of six stages in their understanding and acceptance of other cultures based on their experience with difference. The spectrum runs from those stages that are more ethnocentric to ones that Bennett refers to as more ethnorelative and includes denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, and integration.

Ethnocentrism is a relatively common term that originated in the early twentieth century. In his book *Folkways*, Sumner (1907) was one of the first to utilize this term. He defines ethnocentrism as

the technical name for this view of things in which one's own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it. . . . Each group nourishes its own pride and vanity, boasts itself superior, exalts its own divinities, and looks with contempt on outsiders (p. 13).

Ethnorelativism was created by Bennett (1986) "as an appropriate antonym of ethnocentrism" (p. 182).

Beginning at the most ethnocentric stage of Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS), an individual is at the stage of Denial. In this stage a person has had relatively limited contact with any cultures other than his/her own. Therefore, a person at the Denial stage has no concept or realization that his/her own views could be challenged by any outside influence.

The next stage is Defense. At this stage, an individual must have some perception and realization that differences do exist. "The most common Defense strategy is denigration of difference. This is generally called 'negative stereotyping', wherein undesirable characteristics are attributed to every member of a culturally distinct group" (p. 183).

Bennett notes that final attempts to preserve one's own world view as central involve efforts to present cultures as the same – with differences being relatively unimportant. This occurs at the Minimization stage, the last stage before entering the ethnorelative side of the spectrum. Minimization represents an individual who has an understanding of the differences found between cultures but belittles or ignores those differences.

The first stage that moves from ethnocentric to ethnorelative is Acceptance. According to Bennett, “at this stage, cultural difference is both acknowledged and respected” (p. 184). Even though this shift has occurred, it is typically only a change in the realization of such cultural difference.

Adaptation progresses from acceptance. This stage demonstrates that an individual is capable of having a true understanding and acceptance of cultural differences. Here Bennett identifies empathy as the most common manifestation, where this ability to identify and understand the feelings of others is a common action of the individual.

The last stage, and the one which demonstrates the highest degree of ethnorelativism, is Integration. Here an individual might be considered truly multicultural and to possess the ability to incorporate various cultures into his/her own life and world view. Bennett describes this person as one “who experiences difference as an essential and joyful aspect of all life” (p. 186).

To develop individuals and to move them to higher levels of ethnorelativism, exposure to cultural differences must occur. Higher education shares in this social responsibility to its student populations by, among other things, internationalizing the curriculum. It is the assumption in this study that students move across the spectrum of intercultural sensitivity based, to some degree, upon the extent to which they are exposed to other peoples and cultures during their college experience.

Bennett’s model was established through evaluations of how individuals progress through various cultural worldviews as the cultural awareness and experience of the person increases. By incorporating these observations with concepts related to

constructivism and cognitive psychology, Bennett developed the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMSI) to aid in elucidation of how people experience and respond to cultural difference to which they become exposed (1986). The theoretical framework of the DMSI has been utilized by Hammer (1998) in conjunction with Bennett, in developing an empirical test, referred to as the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI). This test “was constructed to measure the orientations toward cultural differences described in the DMSI” (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003, p. 421). Bennett’s model was developed with the primary assumption that “as one’s experience of cultural difference becomes more complex and sophisticated, one’s potential competence in intercultural relations increases” (Hammer et al., 2003, p. 423). If we assume that greater competence in intercultural situations is useful in working successfully in our interdependent world, we should also assume that as students are exposed to more international themes and experiences as part of their formal educations, they will gain greater multicultural sensitivity and will increase the level of human capital.

Conclusion

The rationale for the internationalization of undergraduate education must of necessity take us back to the meaning we give to liberal education and liberation of the mind. Whatever our definition might be it is clear that acquiring global awareness and an understanding of the diversity of cultures and societies on our planet has to be considered an integral part of education (Harari 1992, p. 53). Global awareness through internationalization is a requirement that institutions, faculty, students, and the community at large agree is a necessity. Unfortunately, even though much discussion has occurred on the subject, relatively little has been accomplished over

the past several decades to further these objectives throughout higher education. Yet to be truly well-educated in today's world of almost ubiquitous cultural diversity, and to be economically productive at both the personal and societal level, requires a background of broad, international understanding and exposure.

Community colleges need to be on the forefront of internationalization efforts due to the role these institutions play in the academic lives of almost half of all first-time college students. Yet very little is being done in these institutions to meet this challenge, and more information must be provided about methods to incorporate global awareness into the curriculum in community college courses.

To date, little research has been conducted on the perspectives of faculty members toward internationalization and none was discovered by this researcher to have occurred at the community college level. Developing an understanding of global awareness and cultural sensitivity among faculty within the community college system may encourage greater acceptance by institutions to increase internationalization efforts. Through this development of understanding, community colleges can help lead a large percentage of individuals to a more ethnocentric point-of-view, while enhancing the value of their human capital.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Community colleges are a significant part of the higher education system of the United States, serving almost half of all undergraduate students. Also, community colleges are providing education experiences to a significant number of international students (AACC, 2008). With these statistics and the fact that the world is becoming more interdependent, there is a significant need to evaluate community colleges and their response to the demand for, and development of, internationalized curricula for their campuses. The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of full-time faculty members teaching general education courses in Missouri community colleges as to the internationalization of curricula within their institutions.

These faculty perceptions were studied to shed light on the principal research question for this study: What factors contribute to or impede the development of internationalized general education curricula in Missouri community colleges? Six hypotheses related to internationalization of curriculum were studied to examine this question.

1. Missouri community colleges that have a higher level of administrative support will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.
2. Missouri community colleges that have faculty with at least some international experience will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.

3. Missouri community colleges where there is an identified “champion” of global education will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.
4. Missouri community colleges that are located in an urban area will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum than will colleges in a more rural area.
5. Missouri community colleges that have faculty with positive attitudes toward internationalization efforts will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.
6. Missouri community colleges that have faculty that place a relatively high value on international awareness will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.

Theoretical Framework

This study utilized as its theoretical framework the work of Gary Becker (1964) on human capital development, informed by theoretical contributions of Milton Bennett (1986). Through his research on multicultural sensitivity, Bennett demonstrates that individuals pass through a spectrum of attitudes concerning other peoples and cultures. This spectrum moves from the most ethnocentric level, denial, through a total of six levels, finally reaching the most ethnorelative level, integration. Becker (1964) maintains that individuals increase their “human capital,” the personal ability to contribute socially and economically, by gaining education that is particularly appropriate to the challenges of the era in which they live.

An assumption was made through this study that students would gain human capital in today's globally integrated economy by becoming more internationally aware, and thereby gain more multicultural sensitivity. The study further assumed that students are more likely to progress along Bennett's ethnocentric – ethnorelative continuum if they are exposed to international themes and ideas during their college experience. It also assumed that failure by a postsecondary institution to provide this experience limits an individual's ability to interact successfully with diverse cultures. The study tests the hypothesis that faculty with greater international experience would be more inclined to support and create internationalized courses, and that the colleges with greater numbers of these faculty would have more fully developed international programs.

Bennett's work on cultural attitudes compliments the assumptions of Human Capital Theory in that it suggests how one can become better prepared to work effectively in a globally integrated economy. The World Bank (1995) acknowledged this relationship in a report where it states, "Education contributes to economic growth both through the increased individual productivity brought about by the acquisition of skills and attitudes and through the accumulation of knowledge" (p.20). As individuals are exposed to more facts, increase their knowledge base, and move to a more ethnorelative level of awareness and acceptance, they become better equipped to participate fully in our progressively expanding international society and economy (Becker, 1964, World Bank, 1995).

Research Design

To address the primary research question for this study, a modification of a study done by Navarro (2004) was conducted (see Appendix B). In that study, faculty

perspectives were measured concerning the “academic and institutional strategies for the internationalization of the undergraduate agriculture curriculum” (p. 8) at two, land grant universities within the college of agriculture. The original survey was developed with two versions specific for each of the two university systems studied. The modified survey for the present study provided questions in a general scheme so only one version was necessary for administering to the community college campuses that were surveyed. Additional questions were added to address specific interests of this study that were not of importance to Navarro’s study.

Navarro (2004) developed the instrument questions through a review of literature related to various group attitudes on the topic of internationalization and higher education. Validity and reliability in the original survey were established by linking questions directly to the research questions of her study, conducting a pilot study, and by receiving input from a panel of experts.

The adaptation for this study underwent a validation process prior to its use in the research. This process consisted of a test administration of the questionnaire and a review by a three-member panel of experts on global education. The test administration was conducted by obtaining 12 voluntary responses to the questionnaire from doctoral students at the University of Missouri – St. Louis who also held positions as full-time community college faculty. The expert panel consisted of two retired community college presidents and a currently employed community college administrator, each with extensive international experience related to community colleges.

Instrument

Data were collected using the survey questionnaire (See Survey, Appendix C). The questionnaire was standardized to collect uniform data from all institutions within the study group. The questionnaire and accompanying material were administered through an online survey system hosted by Flashlight Online.

The questionnaire was composed of three sections: (a) demographics, (b) faculty perspectives on internationalization of curriculum, and (c) an open comment forum. The first section of the survey provided demographic information on each participant and the college at which each participant was currently employed. All questions were designed to maintain the anonymity of the participant. Names were not requested on the survey and the online process did not collect that information. Questions in this section established characteristics of the respondents both on a personal and professional level, especially as they related to international experiences, and to the campus internationalization efforts. The demographic portion of the questionnaire consisted of 21 questions. Six of the questions were obtained from Navarro's original questionnaire, of which three were modified to address community colleges and to provide multiple choice responses rather than fill-in-the-blank responses found with the original questionnaire. Fifteen questions were added to inquire about specific issues related to Missouri community colleges and internationalization of the campuses. A follow-up question was also added to obtain a further understanding of a college's international "champion", if one were identified. Three questions unrelated to community colleges were removed from section one of the original questionnaire.

To gather data on the respondent's perceptions of the level of internationalization at the participant's college, section two of the survey contained six sub-sections scored on a five-point Likert scale. The first sub-section asked participants to respond to questions related to the value of emphasizing specific professional characteristics within the curriculum. The second set questioned the value of including specific requirements in the undergraduate curriculum. This was based on comparisons of criteria commonly utilized in curriculum development at U.S. colleges and universities. These included such areas as interpersonal skills, problem solving skills, technical competencies, etc. Sub-section three asked the participants questions related to the internationalization of community college curricula. The fourth sub-section questioned the "best uses" of resources for supporting internationalization of the curriculum. The effect of specific characteristics related to the respondent's participation in internationalization of curriculum was the topic for the fifth sub-section. The sixth sub-section looked at the support from the college that is given to the participants in relationship to internationalization of the curriculum. Primarily, modifications for this section related the questions to community colleges.

The third portion of the survey included an open comment forum. This allowed the participants to include personal comments about the internationalization of the curriculum on their campus, personal thoughts on internationalization, and other comments that participants wished to provide. Modifications were made from the original questionnaire and specific open-ended questions were removed.

Participants

The population for this research project included all full-time, general education (transfer credit) instructors at 18 public community college campuses within the state of

Missouri. These participants were identified by the researcher from public listings on the colleges' websites during the spring semester of 2009 based on the listed employment classification. Email distribution lists of participants were developed for each campus and duplicate emails for instructors teaching on multiple campuses were eliminated. The sample size was determined by those individuals who voluntarily participated.

The colleges from which participants were identified represent the community college system in Missouri. Each college was assigned to the category of urban, suburban, or small town college as designated in the work for the American Council on Education (ACE) by Siaya and Hayward (2003). "A small town is defined as having a population of fewer than 25,000. A suburban area has a population of more than 25,000, but fewer than 250,000. An urban area has a population of more than 250,000" (p. 86) Following is the list of the three categories with the 18 campuses and the location of each:

Small Town:

Crowder College, Neosho, MO

East Central College, Union, MO

Jefferson College, Hillsboro, MO

Mineral Area College, Park Hills, MO

Moberly Area Community College, Moberly, MO

North Central Missouri College, Trenton, MO

State Fair Community College, Sedalia, MO

Three Rivers Community College, Popular Bluff, MO

Suburban:

Ozarks Technical Community College, Springfield, MO

Saint Charles Community College, Cottleville, MO

Urban:

Metropolitan Community College Campuses

Blue River, Independence, MO

Longview, Lee's Summit, MO

Maple Woods, Kansas City, MO

Penn Valley, Kansas City, MO

Saint Louis Community College Campuses

Florissant Valley, St. Louis, MO

Forest Park, St. Louis, MO

Meramec, St. Louis, MO

Wildwood, Wildwood, MO

Data Collection

Once the population of general education full-time faculty was established, the researcher sent emails to 783 identified potential participants. Of those, 18 emails were returned to the researcher as undeliverable. Therefore the requests for participation totaled 765.

The email to potential participants gave a brief explanation of the project (see appendix D) and directed the recipient to the attached letter of consent (see appendix G). The letter provided informed consent and contained a hyperlink to the survey instrument. Participants were informed that following the hyperlink and continuing to the survey

indicated their voluntary acceptance to the terms of the letter of consent. Approval to send surveys and conduct data collection was provided by the University of Missouri-St. Louis Institutional Review Board (see Appendix H) and the community colleges with established Institutional Review processes. Participants from colleges with no formal process were sent surveys under the directives set forth by the University of Missouri – St. Louis.

Data for this research were stored by Flashlight Online in an anonymous manner during the data collection period. The survey was made available to participants for five weeks during the month of April 2009. This timeframe was determined to try to avoid critical times during the semester when faculty are most heavily loaded with job related responsibilities. To further increase participation, reminders (see Appendices E and F) were emailed seven, 21 and 28 days after the first mailing, requesting participation of those that had not previously done so and acknowledging and expressing appreciation to those that had participated. Due to the anonymous nature of the survey, all potential participants regardless of previous participation received the follow-up reminders. The researcher, being a community college employee, also requested fellow colleagues and members of the Missouri Consortium on Global Education to encourage participation with general education faculty at their institutions.

To provide an additional indicator of success related to internationalization of curriculum for the colleges, information was obtained from the MCCA office. Minutes, with participant rolls of MCGE public meetings during the period of February 2007 through March 2009 were collected. College representation at the meetings was noted and recorded for further analysis.

Quantitative Analysis

The data collected on the Flashlight Online system were secured by username and password. The researcher had sole access to the stored data. Upon completion of the survey period, data were downloaded to a Microsoft Office Excel document and then copied and transferred into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, Version 16.0) analysis program for further data analysis.

Descriptive statistical analysis was performed to provide information on the participants and to develop frequencies for further analysis. Upon examination of frequencies, Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was performed to address the proposed hypotheses of this study. MANOVA was utilized to determine if differences existed between groups of each independent variable with the four established dependent variables.

The dependent variables consisted of the faculty's perceived level of success of their institution based on (a) international focus for students, (b) providing global opportunities, and (c) internationalization of the general education curriculum. Each of the previous dependent variables were obtained from four individual questions on the survey. The fourth dependent variable, active participation in MCGE, was determined by analyzing records of MCGE meetings from the period of February 2007 to March 2009 and establishing the frequency of attendance by a representative of each institution. Upon completion of analysis related to the proposed hypotheses, remaining questions from the survey were analyzed to gain a clearer understanding of the faculty members' perspectives on internationalization efforts. A more in-depth analysis was also conducted

to provide information related to the individual success levels of colleges and campuses where the participants were employed.

Qualitative Analysis

The final portion of the questionnaire provided an open-ended comment box with the directive to, “Please provide your comments on internationalization efforts.” To analyze these comments, content analysis was utilized. The researcher developed two categories for the responses. The first category was for responses that referred to internationalization issues personally associated with the participant. The second was for those responses that referred to issues of internationalization more directly related to the participant’s college.

Based on themes that emerged from the analysis, sub-categories of positive or negative attitudes related to specific areas associated with internationalization efforts were expanded further to include (a) participation in internationalization efforts, (b) the overall concept of internationalization, (c) faculty participation in internationalization efforts, (d) administrative support of global education, (e) governing board support of global education, (f) student participation in college sponsored international activities and (g) overall college support of global education initiatives.

Two volunteers were utilized as inter-coders to reduce the subjectivity of the researcher and placed each of the responses into categories. Each response was numbered and the volunteers placed the number corresponding to a specific response with the appropriate subcategory. If a response fit more than one category or subcategory it was placed in each appropriate location. Upon obtaining the categorized responses, the researcher checked for consistency of the evaluators. There was an 88% agreement rate in

category placement of the responses. Upon further analysis of the categorized comments, final categorical determinations were made by the researcher. Analysis was performed and frequency counts were utilized to further elucidate the feelings of participants toward internationalization efforts. Several themes were observed in these responses and provided further understanding of issues related to internationalization of the general education curriculum of community colleges.

Limitations

This study was limited by the dependence on general education faculty members' willingness to voluntarily participate in this study. Also, some potential faculty members may not have been properly identified and therefore were not contacted by the researcher. This may have occurred due to the fact that names and faculty positions were developed from the posted websites of each institution by the researcher.

A further prospective limitation to this study may include a true understanding of each question by participants since this was an online administration with no immediate questioning or feedback mechanism. This fact may have limited the ability to answer all questions or supply accurate information when an answer was provided. Terms were defined where it was deemed necessary by the researcher and informed by the expert panel and test administration of the questionnaire.

Conclusion

This study was developed to help provide insight into the internationalization efforts of Missouri community colleges through the perspectives of the general education faculty within these institutions around the state. Analysis of this information was performed to aid in answering the research question proposed for this study which was:

What factors contribute to, or impede the development of internationalized general education curriculum in Missouri community colleges?

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to assess the perceived level of internationalization at Missouri community colleges by general education faculty within the institutions, as well as to evaluate within this college system the relationship between the perceived level of internationalization of the general education curriculum and a number of potentially influencing factors related to internationalization efforts. The factors that were examined included (a) the faculty perceptions of administrative support for internationalization, (b) the international experience of the faculty, (c) if an international “champion” was found on the campus, (d) personal attitudes about internationalization, and (e) the geographic location of the college.

Internationalization of general education curriculum has been a topic of increasing focus in higher education, but within community colleges little research has been completed to assess its utilization or effectiveness. Understanding the perceived levels of participation in, and support for internationalization within community colleges will provide institutions information to aid in developing or maintaining future internationalization efforts.

Research Question

The research question addressed in this study was: What factors contribute to, or impede the development of internationalized general education curricula in Missouri community colleges? The following hypotheses were developed to focus the study in answering the research question:

1. Missouri community colleges that have a higher level of administrative support will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.
2. Missouri community colleges that have faculty with at least some international experience will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.
3. Missouri community colleges where there is an identified “champion” of global education will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.
4. Missouri community colleges that are located in an urban area will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum than will colleges in a more rural area.
5. Missouri community colleges that have faculty with positive attitudes toward internationalization efforts will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.
6. Missouri community colleges that have faculty that place a relatively high value on international awareness will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.

Research Design

Data were collected from a questionnaire that was administered through an online survey instrument hosted by Flashlight Online. The survey and letter of consent were sent via email to full-time general education faculty throughout Missouri community colleges in the Spring semester of 2009. Through an evaluation of online directories for each

institution, 783 potential participants were identified by the researcher. Upon distribution of the survey, 18 emails were returned as undeliverable. Therefore, the final pool consisted of 765 potential participants. Three follow-up emails were sent on days seven, 21 and 28 after the original request by the researcher to all potential participants. Those emails invited participants to participate and also thanked those individuals who had previously completed the survey. At the conclusion of the data collection period, 243 surveys were obtained resulting in a 32% response rate.

The survey for this study was modified from a study done by Maria Navarro (2004) at Texas A&M University. The original survey was utilized with slight modifications that provided more directed answers and related other questions to community college issues. Navarro's study researched two, four-year universities and specifically looked at internationalization efforts in the each university's college of agriculture.

The questionnaire consisted of three sections: (a) demographics; (b) faculty perspectives on internationalization of curriculum, and (c) an open comment forum. Items for the first two areas in the questionnaire consisted of multiple-choice, yes/no, and five-point Likert scale questions. The third portion consisted of one open text box to invite further comments on internationalization (see Appendix C).

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, version 16.0) analysis program was utilized to conduct multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) for each of the six hypotheses developed to test this study. The use of MANOVA enabled the researcher to determine differences among the groups as related to the four dependent variables of institutional success consisting of (a) a provision of an international focus for

students, (b) development of a global perspective college wide, (c) internationalization of the general education curriculum, and (d) participation in MCGE meetings. MANOVA also decreased the likelihood of making a Type I error, rejecting the null hypothesis when it is true, and provided the opportunity to account for relationships among variables. If significant differences were determined on those variables with more than two groups, post hoc analysis using the Scheffé post hoc test for significance was also carried out.

The remainder of this chapter is separated into nine sections. These sections provide an overview of the demographics, results of each hypothesis, additional quantitative analysis and themes from the open-ended comments provided on the survey. The first section provides information related to the demographics and characteristics of participants from the general education faculty who responded to the survey and institutional demographics.

The following six sections detail the results of the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) for each of the six hypotheses (see Table 4). Four dependent variables were utilized. Three were obtained from questions provided on the survey that referred to the perceived success of the institutions in internationalization efforts and the fourth was based on participation by the institutions in the Missouri Consortium for Global Education over a two-year period.

The next section provides quantitative data on the remaining information obtained through the questionnaire that did not apply directly to the developed hypotheses of this study. The last section presents qualitative data from the open-ended question provided at the end of the survey.

Demographics

Participants

To obtain a better understanding of the background and characteristics of the general education full-time faculty participating in this study the first step of the data analysis was a summary of the frequency and percentages of the participant demographics (see Table 1). The sample size (N=243) was determined by those individuals who voluntarily participated in completing the questionnaire. Some questions had fewer participants, due to the fact that participants were instructed that they could continue the questionnaire if a previous question was passed over. This may be the case if a participant felt the question might provide identifying information and wished to maintain further anonymity.

The sample was made up of 158 (65%) females and 85 (35%) males. The potential participant pool for this study was also examined for gender distribution. Since participants were identified from lists obtained from the websites of the participants' colleges, the researcher did a manual count of the potential participants to establish this distribution. Names were randomly assigned to the categories of male or female when they had no apparent gender specificity. The initial pool of participants was made up of 423 (54%) females and 360 (46%) males. Therefore, it appears that women had a greater disposition to respond to the survey.

The number of years that participants had taught in a community college was ranked in groupings of 1-5 years through 26 or more years. Those faculty members having been with a community college for 1-5 years constituted the largest group at 72 (30%). The next group, 6-10 years of service, was the next largest at 69 (29%). Together,

these two groups made up 59% of the faculty who chose to respond. Each of the four subsequent groups dropped dramatically and together only comprised 41% collectively.

Participants also indicated the years they had been in higher education. These groupings were more evenly distributed. Sixty percent of the participants indicated they had been involved with higher education for more than 10 years. Due to the higher percentage of long term employment in higher education compared to the same categories in community college service, it was evident that a number of these faculty members had experience in other areas of higher education prior to working at the community college.

The sample consisted of 192 (79%) instructors with a Master's degree and 50 (21%) with a Doctorate degree. This appears to be a relatively consistent distribution when compared to information from Cohen and Brawer (2003) that indicates approximately 80% of general education instructors possess a Master's degree and 20% hold a Doctorate. Participants represented a relatively even distribution among disciplines through the areas of general education and of those participants, 66 (27%) indicated that they had administrative responsibilities beyond the duties of a faculty member. These duties could include but were not limited to such responsibilities as department head, associate/assistant dean or other administrative duties as determined by the participant.

Participants were asked to designate if they were born outside of the United States. Of the 242 responding, only 15 (6%) indicated they were born in a location other than the U.S. A follow-up question provided information on the number of years these individuals had been in the U.S. The greatest percentage of individuals (80%) had been in the U.S. for over 16 years, with 7 (47%) having been in the U.S. for 26 or more years.

Only three individuals (20%) denoted being in the U.S. for a time period of six to 15 years. None in this group had been in the U.S. for less than five years.

Table 1.

*Frequency Counts and Percentages of Demographics of
General Education Full-Time Faculty at Missouri Community Colleges*

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Gender (N=243)		
Female	158	65.0
Male	85	35.0
Years as CC Faculty (N=242)		
1 to 5	72	29.8
6 to 10	69	28.5
11 to 15	33	13.6
16 to 20	30	12.4
21 to 25	21	8.7
26 or more	17	7.0
Years in Higher Education (N=243)		
1 to 5	37	15.2
6 to 10	61	25.1
11 to 15	48	19.8
16 to 20	35	14.4
21 to 25	33	13.6
26 or more	29	11.9
Highest Degree Earned (N=242)		
Masters	192	79.3
Doctorate	50	20.7
Home Department (N=242)		
English	44	18.2
Humanities	30	12.4
Mathematics	31	12.8
Science	50	20.7

	Social/Behavioral Science	61	25.2
	Other	26	10.7
Administrative Duties (N=242)			
	Yes	66	27.3
	No	176	72.7
Born Outside U.S.			
	Yes	15	6.2
	No	227	93.8

Colleges

Frequency and percentages related to perceptions of participant faculty toward the colleges where they were employed at the time of the survey are detailed in Table 2. Participants were asked to identify if global education was referred to in the colleges' mission statements. Of the 241 participants replying to this question, only about one-third (38%) indicated that the mission statements did include some reference to global education and approximately one-third (39%) indicated that this was not the case at their institutions. Another approximate one-third of the participants (24%) responded "unknown," presumably due to the lack of awareness to the wording of the colleges' mission statements. Faculty members appear to be less familiar with the colleges' strategic plans where 110 (45%) indicated they were not aware if this was a focus of the colleges' strategic plans.

In a review of the mission statements for the 12 colleges in this study, none had a direct statement referring to global education. However, three colleges mentioned a global or world component in their statement. Only 49 (20%) of the participants in this study were from those colleges that made any mention of an international focus in their

statements. At a minimum, 18% of the total participants in this study felt there was some mention of global education in their college's mission statement where none was found. This provides a strong indication that there is a great lack of understanding as to the stated mission of the colleges and especially how it relates to global education.

The survey also requested participants' knowledge of an active participant in the Missouri Consortium for Global Education (MCGE) for the college. The respondents (N=242) indicated that 130 (54%) were aware of active participants to this group. Only five (2%) signified that their college did not have an active MCGE representative, but 107 (44%) were not aware if such a person or persons were actively involved from their college. In evaluating the actual participation by colleges 12 (5%) of the participants' colleges had no representation at MCGE meetings during the two year period. Also, 193 (80%) of the participants' colleges had been represented in at least half of the MCGE meetings during the two year period. This further supports the lack of understanding among faculty as to the focus on global initiatives and support by their individual institutions.

Participants were also asked to indicate if internationalization was provided for in annual budgets. A much higher percentage (73%) of participants were able to provide definitive answers to this question with 131 (54%) indicating that their college's budget did provide some funding directly related to internationalization efforts and only 47 (19%) indicated that no budgetary money was allocated to internationalization efforts. Roughly a quarter (27%) did not know.

Perceptions of administrative support for internationalization efforts were assessed for both the senior administrator and board levels. In the area of administrative

support and support up to and including the governing board, 144 (60%) and 83 (34%) of the participants indicated positive support from these groups, respectively. Only 48 (20%) of the respondents did not know what the support level for internationalization was from the administration. However, 129 (53%) were unaware of this type of support from the governing board. Therefore, participants perceived that global education initiatives lacked the support of the administration and the governing board in 20% and 13% of the responses, respectively.

Table 2.

*Frequency Counts and Percentages of Demographics of
Faculty Perceptions on College Internationalization Efforts*

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Global Education in Mission Statement (N=241)		
Yes	91	37.8
No	93	38.5
Unknown	57	23.7
Active Participant to MCCA (N=242)		
Yes	130	53.7
No	5	2.1
Unknown	107	44.2
Internationalization in Strategic Plan (N=243)		
Yes	71	29.2
No	62	25.5
Unknown	110	45.3
Internationalization in Budget (N=242)		
Yes	131	54.1
No	47	19.4
Unknown	64	26.5
Administrative Support (N=242)		

Yes	144	59.5
No	50	20.7
Unknown	48	19.8
Governing Board Support (N=243)		
Yes	83	34.2
No	31	12.7
Unknown	129	53.1

Success Index

To provide a basis for understanding of success levels, analyses of individual college campuses was conducted and utilized in evaluating the hypotheses as they are analyzed in this study. A success index was developed and applied to each campus. Success index ratings were established by averaging the responses to each of the dependent variables for each campus and then placing them into a scale from one to 10, with one having no support and 10 having perfect support. Results from this study placed individual campuses in a success index range from 8.3 to 3.5. To maintain anonymity of the colleges and the individual campuses, each was coded in order of its ranking on the success index and averages for the independent variables for each hypothesis were also specified (see Table 3).

Results for column H1 correspond to hypothesis one and are based on either a respondent answering “yes” (1) or the combined responses of “no” and “unsure” (2). Therefore, those campuses with a rating of 1 would indicate that all respondents indicated administrative support for internationalization efforts was offered on their campus. The further a number was from 1 the less support from administration was indicated. Campuses in this study ranged from 1 to 1.9. Results for H2, H5 and H6 are averages of those institutions as based on a five-point scale for the question related to that hypothesis.

Column H3 indicates the number of respondents who indicated that their campus had a “champion” for global education. Data from this study had 0 to 5 respondents per campus indicating such an individual. Column H4 signifies a campus as urban (U), Suburban (S), or small town (R).

Table 3.

Individual campus Success Index Rating and average response rates of hypotheses

College (N)	Success Index Rating (1-10)	H1 ^a (1-2)	H2 (1-5)	H3 (#Champs)	H4 ^b (U,R,S)	H5 (1-5)	H6 (1-5)
A (8)	8.3	1.0	2.4	1.0	U	3.4	3.3
B (8)	7.5	1.0	2.6	0.0	R	4.1	3.8
C (31)	7.3	1.2	2.8	1.0	U	4.0	3.4
D (9)	7.2	1.2	2.7	0.0	U	4.6	3.8
E (19)	7.1	1.5	2.9	0.0	S	4.2	3.2
F (8)	7.0	1.6	1.6	1.0	U	3.8	3.3
G (11)	6.8	1.5	2.4	0.0	R	3.6	2.9
H (15)	6.4	1.7	2.9	2.0	U	4.0	3.5
I (3)	6.3	1.3	4.0	0.0	U	3.3	2.7
J (14)	6.3	1.4	3.0	2.0	U	4.0	3.4
K (2)	6.0	1.5	3.0	0.0	U	5.0	4.5
L (18)	5.5	1.4	2.8	3.0	R	4.3	3.6
M (6)	5.3	1.0	2.2	0.0	R	4.5	3.3
N (50)	5.2	1.5	2.5	5.0	S	4.1	3.5
O (7)	5.0	1.6	2.4	0.0	R	3.7	3.1
P (8)	4.7	1.5	2.9	1.0	R	4.0	3.5
Q (12)	4.2	1.3	2.4	1.0	R	4.8	2.9
R (12)	3.5	1.9	2.7	2.0	R	4.3	3.3

^aa number further from one indicates less support.

^bU = urban, S = suburban, R = small town.

The “success index ratings” established through this analysis will be used as a basis for further comparison as each hypothesis is evaluated.

Analysis of Administrative Support

The first hypothesis stated, “Missouri community colleges that have a higher degree of administrative support are more successful in implementing and/or maintaining

an internationalized general education curriculum.” Data were analyzed through MANOVA and results were utilized to address the hypothesis.

Administrative support was divided into two groups of “none” and “some.” Therefore, post-hoc tests were not performed. The results of the MANOVA indicated that administrative support (Wilk’s $\Lambda = .797$, $F(4,226) = 14.364$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .203$) has a significant effect on the combined dependent variables (DVs) of institutional success with providing an international focus for students, a global interest college wide, internationalization of the general education curriculum, and participation in MCGE meetings. Having at least some administrative support for internationalization efforts translated into greater success and accounted for approximately 20% of the variability. On an individual college level (see table 3), the two campuses ranking highest on the success index (8.3 and 7.5) both had all respondents indicate that the campus had administrative support for global education. It is worth noting that the lowest ranking campus on the success index (3.5) also demonstrated the least perceived administrative support for global education. Beyond those facts there was no discernable pattern at the campus level and one college, ranking thirteenth on the index (5.3), also had all respondents indicating that the campus provided administrative support for global education.

Analysis of International Experience

The data for the second hypothesis, “Missouri community colleges that have faculty with at least some international experience will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum,” was analyzed to determine the effect of international experience of faculty on

internationalization efforts. No significant difference was found (Wilk's $\Lambda = .980$, $F(8,446) = .560$, $p = .811$, partial $\eta^2 = .010$) for the groups on the combined DVs of institutional success with providing an international focus for students, a global interest college wide, internationalization of the general education curriculum, and participation in MCGE meetings.

Additional analysis was conducted on responses to the question related to the amount of international experience of the participant and how the participant ranked their current level of participation in international activities on campus compared to their peers. A one-way ANOVA was used to test for international experience differences among three levels (high, average, low) of individual participation in international activities. International experiences differed significantly across the three levels of activity, $F(2,235) = 30.317$, $p < .001$. Scheffé post-hoc comparisons of the three groups indicated that high levels of participation in international experiences ($M = 3.42$) were significantly different than both average ($M = 1.99$) and low ($M = 2.34$) levels of participation ($p < .001$) in terms of their relationship to participation in international activities on campus. Comparisons between the average and low levels of participation were not statistically significant ($p = .217$).

Analysis of Identified "Champion"

The third hypothesis stated, "Missouri community colleges where there is an identified "champion" of global education are more successful in implementing and maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum." An insufficient number of respondents ($N=19$) indicated that such a person was associated with their institution.

Individual responses were evaluated to determine if the majority of these responses were from one or two institutions (see Table 3). It was determined that “champions” were identified in various institutions throughout the 18 campuses that were included in this study and no campus was consistently identified as having a true “champion” among its respondents. Three campuses had the largest number of identified “champions” with five respondents each. The campus with the lowest success index was included in that group. Of the 19 “champions,” 14 were identified as faculty, four as administration and one as classified staff. Due to the low number of respondents and the inconsistency among campuses no further analysis was conducted to test this hypothesis.

Analysis of College Location

Analysis was conducted to study the fourth hypothesis which stated, “Missouri community colleges that serve students from an urban area are more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum”. Location of a college (Wilk’s $\Lambda = .473$, $F(8,452) = 25.620$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .312$) indicated a significant effect on the combined DVs of institutional success with the four dependent variables and accounted for approximately 31% of the variability. Of the hypotheses utilized for this study, location appears to be the most significant contributor to success in internationalizing the general education curriculum. Post hoc analysis using the Scheffé post hoc test for significance indicated that the level of internationalization success was significantly higher ($p = .046$) for colleges in urban areas than those in suburban areas or small towns. Differences between suburban areas and small towns were not statistically significant ($p = .991$).

When evaluating this hypothesis on an individual campus basis (see table 3), all eight urban colleges were found to have their campuses within the top 11 based on the success index. However, two small town colleges were ranked in this group; one ranked second the other sixth. Also one suburban campus was ranked fifth.

Analysis of Faculty Attitudes

“Missouri community colleges that have faculty with positive attitudes toward internationalization efforts are more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum,” the fifth hypothesis studied in this research, was tested by evaluating if faculty thought further internationalization of community college general education curriculum was necessary. MANOVA analysis of the data indicates that differences in attitude, or the level of necessity to internationalize the curriculum, (Wilk’s $\Lambda = .926$, $F(8,444) = 2.161$, $p = .029$, partial $\eta^2 = .037$) have a significant effect on the combined DVs of institutional success but accounted for less than four percent of the variability. Post hoc analyses using the Scheffé post hoc test for significance indicated that the level of internationalization success was not significantly ($p > .05$) affected by any individual level of attitude. Therefore, attitude of the faculty, although significant, has little effect on success of the colleges. Although there is no consistent pattern related to this hypothesis when evaluating individual campuses (see table 3), it is interesting to note that the two campuses rated lowest on the success index obtained the two highest attitude rankings (4.83 and 4.3).

Analysis of Value of Internationalization

The sixth hypothesis stated, “Missouri community colleges that have faculty that place a relatively high value on international awareness are more successful in

implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum”. Different levels of value placed on internationalization (Wilk’s $\Lambda = .865$, $F(8,452) = 4.246$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .070$) indicated a significant effect on the combined DVs of institutional success as measured by the four dependent variables. However, these factors only accounted for seven percent of the variability. Post hoc analysis using the Scheffé post hoc test for significance indicated that the level of internationalization success was significantly higher for colleges with faculty who place some ($p = .029$) or a relatively high value ($p < .001$) on internationalization as compared to those that placed no value on these efforts. On an individual campus basis (see table 3), no patterns of success were identified. This is further indicated by the colleges with both the highest and lowest success index ranking having average values of 3.25.

Table 4.

Summary of Hypotheses Results

Hypothesis	Result	p	Partial η^2
H ₁ - Admin. Support	Supported	<.001	.203
H ₂ - Intern. Exper.	Not supported	.811	.010
H ₃ - "Champion"	Insufficient numbers	-	-
H ₄ - College Location	Supported	<.001	.312
H ₅ - Attitudes	Supported	.029	.037
H ₆ - Value	Supported	<.001	.070

Additional Quantitative Analysis

Although not directly related to the specified hypotheses for this study, other questions were posed to the participants that provided evidence of factors that could benefit or impede the development of internationalization efforts at Missouri community

colleges. These questions were derived from the original survey developed by Navarro (2004) and were maintained in the modified version for additional information.

For the first analysis in this group, participants were asked to provide what their perceived value of emphasizing specific criteria in community college general education curriculum was for a variety of areas (see Table 5). These rankings were based on a five-point Likert scale that progressed from “very low” to “very high.” In each of the following analyses, the rankings of “high” and “very high” were combined and utilized for comparison. It was found that faculty members perceived “problem solving, critical thinking, and analytical skills” to have the greatest value (91%). This was followed by “communication skills” (90%), “technical competency within ‘major’ field of study” (73%), “interpersonal skills” (71%), “computer skills” (69%), “international awareness and/or experience” (45%), “prior work and/or internship experience” (31%), and “fluency in a second language” (26%).

Table 5.

*General Education Faculty Perceived Value of Emphasizing Specific
Criteria in Community College General Education Curriculum*

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Interpersonal Skills (N=242)		
Very Low	2	0.83
Low	5	2.07
Average	62	25.62
High	91	37.60
Very High	82	33.88
Problem Solving, Critical Thinking, Analytical Skills (N=241)		
Very Low	0	0.00
Low	2	0.83

Average	20	8.30
High	66	27.39
Very High	153	63.49

Communication Skills (N=242)

Very Low	0	0.00
Low	1	0.41
Average	24	9.92
High	70	28.93
Very High	147	60.74

Technical competency within 'Major' Field of Study (N=241)

Very Low	1	0.41
Low	4	1.66
Average	60	24.90
High	95	39.42
Very High	81	33.61

Computer Skills (N=241)

Very Low	1	0.41
Low	10	4.15
Average	64	26.56
High	113	46.89
Very High	53	21.99

Prior Work and/or Internship Experience (N=239)

Very Low	8	3.35
Low	38	15.90
Average	120	50.21
High	57	23.85
Very High	16	6.69

International Awareness and/or Experience (N=243)

Very Low	7	2.88
Low	40	16.46
Average	87	35.80
High	68	27.98
Very High	41	16.87

Fluency in a Second Language (N=242)

Very Low	33	13.64
Low	53	21.90
Average	92	38.02
High	41	16.94
Very High	23	9.50

Utilizing the same scale as previously mentioned, participants were asked to rank their perceived value of requiring certain areas within the undergraduate general education curriculum (see Table 6). These were not specific to community colleges but were part of general education expectations in many higher education settings. The greatest value, based on “high” and “very high” ranking was “speech/communication” (82%). Ranked second was “cultural diversity” (72%) followed by “international awareness” (60%), “environmental literacy” (47%), and “foreign language” (43%).

Table 6.

*General Education Faculty Perceived Value of Requirements
in Undergraduate Curriculum*

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Environmental Literacy (N=238)		
Very Low	9	3.78
Low	31	13.03
Average	86	36.13
High	63	26.47
Very High	49	20.59
Cultural Diversity (N=240)		
Very Low	4	1.67
Low	11	4.58
Average	52	21.67
High	95	39.58
Very High	78	32.50

International Awareness (N=238)		
Very Low	5	2.10
Low	19	7.98
Average	70	29.41
High	87	36.55
Very High	57	23.95
Foreign Language (N=240)		
Very Low	13	5.42
Low	29	12.08
Average	94	39.17
High	69	28.75
Very High	35	14.58
Speech/Communication (N=237)		
Very Low	1	0.42
Low	5	2.11
Average	37	15.61
High	99	41.77
Very High	95	40.08

The “best uses” of college resources to support internationalization of general education curriculum was the focus of the next section of the survey. Participants were asked to rank each of the areas by indicating if they would be “of no use” to “extremely useful” on a five-point Likert scale. Eight areas that could be provided by the institution were presented (see Table 7). Based on a combination of the two rankings “of high use” and “extremely useful” for comparison, the area of “short-term study abroad courses,” that was defined as a cohort of students with community college faculty traveling and studying abroad for two to five weeks, was designated as having the greatest value (68%) for colleges to utilize their resources in internationalizing the general education curriculum. “Infusion” of global themes into the curriculum was ranked next (61%) as a best use of college resources, followed by “cohort semester abroad” (58%),

“internationalize campus environment” (56%), “on-campus, international subject matter courses” (55%), “semester exchange programs and internships” (55%), “technology and virtual mobility” (39%), and “international certificates or emphasis areas” (30%).

Table 7.

Frequency Counts and Percentages of "the Best Uses" of College Resources to Support Internationalization of General Education Curriculum

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Infusion (N=239)		
Of No Use	6	2.51
Low Use	19	7.95
Average	68	28.45
High Use	86	35.98
Extremely Useful	60	25.10
On-Campus, International Subject Matter Courses (N=238)		
Of No Use	3	1.26
Low Use	21	8.82
Average	82	34.45
High Use	89	37.39
Extremely Useful	43	18.07
Technology and Virtual Mobility (N=238)		
Of No Use	5	2.10
Low Use	46	19.33
Average	95	39.92
High Use	64	26.89
Extremely Useful	28	11.76
International Certificates or Emphasis Areas (N=238)		
Of No Use	10	4.20
Low Use	53	22.27
Average	104	43.70
High Use	53	22.27
Extremely Useful	18	7.56

Short term Study Abroad Courses (N=239)		
Of No Use	2	0.84
Low Use	20	8.37
Average	54	22.59
High Use	98	41.00
Extremely Useful	65	27.20
Cohort Semester Abroad (N=238)		
Of No Use	5	2.10
Low Use	35	14.71
Average	60	25.21
High Use	81	34.03
Extremely Useful	57	23.95
Semester Exchange Programs and Internships (N=237)		
Of No Use	10	4.22
Low Use	24	10.13
Average	72	30.38
High Use	80	33.76
Extremely Useful	51	21.52
Internationalize Campus Environment (N=240)		
Of No Use	4	1.67
Low Use	24	10.00
Average	73	30.42
High Use	79	32.92
Extremely Useful	60	25.00

The last section analyzed in this segment related to the perceived benefits to faculty in internationalizing courses and programs of certain criteria (see Table 8). Twelve criteria were presented and participants ranked each from “not at all” to “a great deal” of benefit. The criterion that provided the greatest benefit as ranked by “much” and “a great deal” for faculty to internationalize the curriculum was “funds for student participation” (66%). This was followed relatively closely by “collaboration with other

faculty” (64%), and “funds for participation in programs” (64%). The other areas in this section ranked as follows: “funds for off-campus courses” (60%), “funds for infusion” (60%), “seminars and workshops” (58%), “internationalized instructional materials” (57%), “support by governing board” (56%), “support from department and administration” (56%), “release time from teaching” (55%), “participation in efforts part of evaluation” (42%), “creation of ‘international support specialist’” (39%). Although administrative support was demonstrated to be one of the most significant contributors of success in internationalization, it ranked relatively low as a benefit to faculty on this scale.

Table 8.

Perceived Benefit to Faculty in Internationalizing Courses and Programs

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Release Time from Teaching (N=236)		
Not at All	24	10.17
A Little	25	10.59
Some	58	24.58
Much	49	20.76
A Great Deal	80	33.90
Creation of "International Support Specialist" (N=234)		
Not at All	49	20.94
A Little	28	11.97
Some	65	27.78
Much	49	20.94
A Great Deal	43	18.38
Collaboration with Other Faculty (N=236)		
Not at All	10	4.24
A Little	23	9.75
Some	51	21.61
Much	86	36.44
A Great Deal	66	27.97

Internationalized Instructional Materials (N=236)		
Not at All	18	7.63
A Little	26	11.02
Some	58	24.58
Much	70	29.66
A Great Deal	64	27.12

Seminars and Workshops (N=235)		
Not at All	16	6.81
A Little	25	10.64
Some	58	24.68
Much	79	33.62
A Great Deal	57	24.26

Funds for Participation in Programs (N=235)		
Not at All	16	6.81
A Little	24	10.21
Some	45	19.15
Much	50	21.28
A Great Deal	100	42.55

Funds for infusion (N=236)		
Not at All	17	7.20
A Little	23	9.75
Some	55	23.31
Much	65	27.54
A Great Deal	76	32.20

Funds for off-campus courses (N=234)		
Not at All	16	6.84
A Little	24	10.26
Some	54	23.08
Much	58	24.79
A Great Deal	82	35.04

Support from department and administration (N=231)		
Not at All	15	6.49
A Little	29	12.55
Some	58	25.11
Much	67	29.00
A Great Deal	62	26.84

Participation in efforts part of evaluation (N=237)		
Not at All	40	16.88
A Little	35	14.77
Some	63	26.58
Much	48	20.25
A Great Deal	51	21.52
Funds for Student Participation (N=234)		
Not at All	13	5.56
A Little	24	10.26
Some	42	17.95
Much	63	26.92
A Great Deal	92	39.32
Support by Governing Board (N=234)		
Not at All	20	8.55
A Little	26	11.11
Some	57	24.36
Much	59	25.21
A Great Deal	72	30.77

Additional Qualitative Analysis

Further insight into internationalization of the general education curriculum was gained from analysis of qualitative data that were collected through an open-ended comment text box at the end of the questionnaire. Directions for this open-ended comment simply stated, “Please provide your comments on internationalization efforts”. Of the 243 participants, 65 chose to respond in some manner and of those 63 provided comments related to internationalization. Content analysis of the responses was utilized by the researcher to develop categories. The primary categories were established based on the respondent’s focus of global education and whether it pertained mainly to issues related to institutional concerns or personal concepts. Using a thematic review of the comments, subcategories were established within each of these divisions that related to the positive or negative opinions associated with each of these specific areas to further

expand the analysis. Those areas that could be classified as having either positive or negative opinions included (a) participation in international efforts, (b) support of the concept of internationalization, (c) administrative support of global education, (d) governing board support of global education, (e) student participation in internationalized activities both on- and off-campus, and (f) college support or the overall culture of acceptance at the institutions in reference to international activities and global education.

To reduce the subjectivity of the researcher, two volunteers were utilized as inter-coders to evaluate the responses provided in the open-comment forum. The review team consisted of a professor of Sociology and an institutional researcher, each with extensive qualitative research experience. The researcher provided guidance on the concepts of the categories and sub-categories and allowed the inter-coders to privately evaluate the responses. As part of this evaluation, each statement was placed into the appropriate category and subcategory as independently determined. Given that the comments were provided in one comment box, some responses were appropriately placed in more than one area. An agreement rate of 88% was obtained between the two evaluators and the researcher. The coded data were analyzed and frequency and percentages were calculated for each subcategory (see Table 9).

This forum provided further information on some attitudes related to the concept and institutional initiatives related to internationalization. Of those respondents who had positive personal comments the most common response with 27 (43%) related to the importance and approval of the concept of internationalization of general education curriculum at community colleges. Respondents utilized words like “vital” and “essential” in describing the need for internationalization efforts. This was emphasized by

several respondents with answers such as, “We have to know what is happening and be active participants or we will be left behind” (Respondent #5) and “I think it is very important, but require[s] strong institutional support and encouragement” (Respondent #54).

There were 10 (16%) respondents who had negative comments related to their personal attitude toward internationalization. One faculty member stated, “Honestly, I think we try to emphasize this too much. We are a COMMUNITY college and I am uncomfortable with a large commitment of funds to global education” (Respondent # 2).

Comments related to faculty perceptions of institutional issues were also discovered in the open comment forum. An overall college atmosphere of being accepting and encouraging of internationalization efforts was described by seven (11%) of the respondents. Two of these comments referred to their college having a global education certificate within their curriculum. The highest rate (16%) of responses with negative issues related to the institution’s lack of administrative support for internationalization. That, coupled with the negative comments (8%) about support from governing boards, provides a relatively large percentage (58%) of negative institutional respondents who found dissatisfaction with the internationalization efforts of their institution’s leadership. One faculty member commented, “our college board is also very rural and not internationally minded” (Respondent #4) and another said “support from the administration has been deflected to other areas” (Respondent #29).

Table 9.

Responses to Open-ended Question Regarding Internationalization Efforts

Category	Sub-category	Frequency	Percentage
----------	--------------	-----------	------------

Personal Issues

Positive

Participation	5	7.94
Concept	27	42.86
Faculty	2	3.17
Administration	1	1.59
College	2	3.17

Negative

Participation	4	6.35
Concept	10	15.87
Faculty	1	1.59
Governing Board	1	1.59

Institutional Issues

Positive

Concept	3	4.76
Faculty	2	3.17
Administration	1	1.59
College	7	11.11

Negative

Concept	2	3.17
Faculty	4	6.35
Administration	10	15.87
Governing Board	5	7.94
Students	2	3.17
College	3	4.76

Summary and Conclusion

The typical participant in this study was female and has taught at a community college for one to five years, but has been in higher education for 11-15 years. She holds a Master's degree and does not have other administrative duties, and she was born in the United States. The college at which she is employed has an active participant in MCGE

and there is administrative support for internationalization and it is provided for in the budget. However, there is no indication that global education is part of her college's mission statement, or that the governing board is supportive.

Administrative support for internationalization is a necessary component in the success of these efforts and the lack of it appears to be a major hindrance to other attempts to promote such efforts. Individuals with higher levels of international experience are more likely to be actively involved in internationalizing the curriculum than are those with little or no international experience but this in itself does not have a key effect on the success of a college's global education initiative. Also, due to the limited number of responses, it is unclear whether a college or campus having a "champion" for global education has an effect on internationalization success.

Those colleges located in an urban setting are more successful in internationalizing the curriculum and providing global education. Although this is the most prominent factor for internationalization success it is also the factor that is the least subject to change. Both having a positive attitude toward internationalization and placing a relatively high value on it can be a catalyst for success in such endeavors but neither is a large factor due to low contribution rates.

This chapter presented the analysis and results of this study. A "success index rating" was established for each college, and quantitative findings for each of the hypotheses were offered and further analysis was performed. Also, qualitative information was obtained and analyzed from the open comment forum at the end of the questionnaire. The concluding chapter will further examine these findings and place them in the context of Human Capital Theory as supported by Bennett's ethnocentric –

ethnorelative continuum. Final thoughts will be provided on further areas of continued research related to the topic of internationalization.

Chapter 5

Summary, Discussion, and Recommendations

This chapter is organized into four sections. The first section provides an overview of the study and an account of the methods employed to complete the study. Section two offers a summary of major findings related to the developed hypotheses and additional data analyses. The third section reviews the conclusions of the study and provides a discussion of how this information relates to current literature and theory on internationalization in higher education. The final section proposes areas of future research related to this topic.

Overview

As reviewed in Chapter 2, internationalization of higher education curriculum is an area of great concern and support, although limited in application at a vast number of colleges and universities. As the world becomes more interdependent and the need for globally competent individuals increases, institutions of higher education will be required to take a more active role in providing opportunities for students and developing an overall culture of global inclusion on their campuses. With community colleges being the first and many times the only exposure to higher education for many individuals (AACCC, 2008), it is critical to have an understanding of internationalization efforts at these institutions. Unfortunately, there has been limited research conducted on this topic and information related to community colleges is essentially nonexistent.

This study was developed to provide insight into the perceptions of those individuals that will be the most influential agents of change to the general education curriculum at community colleges; the faculty. Responses from general education faculty

of Missouri community colleges were gathered from an anonymous online survey instrument. Those responses were examined to gain an understanding of the internationalization efforts in Missouri community colleges and the perceived level of success that each of these colleges had with integrating global content into the curriculum and college culture.

Purpose Statement and Research Question

The purpose of this study was two-fold. First, the study assessed the perceived level of internationalization at Missouri community colleges by general education faculty within the institutions. Second, it evaluated within Missouri community colleges the relationship between this perceived level of internationalization of the general education curriculum and a number of factors that could have potential influence on the success of the institution in these endeavors. It was predicted that an examination of these factors would develop generalizations that could benefit efforts by community colleges to increase successful internationalization activities.

To that end, the following research question was utilized to guide this study: “What factors contribute to, or impede, the development of internationalized general education curricula in Missouri community colleges?” The following hypotheses were formulated to explore the research question:

1. Missouri community colleges that have a higher level of administrative support will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.

2. Missouri community colleges that have faculty with at least some international experience will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.
3. Missouri community colleges where there is an identified “champion” of global education will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.
4. Missouri community colleges that are located in an urban area will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum than will colleges in a more rural area.
5. Missouri community colleges that have faculty with positive attitudes toward internationalization efforts will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.
6. Missouri community colleges that have faculty that place a relatively high value on international awareness will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.

Review of Methodology

To obtain the perceptions of general education faculty members at Missouri community colleges, a questionnaire was utilized that was a modification of a study conducted by Navarro in 2004. Minor modifications were required mainly due to the distinction in population that was researched in each study. Navarro’s study was directed toward two, four-year universities and looked specifically at their agriculture programs; this study was directed to two-year community colleges in Missouri and their general education divisions. The survey was completed by participants in an online format.

The total sample (N=243) was composed of participants from each of the 18 campuses within Missouri. This constituted participants from all 12 community college districts in the state, some having multiple campus structures. Participants were identified by the researcher from the online directories of each institution and a total of 765 potential participants were identified and asked to take part in the survey. Upon concluding the designated period for participants to complete the questionnaire, 243 usable surveys were returned for a response rate of 32%.

The questionnaire was composed of three sections. Demographic information regarding the participants along with information about the colleges where they were employed was provided in the first section and was analyzed to obtain frequencies and percentages as well as to correlate other findings by college. The second section provided responses to questions related to the independent and dependent variables utilized to evaluate the hypotheses developed for this study. Each of these areas was evaluated using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and post hoc tests when appropriate. The second section also provided additional data that were analyzed to gain supplementary information beyond the general hypotheses, but related to the internationalization efforts in Missouri community colleges. A review of these findings is provided in the previous chapter.

The last section of the questionnaire provided an open comment forum. This allowed participants to include additional comments on the topic and was analyzed using a content analysis to gain insight into areas of internationalization that were not a focus of the questionnaire. Information from each section was assessed to determine what factors may encourage or enhance internationalization efforts in community colleges.

Major Findings

Due to the relatively limited research on the perspectives of faculty members associated with internationalization (Backman, 1993; King, 1991; Navarro, 2004) and none directly related to community colleges, this study has provided much needed baseline information on the topic of internationalization from the perspective of community college faculty. The study also provides necessary information that will help community colleges determine areas of focus for future efforts in internationalizing their institutions.

Demographics from the study provided information on both the participants in the study and on the colleges where the participants were employed at the time of the survey. Although much of the participant information appears typical to community college faculty, a greater percentage of women responded to the survey than men when compared to the ratio determined from the initial pool of potential participants. The study provides no explanation for this, but does raise questions about whether interest and perceptions might vary by gender, and calls for additional research on this subject.

An interesting side note is that within this sample a large proportion of full-time faculty members have been employed in higher education for a longer period of time than they have been a faculty member at community colleges. This appears to support findings by King (2008) that many individuals begin their professional lives at community colleges at a later age and this choice may be as a second career.

Responses also indicate that faculty members at Missouri community colleges believe they have some understanding of international efforts within their institutions. However, a relatively large percentage demonstrated that they were not aware of the level

of support or international activity at their colleges, as indicated by respondents selecting “unknown” on the questionnaire. Being unaware of such efforts was prevalent in three areas, (a) the college having an active participant in the Missouri Consortium for Global Education (44%), (b) internationalization being addressed in the strategic plan of the college (45%), and (c) the governing board’s support for internationalization efforts (53%). To the degree that lack of awareness is indicative of lack of interest, this finding hints at why internationalization is developing slowly at community colleges.

When comparing individual responses from each campus studied and evaluating actual mission statements for those colleges, it is evident that an even larger number of individuals perceive that colleges have stated support for international education when that is clearly not the case. The reasons for this lack of information are unclear, but they could have critical impacts on internationalization efforts in two respects. First, if institutions are not including international education and awareness in mission statements, it is unlikely to become a priority. Secondly, if faculty are unaware of board or policy support for these efforts they will not see it as a priority. As an institution incorporates global aspects into its curriculum and institutional culture this emphasis should be reflected in the mission, and communication is vital for all employees of the college to understand the level of support throughout the institution. Also, colleges need to incorporate professional development activities to educate faculty on the mission and policies of the college.

The demographic information provided an overview of the participants and their institutions. Having an understanding of this background can allow for further discussion of the hypotheses developed and help answer the research question of this study. The

following discussion of these findings is organized by each hypothesis and presented below.

It is interesting to note that when the rating index described in Chapter 4 was applied to the 18 colleges, institutions within the same state varied from “highly involved” in international education to “minimally involved”. This would suggest that at least in the case of this particular state, institutional climate, leadership and culture have a much more profound influence on the content and emphasis within general education than do state policies or guidelines. It is noteworthy that one of the general competencies expected of the general education core requirements by the Missouri Department of Education is “to develop students' understanding of themselves and the world around them” (MDHE, 2007, para. 21). Yet among the community colleges there is wide divergence in terms of both commitment to and understanding of this program. These differences are explained to some degree by an analysis of the six hypotheses.

Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis stated that Missouri community colleges that have a higher level of administrative support will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum, was tested and results supported the statement. Those institutions which had some administrative support indicated a significantly greater success ($p < .001$) in internationalization efforts in comparison to those institutions where the faculty indicated no support was provided by the administration.

When evaluating administration support on individual campuses, it was found that the campus that ranked lowest on the success index (3.5) also indicated the lowest overall

administrative support among all the campuses. This campus ranked markedly low on the success index even though responses indicated that the college has relatively high portions of faculty with international experience and good attitudes toward internationalization efforts. Also, over 41% of the respondents from this college indicated that they had a “champion” for global education. These results support findings from Navarro (2004) that indicate that a main impediment to internationalization can be a lack of leadership and support from administrative levels at an institution. Others (Backman, 1993; Graham, 1998; Green & Siaya, 2005) have indicated that having leadership and administrative support aid in the success of establishing and maintaining internationalization efforts.

As noted later, the most significant influence on internationalization of the six tested hypotheses was location – specifically an urban setting. Yet three colleges, two small-town and one suburban, had high success scores. Each of these three showed moderate to strong administrative support, indicating that interest in internationalization at the top levels can compensate for the challenges presented by less diverse campus locations.

When asked about internationalization support by the administration, the total participating sample in this study indicated that within approximately 60% of the institutions, administrative support was offered. It is interesting to note that this percentage is comparatively the same as the average success rate (59%) of all institutions as calculated from the overall means of the four dependent variables utilized in this study. Also, the two campuses ranking highest on the success index were both designated as

having administrative support by all respondents. Having administrative support appears to be an important aspect of a successfully internationalized curriculum.

Engberg and Green (2002) note the necessity of administrative support in their report of eight successful internationalization programs across the U.S. In many cases, the president of the institution in conjunction with support from the governing boards were the impetus for success. This also follows LeBlanc's (2007) findings that as the number of individuals who support internationalization efforts at an institution increase, the greater the possibility that efforts related to internationalization will improve and become engrained in the culture of the institution. This study provides convincing evidence that without a change in support emphasis from top leadership, colleges will not place an importance on global issues or global experiences. Therefore, students will complete their community college education with little or no understanding of the world beyond their local or national experience.

Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis in this study stated that Missouri community colleges that have faculty with at least some international experience will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum. Results indicate that personal international experience by the general education faculty does not significantly impact ($p = .811$) the overall level of success to the internationalization efforts of the institution. The international experience level of participants appeared to be widespread throughout the various institutions, and therefore additional analysis was conducted to determine if increased levels of international experience had an effect on personal international participation.

Personal international experience did indicate an increase in the level of individual participation with international activities. An individual with international experience may not greatly affect the institution's level of success for internationalization, but it would appear that an increase in the number of individuals with international experience at the institution may increase participation and would have an eventual impact on the overall success of internationalization efforts at the college. An increase in global experiences to increase knowledge supports previous work providing evidence that these faculty members will have increased participation in international activities at their institutions (Backman, 1993; Graham, 1998). Again, this is reinforced by LeBlanc (2007) where an increase in participation would improve the overall success of internationalization efforts at an institution.

These findings also support aspects of the theoretical framework for this study. As an instructor becomes more exposed to and comfortable with other cultures, she/he is capable of utilizing these insights to participate more freely in international activities. As Bennett's multicultural sensitivity scale indicates, this instructor will move across the scale to a more ethnorelative level. This also allows the instructor to pass along critical information to broaden the horizons of her/his students and aid those students in increasing their "human capital".

Hypothesis Three

The third hypothesis in this study stated, Missouri community colleges where there is an identified "champion" of global education will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum. Due to the insufficient number of responses indicating a "champion," no direct analysis was

conducted to test this hypothesis. As noted earlier, the institution with the lowest success index had a high number of responses identifying a champion for global education. This would indicate that a single voice for internationalization cannot overcome the stifling effects on institutional isolation or lack of administrative support, but deserves further research.

Hypothesis Four

The fourth hypothesis studied through this research was, Missouri community colleges that are located in an urban area will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum than will colleges in a more rural area. As determined through this study, urban colleges were more successful ($p = .046$) in internationalization efforts compared to both suburban and small town colleges with no differences identified between the latter.

It was assumed in framing this hypothesis that urban institutions have the benefit of providing international students and faculty with community resources and ethnic cultural events that afford these individuals a certain amount of ease when living and working in a foreign country. As a result, these institutions might more readily attract international students and teachers. It is further assumed that diverse cultural communities in urban areas encourage greater emphasis on global studies in urban colleges.

Therefore, institutions in more rural locations that lack such resources may find it more difficult to increase diversity on the campus, or stimulate interest in other cultures. With the reduced ability to increase students and instructors from international locations, these institutions may find it difficult to develop or improve their international programs

(Leinwald, 1983). It also seemed probable that residents of rural communities would see less need to be culturally aware because of the relative homogeneity of their population. This study concludes that urban setting does make a difference and the reasons here are simply inferences. Further research is needed to determine if, in fact, these inferences are accurate assessments of ways urban institutions are more globally involved and aware.

Although small town and suburban colleges do not have the ability to change the physical location of the institutions, it is important for these colleges to be aware of the issues that may reduce the chances of drawing international students and faculty to the institution and find innovative ways to compensate. To be successful in this endeavor, a college may need to spend an extended period of time developing a culture of understanding and acceptance prior to moving toward actively recruiting international students and faculty. Many organizations for internationalization are available and aid in providing opportunities to promote this culture (NAFSA, 2008; CCIS, 2008; CCID, 2007; MIIIE, 2007; CICCEL, 2008; AACC, 2006; MCGE, 2002). Small-town institutions may also need to rely on regional businesses representatives to help students, faculty and administrators understand that the economic effects of internationalization reach every community and should be understood by every well educated citizen.

Hypothesis Five

The fifth hypothesis in this study stated that Missouri community colleges that have faculty with positive attitudes toward internationalization efforts will be more successful in implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum. Those colleges with faculty that have a positive attitude were more successful ($p = .029$) in internationalization efforts. Attitudes toward internationalization

did however represent a relatively low variability rate (< 4%). Therefore, very little overall effect can be contributed to the attitudes toward internationalization efforts and the success that institutions can achieve.

Results do support findings from Navarro's (2004) research that demonstrated those faculty members with negative attitudes toward internationalization efforts may have a detrimental effect on the development or improvement of such efforts. However, in evaluating the individual campuses of this study it was shown that the two colleges ranking lowest on the success index had the two highest ratings in positive attitudes toward global education. These attitudes toward global education further support findings by Green et al. (2008) which point toward higher education institutions being deficient in international programs despite indication that cultural awareness is important in most fields of study. This may further indicate the fact that attitude has much less effect on internationalization efforts than other factors, especially administrative support.

There are some major issues that must be addressed to alleviate negative concerns toward internationalization efforts at community colleges. One of those issues, as seen in the comments portion of the questionnaire, is whether global education fits within the parameters of the overall mission of community colleges. Realization of global education's place in community colleges may not be forthcoming until a greater understanding is created among faculty as to what constitutes the college's "community" and what impacts the communities long term economic and social viability.

Hypothesis Six

The sixth hypothesis studied how Missouri community colleges that have faculty that place a relatively high value on international awareness will be more successful in

implementing and/or maintaining an internationalized general education curriculum.

Those colleges that have faculty that place at least some value to a relatively high value on internationalization are more successful ($p < .001$) in internationalization efforts. This factor only accounted for seven percent of the variability rate and therefore is not a large contributor to determining success at the institutions. However, as positive attitudes and the rate of valuing internationalization increase among the faculty, it would appear evident that the success rate would increase.

As institutions continue to investigate ways to successfully increase internationalization efforts, providing development opportunities that help faculty value internationalization of curriculum within institutions will be essential. As these efforts become more accepted throughout the institution, an overall change in attitude toward global education could become more positive. Although much focus has been directed at providing global education to students, it should be evident that faculty, administration and the community served by an educational institution may need increased exposure to move individuals from an ethnocentric viewpoint to a more ethnorelative mindset as indicated by Bennett (1986).

It is crucial to have faculty “buy-in” and consensus on the benefits of providing global education to promote the efforts throughout the institution. Huang and Lin (2007) noted that to be effective in internationalizing the curriculum the issues and conflicts that occur during the process of change must be minimized. Developing clear lines of communication and development of a concise plan of action toward global education will aid in reducing the anxiety associated with such changes, improve attitudes, and increase the perceived value of internationalization efforts.

Additional Data Analysis

Quantitative analysis

Although not directly related to the hypotheses established to study this research question, additional information was gathered from the questionnaire that provided further understanding of faculty perspectives related to internationalization efforts and global education. This information focused on how faculty ranked internationalization and global education issues, compared to other areas within the curriculum and around the colleges.

Several groups of specified subjects were presented to the participants and they were asked to rank each. The first subject area examined how the faculty perceived the value of emphasizing certain skills and knowledge within the general education curriculum. Overwhelmingly, the faculty indicated that the ability to problem solve, utilize critical thinking and develop analytical skills was the most highly valued skill that should be emphasized in the community college general education curriculum. Over 63% of the participants ranked these skills as very highly valued. This was followed closely by communication skills at just over 60%. International awareness and fluency in a second language ranked at 17% and 10% respectively, thereby indicating that these two areas were perceived to be inconsequential when compared to the other more valued topics.

It appears that faculty are considering a student's ability to communicate and think critically in a very limited context and not in a global framework. This may also provide some insight into the lack of international context that faculty see as a necessary component for students higher education experience. One might wonder, for example, how a student is encouraged to think critically and analytically about economics, politics,

history, geography, sociology or even science if unfamiliar with how they fit into a global context. How do students think critically and analytically about our involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan if students are unable to find them on a map, or explain why Al-Qaeda has issues with the U.S.? How do students assess their own or the nation's economic future if unaware of what is happening economically in China or India? Faculty education must be broadened to raise and address these questions and community colleges may need to decide that faculty education in global areas must be a priority before student education can occur.

For the requirements in an undergraduate curriculum, the faculty placed speech and communication as the most highly valued of the areas listed in the survey. Cultural diversity and international awareness were valued at the next highest levels, coming before environmental literacy. Foreign language was ranked lowest in perceived value in undergraduate curriculum.

In future research, more exhaustive areas may need to be identified to provide a more concise understanding of where global education issues are ranked. It is interesting to note that these results indicate that faculty see a difference between cultural diversity, international awareness and foreign language offerings. There is much more to internationalization of curriculum and global education than simply providing foreign language courses at an institution but there should be a recognized relationship. Also, if a foreign language course only strives to teach the fundamentals of the language, there may be no internationalized material in the course and therefore no appreciation of various cultures would be developed.

Unfortunately, these results may also indicate that foreign languages are not recognized as an essential requirement for U.S. students due to the perceived commonality of the English language worldwide. As pointed out in the National Geographic Roper Poll Final Report (2006), 74% of young Americans thought English was the most commonly spoken language worldwide instead of Mandarin. It is noteworthy that 26% of the respondents to this study perceived fluency in a second language as very highly valued. It could be inferred that many adults, and educators, may have comparable attitudes as the typical 18-25 year old. Having more accurate information as to why faculty ranked foreign language skills so low might provide more directed information on what professional development opportunities would benefit faculty to improve internationalization efforts.

When asked about the utilization of college resources to support internationalization, the greatest percent (27%) of faculty designated short-term study abroad courses as the best use of college resources as indicated by the rating of “extremely useful.” Although international experience abroad is an excellent opportunity for students to increase their awareness and acceptance of other cultures, it has been shown that only about three percent of students in higher education enroll in such programs (Hayward, 2000). There is also considerable debate about how useful short-term travel experiences are in changing attitudes and improving understanding, and further study needs to be conducted to determine why faculty value this choice. Even though increased funding would be beneficial for such programs, the likelihood of an institution being able to support enough students to make a considerable impact from such efforts is improbable. Such information may indicate that faculty either do not

understand the benefits of global education within an institution or that they may feel that providing that information is not part of their job as a general education instructor.

This group of questions, associated with budgeting of resources to global initiatives, had an interesting distribution of responses. Most commonly, “average” received the greatest number of responses and none of the questions had “extremely useful” as the main designation. Overall, it appears that respondents were reluctant to have college resources allocated to internationalization efforts. In times of economic hardship for institutions, this issue may become even more problematic and could have a detrimental effect on internationalization efforts throughout the institution. Even though internationalization is accepted as a necessary component in most higher education institutions, it could easily become one of the first areas to receive financial cuts due to limited economic resources.

Participants in this study also indicated that providing funds for students to participate in international activities provided the highest perceived benefit to faculty. However, it was also shown that the participants felt that having collaboration with other faculty and receiving funds to participate in international programs would be highly beneficial. These responses indicate that faculty understand the benefits of traveling abroad for both students and faculty to gain a more complete understanding and awareness of our global community consistent with Bennett’s assessment of what aids in becoming ethnorelative. The results further reflect that these faculty have an appreciation of their colleagues and the information that might be shared from such experiences. This would help validate budgetary support for individual faculty members to travel abroad, and then return to the institution to help train their colleagues.

It would appear from the responses that most participants would not see a great benefit to having an International Support Specialist position created at their institution. In fact, a greater percentage of responses demonstrated a desire for increased funding of the various internationalization efforts, but there was less perceived benefit to having support from administration and governing boards. It is difficult to understand how such financial backing would be acquired without upper level support at the institutions.

Qualitative Analysis

Qualitative analysis was conducted on the single open forum question at the end of the survey. This question was included so participants could provide further comments on the concept of internationalization and was utilized to gain further information that might not have been gathered in the questionnaire. Responses received were varied and demonstrated that individuals with exceedingly different opinions had participated in the survey.

Participants' responses were categorized into two areas; personal and institutional comments related to internationalization. Responses were further classified into positive and negative opinions associated with specific areas within each category. Overall, the greatest percent (43%) of respondents had a positive opinion about the concept of internationalization. However, there were approximately 16% of the participants who made comments that expressed a negative opinion toward the general concept of internationalization or global education in community colleges. Some of the individuals with negative opinions expressed their concern that community colleges are not the level of higher education at which global education should be emphasized.

In reference to the institution's involvement in global education, 11% of the comment responses were positive toward their college's overall support and participation in such efforts. However, 16% signified that they had negative opinions about the support that was provided by the administration. This reinforced expressions in the survey that there is support occurring within faculty groups across the institutions, however, there may be some question as to the administration's commitment for such efforts at some institutions.

For community colleges to become more effective in their efforts there needs to be an established understanding from all parties involved what the expectations and goals are and how those efforts would be carried out and supported. It is essential for those who understand the importance of global education to become vocal advocates for the cause, with specific effort to educate colleagues about its importance to education. There must be a sense of need to teach, understand and be involved in global studies recognized within community colleges. Until this sense of need is created among faculty, administrators, and boards it is unlikely that any major positive change in global education initiatives will occur. As more information is gathered on this topic, further qualitative studies should follow to gain a true understanding of what the colleges and those individuals personally involved in internationalization efforts identify as necessary steps to be successful.

Theoretical Implications

This study was grounded in Gary Becker's work on human capital theory and further informed through Milton Bennett's observations on intercultural sensitivity. Human capital theory demonstrates that to be economically well prepared an individual

must gain educational insights appropriate to existing demands of the surrounding environment. This will allow an individual to become skilled in the tools of the new global economy that is apparent in the interdependent world in which we now live. To become comfortable with this global marketplace requires awareness and understanding of the various cultures within it. Using Bennett's language, to provide an ethnocentric education in an ethnorelative world diminishes the human capital of each of our graduates and leaves them less well prepared and less competitive in our current environment.

To obtain such awareness and understanding, students must be exposed to internationalized curriculum and global education during their college experience. This is maintained in Bennett's developmental model of intercultural sensitivity where the amount of understanding and acceptance of other cultures progresses to a more ethnorelative level with increased exposure to such cultures. It has been shown that some community colleges across the U.S. are doing well in this area. However, the current study finds that many community colleges are not providing the level of internationalization necessary to move students along the ethnorelative continuum and effectively increase the human capital of the students served by these institutions.

Students at community colleges will be unable to develop appropriate awareness and understanding if there is a similar lack of awareness and understanding demonstrated by the faculty at these institutions. Therefore, it is critical that these faculty obtain further training and expertise in this area. There are a number of ways to obtain this training. As noted previously, several organizations have been established that offer opportunities and educational resources to increase international knowledge for faculty of community

colleges. Also, universities offer community college educational leadership degree programs with courses and advanced degrees related to global education. Finally, traveling abroad, whether independently or in conjunction with institution supported trips, will provide increased understanding and awareness of other cultures.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the following realities concerning global education and Missouri community colleges became evident. It is apparent that internationalization efforts are being discussed and some progress is being made throughout the institutions but this progress varies widely based on leadership interest and institutional setting. There is a mixed level of understanding that developing competencies in global issues is a necessity to generate internationally conscious citizens, and this recognition ranks relatively low in terms of both academic and resource allocation priorities. Faculty appear to be more committed than are their leaders, and in the absence of leadership support, little happens.

Community colleges are well positioned to reach a large population of students and should be at the forefront of the internationalization movement. These institutions are uniquely situated to globally educate those individuals who may not have the opportunity to be exposed to this vital information in other arenas of higher education. Therefore, community colleges must internationalize their curriculum and provide this much needed information to the student populations they serve.

Through this study it has become evident that there is still a lack of understanding as to what internationalization truly entails and why it is important. For institutions to be successful in the effort there must first be a sense of need established for global education

among faculty, administration and governing boards. This will require professional development at all levels that demonstrates how absence of global context in the curricula causes a postsecondary education to fall short of being complete. Once this is accomplished, colleges must endeavor to develop a more educated population in the surrounding community that will support the work being undertaken by the college to increase global competencies.

This study also indicated although some did not feel there was support from the administration, they were committed to continuing their individual efforts due to their dedication to what they saw as a worthy cause. Although admirable, to be truly successful, all levels of the institution must be a part of the initiative. Without administrative support, it is highly unlikely that any programs or courses would grow extensively. As was noted previously, any increase in the number of individuals and groups committed to such initiatives will provide greater opportunities for success.

To summarize findings concerning the research question of what factors contribute to, or impede the development of internationalized general education curricula in Missouri community colleges, the following determinations were found to positively affect development:

1. Administrative support is key to internationalizing curricula. With high support, there is high success. With low support, low success.
2. Institution setting has a major influence on an institutions success in internationalizing programs and curriculum.
3. Positive leadership can overcome some of the obstacles presented by locations that lack diversity.

4. Faculty attitudes about internationalization can have a positive influence on internationalization, but will probably not overcome poor administrative support.
5. Faculty with significant international experience will be more actively involved in related college programs and activities.

Barrier to development include the following:

1. Many community college mission statements do not include international education as a priority.
2. Even if mission statements include this priority, most faculty do not know about it.
3. Governing Boards are not viewed by general education faculty as being supportive of the effort.
4. The faculty sense of what “community” entails is sometimes limited.
5. There is a disconnect in the mind of many faculty between diversity education and international education.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study focused entirely on the perceptions of the general education, full-time faculty at Missouri community colleges on internationalization issues. To gain a more comprehensive understanding of internationalization efforts in community colleges, the following areas would be worthy of future studies:

1. A thorough analysis of internationalization efforts at community colleges from the student perspective would be useful. This should include an in-depth examination of perceived benefits to students currently attending community colleges and/or

actual benefits received by students with data gathered after a student has moved from the community college or has participated in an international experience.

2. A thorough analysis of internationalization efforts at community colleges from the perspective of the administration would be useful. Developing a firm understanding of administrative support of internationalization efforts would provide critical information in advancing programs at institutions since administrative support has been shown to be critical.
3. A thorough analysis of governing boards' perspectives related to internationalization efforts and support is important for the same reason. Continuing on the theme of obtaining levels of support and obtaining critical information to advance internationalization efforts, board perspectives about why international education is or is not important should be obtained.
4. A thorough analysis of the view of the tax-paying community on internationalization of curriculum at local community colleges would be a useful study. This study would aid in determining how the local community feels about such efforts and in understanding local support as well as the overall cultural awareness of the community.
5. A concurrent study of each of the previously mentioned groups (students, administration, governing boards, and local community) is needed to determine how perspectives align or differ on the subject of internationalization.
6. This study's instrument should be used in other state community college systems to gain a more complete understanding of faculty perspectives on internationalization of community college general education curriculum. There

are several distinctly different types of U.S. community college systems, and states and regions will vary considerably. Researching other systems would be beneficial and provide much needed information on internationalization efforts. Also, with several different models of community colleges worldwide (U.S., Canadian, Australian, etc.) it would be interesting to incorporate various countries into the analysis.

7. A study of similar design to the current study would be useful to evaluate the perspectives of faculty in other areas of instruction at community colleges. International education may have equal value for students in career and technical programs.
8. A study focused on the students having a broad global perspective and the level of ability to think critically and analytically would be useful to understand the importance of an individual becoming more culturally aware and its effect on other critical skills.
9. Further qualitative inquiry into internationalization initiatives is needed to gain a greater understanding of why various groups hold the attitudes and opinions they express. As mentioned earlier, the effects of gender on interest in the topic and on reasons for being more or less responsive would be useful.
10. A comparison of internationalization efforts in private to public and two-year to four-year institutions would provide increased understanding of internationalization efforts in all areas of higher education.
11. Finally, application of Bennett's DMIS to a representative cross-section of community college faculty to gauge ethnocentricity and ethnorelativity would be

helpful to determine how much development work is needed to prepare a faculty who can effectively present an internationalized curriculum.

Concluding Remarks

Internationalization of curriculum and global education are not new concepts to higher education; yet, a universal understanding of what these entail is lacking. As the world becomes increasingly interdependent, individuals will be required to move away from their insular views to be effective citizens. Institutions of higher education, and especially community colleges, must be prepared to provide the necessary insights to broaden the cultural awareness and acceptance that is essential in these endeavors, now and in the future.

There is much need for continued research on internationalization to obtain a more complete understanding of the issues surrounding this topic. The results of this study provide necessary information toward understanding issues within community colleges in developing and maintaining global education. To meet the future demands of students who want to increase their international cultural awareness, further research and implementation are required.

References

- Abdullahi, I., Kajberg, L., & Virkus, S. (2007). Internationalization of LIS education in Europe and North America. *New Library World*, 108(1/2), 7-24.
- Adams, A. H., & Earwood, G. (1982). Internationalizing the community college (Fellows Research Report No. 2). Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University Institute for Studies in Higher Education.
- Altbach, P. G. (2002, Spring). Perspectives on internationalizing higher education. *International Higher Education*. Retrieved February 19, 2008, from http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News27/text004.htm.
- Altbach, P. G. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. [Electronic version]. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10, 3-25.
- Altbach, P. G. & Knight, J. (2006). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *The NEA 2006 Almanac of Higher Education*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2006). Community colleges past to present. Retrieved January 15, 2007, from http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/AboutCommunityColleges/HistoricalInformation/PasttoPresent/Past_to_Present.htm
- American Association of Community Colleges. (2008). AACC research and statistics. Retrieved May 4, 2008, from <http://www2.aacc.nche.edu/research/index.htm>
- Backman, G. M. (1993). *Internationalization of home economics education: Global education practices and perceptions of teacher educators*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames.

- Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of universities: a university culture-based framework. [Electronic version]. *Higher Education*, 5(1).
- Becker, G. S. (1962). Investment in Human Capital: A theoretical analysis. *The Journal of Political Economy*, Part 2: *Investment in Human Beings*, 70(5), 9-49.
- Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human Capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to Education*. General Series 30. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bennett, M. J. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10, 179-196.
- Bush, G. W. (2006, January 6). *Remarks by President Bush*. Retrieved February 18, 2008, from U.S. Department of State: <http://www.state.gov/summit/58734.htm>
- Center for International Community College Educational Leadership. (2008). Welcome to CICCEL. Retrieved June 28, 2008, from <http://www.ciccel.org/>
- Cohen, A. M. & Brawer, F. B. (2003). *The American Community College* (4th Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- College Consortium for International Studies. (2008). Welcome to CCIS study abroad. Retrieved June 22, 2008, from <http://www.ccisabroad.org/>
- Community Colleges for International Development, Inc. (2007). Welcome to CCID. Retrieved June 22, 2008, from <http://www.ccid.cc/welcome.htm>
- Cronk, G. (2004). *Definitions and systems of general education: A sampling from various sources*. The Bergen Community College on General Education. Retrieved September 16, 2009, from http://www.bergen.edu/gened/df_gened.pdf

- Dellow, D. A. (2007, Summer). The role of globalization in technical and occupational programs. In R. Raby & E. Valeau (Eds.), *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 138, 39-45. doi: 10.1002/cc.280
- Desruisseaux, P. (1991, December 4). Congress approves program to support overseas study: Includes provisions for training in languages and area studies. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved February 18, 2008, from <http://chronicle.com/che-data/articles.dir/articles-38.dir/issue-15.dir/15a05303.htm>.
- de Wit, H. (2000) Changing rationales for the internationalization of higher education. In Barrows, L.C. (Ed.), *Internationalization of higher education: An institutional perspective. Papers on higher education* (CEPES/UNESCO, pp. 9-22). Bucharest, Romania: United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Ellingboe, B. J. (1998). Divisional Strategies to internationalizing a campus portrait: Results, resistance, and recommendations from a case study at a U.S. university. In J. Mestenhauser & B. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus*, (pp.198-228). Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Engberg, D. and Green, M. (2002) *Promising practices: Spotlighting excellence in comprehensive internationalization*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
- Fischer, K. (2008a, May 30). New report reveals mixed results in colleges' efforts at international education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved May 30, 2008, from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v54/i38/38a02401.htm>.

- Fischer, K. (2008b, October 31). Professors get their own study-abroad programs. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved November 13, 2008, from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v55/i10/10a00102.htm>.
- Frost, R. (2007, Fall). Global studies in the community college curriculum. *The Community College Enterprise*. Retrieved May 31, 2008, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa4057/is_200710/ai_n21185467.
- Graham, P. (1998). Internationalization of course work in soil science and agronomy. In J. A. Mestenhauser & B. J. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus*. (pp. 125-134). Series on Higher Education. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Green, M. F., Luu, D., and Burris, B. (2008). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: 2008 edition*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Green, M. F. and Siaya, L. (2005). *Measuring internationalization at community colleges*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Hamm, B. and Smandych, R. (Eds.). (2005). *Cultural imperialism: Essays on the political economy of cultural domination*. Ontario: Broadview Press Ltd.
- Hammer, M. R. (1998). A measure of intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. In S. Fowler & M. Fowler (Eds.), *The intercultural Sourcebook: Volume 2*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., and Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 27, 421-443.

- Harari, M. (1992). The internationalization of the curriculum. In C. B. Klasek (Ed.), *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education*. Pullman, WA: Washington State University's Center for International Development. Headquarters of the Association of International Education Administrators.
- Hayward, F. (2000). *Internationalization of U.S. higher education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Huang, Y. and Lin, Y. (2007). Connecting to the world: Curriculum and faculty internationalization of higher education in Taiwan. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 9, 67-78.
- Hughes, K. (2006, January 6). *Remarks at the U.S. university presidents' summit on international education*. Retrieved February 18, 2008, from U.S. Department of State: <http://www.state.gov/r/us/587776.htm>.
- Institute of International Education. (n.d.). *Fulbright*. Retrieved May 14, 2008, from <http://www.iie.org/Template.cfm?section=Fulbright1>
- Jackman, L. W. & Jones, L. D. (2002). Information literacy, information communication technologies (ITCs), and the nongovernmental organization (NGO)/nonprofit world: A practitioner's perspective [White paper]. Retrieved from <http://www.nclis.gov/libinter/infolitconf&meet/papers/jackman-fullpaper.pdf>
- Jefferson College. (n.d.). MCCA-MCGE Title VIA Grant 2007-2010: Grant narrative. Retrieved June 16, 2008, from http://www.jeffco.edu/mcge/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=12&Itemid=27

- Joliet Junior College. (2007). *History of Joliet Junior College*. Retrieved September 28, 2008, from <http://www.jjc.edu/admin/history.html>
- Kiker, B. F. (1966). The historical roots of the concept of human capital. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 74(5), 481-499.
- Kim, D. & Rury, J. L. (2007, August). The changing profile of college access: The Truman commission and enrollment patterns in the postwar era. *History of Education Quarterly*, 47(3), 302-327.
- King, D. R. (1991). *Perceptions regarding the infusion of a global perspective into the curriculum as identified by the faculty of the College of Agriculture at Iowa State University*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames.
- King, J. E. (2008). Too many rungs on the ladder? Faculty demographics and the future leadership of higher education. ACE Center for Policy Analysis. Retrieved July 5, 2009, from <http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Home&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=28763>
- Knight, J. (2003a). *Internationalization of higher education practices and priorities: 2003 IAU Survey Report*. Paris, International Association of Universities.
- Knight, J. (2003b). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education* (33). Retrieved February 19, 2008, from http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/ihe_pdf/ihe33.pdf
- Knight, J. & de Wit, H. (Eds.) (1997). *Internationalisation of higher education in Asia Pacific countries*. Amsterdam: EAIE.

- Korbel, L. (2007). In union there is strength: The role of state global education consortia in expanding community college involvement in global education. In E. Valeau & R. Raby (Eds.), *New Directions for Community Colleges* (38), 47-55. DOI: 10.1002/cc.281
- Kwok, V. & Leland, H. (1982). An economic model of the brain drain. *The American Economic Review*, 72(1), 91-100.
- LeBlanc, E. (2007). Internationalizing the curriculum: A discussion of challenges and first steps within business schools. *Higher Education Perspectives*. 3(1), 29-44.
- Leinwald, G. (1983). *Without a nickel: The challenge of internationalizing the curriculum and the campus*. Washington DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- Lundy-Dobbert, M. L. (1998). The impossibility of internationalizing students by adding materials to courses. In J. Mestenhauser & B. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus* (pp. 53-68). Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- McDonnell, L. M., Berryman, S. E., & Scott, D. (1981, May). Federal support for international studies: The role of NDEA Title VI. Report for Department of Education. Rand Corp., Santa Monica, CA. Retrieved June 17, 2008, from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/2e/23/62.pdf
- Mestenhauser, J. (1998) Introduction. In Mestenhauser, J. & Ellingboe, B. (Eds.), *Reforming the higher education curriculum: Internationalizing the campus*. (pp. xvii-xviii) Phoenix: Oryx Press.

- Midwest Institute for International/Intercultural Education. (2007). Midwest Institute Consortium. Retrieved April 6, 2008, from <http://orgs.kvcc.edu/midwest/Projects/>
- Mincer, J. (1958). Investments in human capital and personal income distribution. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 66(4), 281-302.
- Missouri Consortium for Global Education. (2002). *MCGE*. Retrieved February 19, 2008, from <http://www.mocca.org/mcge>
- Missouri Department of Higher Education . (2007). Credit Transfer Guidelines for Student Transfer and Articulation Among MO Colleges and Universities. Retrieved September 16, 2009, from <http://www.dhe.mo.gov/credittransfer.shtml>
- National Association of Foreign Student Advisers. (2008). About NAFSA. Retrieved June 28, 2008, from <http://www.nafsa.org/about.sec>
- National Geographic. (2006). Final report: National Geographic-Roper Public Affairs 2006 Geographic Literacy Study. Retrieved June 10, 2008, from <http://www.nationalgeographic.com/roper2006/pdf/FINALReport2006GeogLitsurvey.pdf>
- Navarro, M. (2004). *Analysis of factors affecting participation of faculty and choice of strategies for the internationalization of the undergraduate agricultural curriculum: The case of two land grant universities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A & M, College Station.
- Pierce, D. (1996). Preface. In A. Chase and J. Mahoney (Eds.), *Global awareness in community colleges*. (p. V). Washington DC: Community College Press.
- Qiang, Z., (2003). Internationalization of higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education*, 1(2), 248-270.

- Quimbita, G. (1989). *Internationalizing the community college: Examples of success*. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. (ERIC Identifier: ED321833)
- Raby, R. (2007). Internationalizing curriculum: On- and off-campus strategies. In E. Valeau & R. Raby (Eds.). *New Directions for Community Colleges* (pp. 57-66). Wiley Periodicals, Inc.
- Raby, R. L. (2008, September). Expanding education abroad at U.S. community colleges [white paper series (3)]. Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/Content/NavigationMenu/Research_and_Evaluation/Study_Abroad_White_Papers/StudyAbroad_WhitePaper3.pdf
- Rice, C. (2006, January 5). Remarks at the U.S. university presidents' summit on international education dinner. Retrieved February 18, 2008, from <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2006/58750.htm>
- Romano, R. M. (Ed.). (2002). *Internationalizing the community college*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college & university: A history*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press.
- Schock, L. (Ed.). (2007). *Internationalizing the campus 2007*. Washington, DC: NAFSA
- Schultz, T. W. (1960). Capital formation by education. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 68(6), 571-583.
- Siaya, L. & Hayward, F. (2003). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

- Smith, A. (1776). *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. Penn State Electronic Classics Series Publication. The Pennsylvania State University. Retrieved September 16, 2009, from <http://www2.hn.psu.edu/faculty/jmanis/adam-smith/Wealth-Nations.pdf>
- Sorensen, M. R. (2000). *Training, wages, and the human capital theory*. (Working Paper 9:2000). Copenhagen, Denmark. The Danish National Institute of Social Research.
- Spelling, M. (2006, January 5). *Secretary Spellings delivered remarks at the U.S. university presidents' summit on international education*. Retrieved February 18, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/print/news/speeches/2006/01/01062006.html>
- Sumner, W. G. (1907). *Folkways: A study of the sociological importance of usages, manners, customs, mores, and morals*. Boston: Ginn & Company.
- Thomas, J. (2007, November 19). *Internationalizing U.S. campuses benefits students*. Retrieved February 21, 2008, from <http://usinfo.state.gov/utills/printpage.html>
- United States Department of Education. (2005). *The history of Title VI and Fulbright-Hays: An impressive international timeline*. Retrieved April 2, 2008, from <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/iegps/history.html>
- United States Department of Education. (2006). *A test of leadership: Charting the future of higher education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- United States Intelligence Community. (2002, November 27). *National security act of 1947*. Retrieved April 15, 2008, from http://www.intelligence.gov/0-atsecact_1947.shtml

Weisbrod, B. A. (1962). Education and investment in human capital. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 70(5) Part 2: Investment in human beings, 106-123.

World Bank. (1995). *Priorities and strategies for education: A World Bank Review*. Washington, DC: Author.

Appendix A

Recipients of the Senator Paul Simon Award for Campus Internationalization¹

2003

Community College of Philadelphia

Dickson College

Eastern Mennonite University

Indiana University

San Diego State University

Yale University

2004

Bellevue Community College

Binghamton University

Duke University

St. Norbert College

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

2005

Colby College

Colgate University

Howard Community College

University of Kansas

University of California, at Los Angeles (UCLA)

2006

Arcadia University

Concordia College

Earlham College

Michigan State University

Purdue University

2007

Calvin College

Elon University

University of Oklahoma

Georgia Institute of
Technology

¹ (Schock, 2007, p. 66)

Appendix B

From: Maria Navarro
Sent: Wednesday, April 09, 2008 6:43 PM
To: O'CONNOR, GAVIN C.
Subject: RE: Dissertation request

I have no problem with you utilizing my survey. I would like to continue the conversation regarding opportunities... although now is not a good moment, maybe in May. In the meantime, know that I give you permission to use the instrument, of course, always with appropriate citations.

Best and good luck in your program,
MN

Appendix C

The URL of this survey:

<http://CTLSilhouette.wsu.edu/surveys/ZS89825>

Internationalization of General Education Curriculum in Missouri Community Colleges

Internationalization of the curriculum may be defined in different ways, accomplished at varying degrees of satisfaction, and through different methods. For the purpose of this study, internationalization of the curriculum is: “integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education”. The following questions are related to personal, professional and college information.

1. What is your gender?

Female

Male

2. How many years have you been working at a community college in a faculty position?

1-5

6-10

11-15

16-20

21-25

26 or more

3. How many years have you worked in higher education?

1-5

6-10

11-15

16-20

21-25

26 or more

4. What is your highest degree earned?

Associate

Bachelors

Masters

Doctorate

5. What is your home department?

English

Humanities

Mathematics

Science

Social/Behavioral Science

Other

6. The following three questions list alphabetically Missouri community colleges, and campuses when appropriate. Please indicate the college you are currently employed.

Crowder College

East Central College

Jefferson College

MCC-Blue River

MCC-Longview

MCC-Maple Woods

MCC-Penn Valley

Mineral Area Community College

7. Community colleges continued.

Moberly Area Community College

North Central Missouri College

Ozarks Technical Community College

STLCC-Florissant Valley

STLCC-Forest Park

STLCC-Meramec

STLCC-Wildwood

St. Charles Community College

8. Community Colleges Continued.

State Fair Community College

Three Rivers Community College

9. Do you have administrative responsibilities (e.g. Department Head, Associate/Assistant Dean, etc.)?

Yes

No

10. Were you born outside the United States?

Yes (Please answer question 11)

No (proceed to question 12)

11. If you answered 'yes' to question 10, how many years have you been in the United States?

1-5

- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16-20
- 21-25
- 26 or more

12. How much international experience (travels/studies) outside the United States have you personally been involved?

- None
- One or two tours abroad of less than 3 weeks
- International touring abroad of 3 weeks or more in the same trip
- Extended travel abroad lasting several months
- Lived or studied abroad for more than one year

13. How would you rate the success of your institution in maintaining an international focus for general education students?

- Very poor
- Poor
- Fair
- Good
- Very Good

14. How would you rate your international knowledge/experience in comparison with that of the majority of your peers?

- Very poor
- Poor
- Fair
- Good

Very good

15. How would you rate your current participation in any kind of international activities in comparison with that of the majority of your peers?

Very low

Low

Average

High

Very high

16. Does your institution (individual campus or college system) include global education in its mission statement?

Yes

No

Unknown

17. Does your institution have an active representative to the Missouri Consortium for Global Education?

Yes

No

Unknown

18. Does your institution include internationalization as a priority within its strategic plan?

Yes

No

Unknown

19. Does your institution provide for internationalization efforts as a budgetary item (e.g. faculty lead study abroad programs, internationalization of courses, faculty

travel to international meetings, etc.)?)

Yes

No

Unknown

20. Does your administration encourage internationalization of general education courses?

Yes

No

Unknown

21. Does your governing board support internationalization efforts by the college?

Yes

No

Unknown

22. How would you rate the internationalization efforts of your institution?

None

One "champion" leading the movement (please answer question 23 below)

Small group working toward internationalization

Accepted and encouraged throughout the college faculty

Accepted and encouraged throughout the college up to and including the upper-level administration

Accepted and encouraged throughout the college up to and including the governing board

23. Only answer if you chose the answer "One champion" on question 22 above. If your college has an international "champion", what is that person's role at the institution?

Administration

Faculty

Professional Staff

Classified Staff

24. How successful has your institution been in providing a global aspect into the general education curriculum

No success

Little success

Average success

Good success

Excellent success

Please indicate, from your perspective, the value of emphasizing each of the following in the community college general education curriculum.						
		Very Low	Low	Average	High	Very High
25.	Interpersonal skills (e.g. leadership, management, teamwork)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
26.	Problem solving, critical thinking, and analytical skills	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
27.	Communication skills (e.g. listening, verbalizing, presentation, professional writing)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
28.	Technical competency within the 'major' field of study	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
29.	Computer skills (e.g. basic office packages, internet use, database management)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
30.	Prior work and/or internship experience	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
31.	International awareness and/or experience	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
32.	Fluency in a second language	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Many Universities and/or colleges are including requirements in their undergraduate curriculum such as the ones listed below.						
Please indicate, from your perspective, the value of each of the following.						
		Very Low	Low	Average	High	Very High
33.	Environmental literacy requirement (i.e. fluency in ecological principles)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
34.	Cultural diversity requirement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
35.	International awareness requirement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
36.	Foreign language requirement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
37.	Speech/communication requirement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Internationalization is "integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education".						
Please answer the follow questions about the internationalization of curriculum from your perspective						
		No	Not much	Neutral	Somewhat	Yes
38.	In general, are community college graduates prepared to compete in the global job market?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
39.	Is your institution's general education curriculum internationalized?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
40.	Do you think that further internationalization of community college general education curriculum is necessary?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

41. How successful has your institution been in internationalizing the general education curriculum

No success

Little success

- Average success
- Good success
- Excellent success

42. What has been your level of participation to date in efforts to internationalize the curriculum in comparison with that of the majority of your peers?

- Very low
- Low
- Average
- High
- Very high

Please indicate which of the following are "the best uses" of college resources (e.g. faculty time, personnel, and funds) for the support of the internationalization of the general education curriculum.						
		Of no use	Low use	Average	High use	extremely useful
43.	Infusion: integrating internationalized lessons, readings, examples, case studies, activities, and/or perspectives into existing (regular) on-campus courses and programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
44.	On-campus, international subject matter courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
45.	Technology and virtual mobility: distance learning courses with foreign students, foreign universities, and resource people around the world	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
46.	International certificates or emphasis areas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
47.	Short term study abroad courses: a cohort of students with community college faculty, 2-5 weeks abroad	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
48.	Cohort semester abroad: one semester at a foreign college or university, with community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	college faculty and students					
49.	Semester exchange programs and internships: individualized programs at foreign colleges, universities or internship posts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
50.	Internationalize campus environment: increase in number of international students and faculty, organization of workshops, discussions, and varied 'social' activities of international subject matter, etc.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Internationalization is "integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education".						
What type of effect (negative to positive) does each of the following have on your participation in internationalizing the general education curriculum?						
	Negative	Somewhat negative	Neutral	Somewhat positive	Positive	
51. Your personal interest (or lack thereof)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
52. Relevance (or lack thereof) to your job	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
53. Student interest (or lack thereof) in internationalized curricula	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
54. Your international knowledge/expertise (or lack thereof)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
55. Your ability (or lack thereof) to develop internationalized curricula (e.g. you may have the necessary knowledge but are unsure how to use it effectively in your classes)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
56. Time available (or lack thereof) for curriculum development and internationalization efforts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

57.	Support (or lack thereof) you receive from your department, division, or college administration for internationalization efforts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
58.	Support from the college governing board for international activities or involvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Please indicate how much the following could support you in your efforts to internationalize the courses and programs for which you are responsible		Not at all	A little	Some	Much	A great deal	
59.	Release time from teaching (or other duties) for you to internationalize your curriculum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
60.	Creation of an "internationalization support specialist" position in your college	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
61.	Collaboration with other faculty members	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
62.	Development and availability of internationalized instructional materials for you to choose from, adapt, and use in your classes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
63.	Seminars and workshops to assist you in your curriculum development and internationalization efforts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
64.	More funds for participation in international programs, sabbaticals, and other related professional development opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
65.	More funds to support curriculum development and internationalization for on-campus courses (e.g. infusion, international subject matter courses)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
66.	More funds to support curriculum development and internationalization for off-campus courses (e.g. study abroad, exchange	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	programs)						
67.	More support from the department and college administration for internationalization of the general education curriculum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
68.	Including your participation in internationalization efforts in your evaluation process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
69.	More funds to support student participation in internationalized programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
70.	Greater support by the college governing board for international involvement by the college	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

71. Please provide your comments on internationalization efforts.

[send survey]

[reset]

Appendix D

From: Oconnor, Gavin C (UMSL-Student)
Sent: Sunday, March 29, 2009 11:14 AM
Subject: Gen Ed Faculty Request
Attachments: Letter_of_Consent[1].docx

Dear Community College Colleague,

I need your help for about 15 minutes. As a fellow General Education faculty member and current academic administrator at a Missouri community college, I understand the importance of the input from the general education faculty on key issues. Due to this fact, I have based my doctoral dissertation research on the critical value of faculty perceptions of global education efforts in our general education curriculum.

With that said, I am asking for your assistance in participating in a short survey (approximately 12 minutes) that will provide insight into the internationalization efforts that are occurring on Missouri community college campuses. Your participation is completely voluntary and anonymous, but I would like to have enough representation from each college in the state that I can use the data in my study. Reminders will be emailed over the next month and due to the anonymity of the survey will be sent to all participants regardless of prior participation. But it will probably be simplest to complete the survey now, and ignore the reminders later. It is completely online, and I think you will find it a very interest survey!

Please read the attached letter of consent. The link to the survey is found at the end of the Consent Letter attachment and at the end of this email. By clicking on the link and continuing to the questionnaire you indicate your agreement with the statements in the letter of consent.

If you have any questions, please feel free to email me at [REDACTED]

Survey URL:

<http://CTLSilhouette.wsu.edu/surveys/ZS89825>

Thank you for your consideration,

Gavin O'Connor

PhD Candidate
Department of Education
University of Missouri-St. Louis

Assistant Dean of Sciences
Ozarks Technical Community College
Springfield, MO

Appendix E

From: Oconnor, Gavin C (UMSL-Student)
Sent: Mon 4/6/2009 9:15 AM
Subject: Gen Ed faculty request
Attachments: Letter_of_Consent.docx

Dear Colleagues,

As I mentioned in a previous email, I am requesting your assistance in a short survey. This survey will provide insight into the global education efforts occurring on Missouri community college campuses as seen by those most involved, the General Education faculty. Also, people have reported to me that it has only taken them 7-8 minutes (others longer) to complete the survey. So, even during these busy days, it will not take much of your time to complete.

Your participation is completely voluntary and anonymous. However, I need your help to provide enough data to demonstrate how global education from your perspective is, or is not, being carried out in Missouri community colleges. No matter your stance on this issue, your opinion is vital. So please consider taking a few minutes to participate.

For those that have already taken the time to participate, I am very grateful. Might I ask one more favor? If you get a chance to encourage your full-time Gen. Ed. colleagues to participate in the survey it would be greatly appreciated.

To complete the survey, please read the attached Letter of Consent and follow the link to the survey. You may also click on the following link to obtain the survey. By clicking on the link and continuing to the questionnaire you indicate your agreement with the statements in the Letter of Consent.

Survey URL:
<http://CTLSilhouette.wsu.edu/surveys/ZS89825>

The survey will be available for a few more weeks and I will be sending at least one more reminder in a couple of weeks. As mentioned previously, due the anonymous nature of the survey these reminders will be sent to all participants regardless of prior participation.

Thank you for your consideration and contribution to this project,

Gavin O'Connor
PhD Candidate
Department of Education
University of Missouri - St. Louis

Assistant Dean of Sciences
Ozarks Technical Community College
Springfield, MO

Appendix F

From: Oconnor, Gavin C (UMSL-Student)
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2009 2:12 PM
Subject: Last Opportunity - Gen Ed Faculty Request
Attachments: Letter_of_Consent.rtf

Hello again,

Thank you to all that have participated in my study. If I get enough participation this week, this should be my last reminder. I realize how busy each of you are and appreciate your consideration in taking the time to complete the survey.

The survey will be available until Saturday night. If you have planned on participating, please do so before April 25. Each survey is important to obtain a proper measure of our work of internationalizing the community college general education in Missouri.

Please read the attached letter of consent and follow the link provided to continue. Also, the following link will take you directly to the survey.

<http://CTLSilhouette.wsu.edu/surveys/ZS89825>

Your support has been greatly appreciated.

Gavin O'Connor

PhD Candidate
Department of Education
University of Missouri - St. Louis

Assistant Dean of Sciences
Ozarks Technical Community College
Springfield, MO

Appendix G

Letter of Consent

Dear faculty member,

Thank you for your consideration of completing the following survey related to your perceptions of internationalization of general education curriculum at your college. The survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

Answers to the survey will be kept strictly confidential and anonymity will be maintained throughout the process. In order to further protect the anonymous nature of the responses, answers will be grouped and not reported on an individual basis. Also, the survey program does not provide the researcher the ability to track the electronic identification of participants.

To gain an accurate and representative understanding of internationalization of general education curriculum in Missouri community colleges, your feedback is important. However, you are not required to participate in the research study and there will be no penalties or negative consequences for choosing not to participate. Approximately 750 Missouri community college faculty are being asked to take part in this survey.

The survey can be completed by following the link below. By clicking the link and continuing to the questionnaire, you volunteer to participate in the study. As a participant you may refuse to answer any particular question(s) and still continue with the research. You may stop participating at any time by closing the browser window. To provide the most accurate information, please do not complete more than one survey. To assure a high response rate, two email reminders will be sent to all possible participants at regular intervals.

Survey URL:

<http://CTLSilhouette.wsu.edu/surveys/ZS89825>

Please direct any questions regarding this research to Gavin O'Connor at

██████████.

Thank you for your valuable contributions.

Gavin C. O'Connor

PhD Candidate
Department of Education
University of Missouri – St. Louis

Assistant Dean of Sciences
Ozarks Technical Community College
Springfield, MO

Appendix H



OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Interdepartmental Correspondence

Name: Gavin O'Connor

Title: Internationalization of General Education Curriculum in Missouri Community Colleges

The chairperson of the Human Subjects Committee for UM-St. Louis has reviewed the above mentioned protocol for research involving human subjects and determined that the project qualifies for exemption from full committee review under Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations Part 46.101b. The time period for this approval expires one year from the date listed below. You must notify the Human Subjects Committee in advance of any proposed major changes in your approved protocol, e.g., addition of research sites or research instruments.

You must file an annual report with the committee. This report must indicate the starting date of the project and the number of subjects to date from start of project, or since last annual report, whichever is more recent.

Any consent or assent forms must be signed in duplicate and a copy provided to the subject. The principal investigator must retain the other copy of the signed consent form for at least three years following the completion of the research activity and they must be available for inspection if there is an official review of the UM-St. Louis human subjects research proceedings by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office for Protection from Research Risks.

This action is officially recorded in the minutes of the committee.

Protocol Number	Date	Signature - Chair
0902060	2/19/09	<i>Cal J. Davis</i>